Goble UrbanScope article : Professor Niki comments : Comments : from the standpoint of urban history

UrbanScope

Goble UrbanScope article; Professor Niki comments
Comments – from the standpoint of urban history

Hiroshi NIKI*

I

Firstly, I'd like to clarify the urban space that Professor Goble has taken as his subject.

The Tenma temple urban district (in Kita-ku ward of Ōsaka city) was established in the sixth month of Tenshō 13 (1585) when the Honganji head Kennyo, in response to an invitation from Hashiba [Toyotomi] Hideyoshi, transferred the Honganji headquarters to there from Kaizuka (Kaizuka city in Ōsaka prefecture). Having Honganji followers concentrated there and building a district, and having pilgrims come from all around the country, and thereby stimulate the growth of the city of Ōsaka, was one element of Hideyoshi's urban policies.

However, being placed directly under the eyes of national political authority led to the loss of the Honganji temple urban district's tradition of being a self-governing city. In Tenshō 17 (1589), using as an excuse an incident in which *rōnin* who had committed crimes were given shelter, political authority was introduced into the temple urban district, which then led to an official census being conducted.

The Tenma temple urban district was part and parcel of the growth and transformation of the Ōsaka castle town, but in the first month of Tenshō 19 (1591), as part of the urban redevelopment of the southern portion of Kyoto, Hideyoshi decided to relocate it to the Rokujō area of Kyoto (in Shimogyō-ku of Kyoto city).

In the eighth month of Tenshō 19 (1591) Honganji relocated from Tenma in Ōsaka to Rokujō. Honganji's centripetal force was very strong. At Rokujō an organized temple urban district was completed in short order, and followers from all over the country came on pilgrimage, thus contributing to the growth of the city of Kyoto as a whole. In Keichō 1 (1596) Honganji and the temple urban district suffered substantial damage from an earthquake, but they were soon rebuilt. In Keichō 7 (1602), as a result of the political policy of the Tokugawa bakufu, a new "Eastern Honganji (Higashi Honganji)" split off as a separate entity, but the Rokujō temple urban district did not decline.

The old site of the Tenma temple urban district was incorporated as part of Ōsaka castle town, and in the early modern period became the "Tenma group," becoming one of the constituent components of the so-called "Ōsaka three districts." The land allotments of the contemporary temple urban district were maintained and have continued through to the present. The exact location of the Tenma Honganji itself has yet to be confirmed, but it is speculated that it may be around the site of the present-day Ōsaka Mint.

As for the Rokujō temple urban district, even today it has been preserved in the rows of houses on the eastern side of Nishi Honganji (Jōdo Shinshū Honganji Lineage). Today, traditional Japanese inns that cater to followers from around the country who come to visit, and shops that deal in Buddhist religious paraphernalia, remain, thus retaining some of its original vestiges.

II

I'd now like to turn to studies of the social connections in sixteenth century cities.

The bulk of these deal with the capital city of Kyoto, and since the 1980s attention has been focused on neighborhood communities (*machi kyōdōtai*). Starting with Asao Naohiro, research has continued to be pursued by such scholars as Tsukamoto Akira, Ankoku Ryōichi, and Yoshida Nobuyuki. The research by Asao et al has mainly been

* Litt.D., Professor, Department of Japanese History, Graduate School of Literature and Human Sciences, Osaka City University.
3-3-138 Sugimoto, Sumiyoshi-ku, Osaka-shi, 558-8585 Japan.
E-mail: niki@lit.osaka-cu.ac.jp

focused on the seventeenth century and beyond, but my own research has analyzed the history of the establishment of the *chō* (urban neighborhood) in the sixteenth century.

As a precondition for the establishment of the *chō*, the social stability of the "house owner" stratum which constituted the *chō* community was indispensable. For that we might expect to see the existence of families, and the establishment of long-lasting *ie* (households), but for sixteenth century Kyoto it is not possible to confirm that.

On the one hand, Kawauchi Masayoshi, Mieda Akiko and others have drawn attention to, in Kyoto, resident organizations that were different from the *chō*. Certainly in cities in this era commoner families and households were splintered, and by comparison with those of agricultural villages it was difficult for them to survive over a long period. However, I have brought to light the clustering of temple hermitages in Ōyamazaki, a city on the outskirts of Kyoto, and have hypothesized the establishment of the *ie* (households) of urban residents in the sixteenth century. Further, I have discovered the stabilization of rites for ancestors deriving from the establishment of graveyards within temple grounds in the city of Kyoto, and have inferred that this is connected with the establishment of *ie* (households) of urban residents.

Yokota Fuyuhiko has shed light on Kyoto's physical expansion as a city, and on the temporary residences of urban residents. Different from the "old *chō*" established up through the 1570s, in the "new *chō*" established as a result of the rapid concentration of people from the 1580s, there were many assembled households, and the majority of those were renters and those in the day-use stratum (day laborers).

In this fashion, studies to date of urban society in this period have taken the urban *chō* community as fundamental, and the central task has been explication of how that was established.

Professor Goble's research explicates the types of family in the city, and the social associations in the city, during this period, from the standpoint of medical treatment and care of the sick. As such, it may be considered a ground-breaking demarcation of a new line beyond the research trends noted above. It analyses the social associations of this period that to date have not been made clear.

III

Until now the history of urban development from the sixteenth through the seventeenth centuries has been explained by such things as the clustering of cities, the expansion of the scale of the city, and the human movement from agricultural villages to cities. Furthermore, the cultural history of early modern cities has been narrated with a focus on literature, thought, the arts, entertainment, and intellectuals and thinkers.

By contrast, a distinctive feature of Professor Goble's work is that he argues for a relationship between medical culture and urban (lifestyle) development. This then becomes an explanation for the enrichment of urban society due to medical arts, the variety and varied nature of medicines, and the knowledge and regular practices of urban residents. This is a discussion of urban culture that has no precedent, and a history of urban development to which we are led by that. By this, the establishment of early modern cities, which are quite different from the medieval, is made clear.

Beyond this, in conclusion, I would like to raise some problematic points about Professor Goble's research, and some areas to address.

1) The Tenma temple urban district and the Rokujō temple urban district were both temple urban districts whose core was the Honganji. The cities where Yamashina Tokitsune carried on his social activities were these very temple urban districts, and Professor Goble is attempting to find special types of human relationships, and particular significance, in their being temple urban districts.

However, I myself have come to argue that the theory of an ideal city, as is hypothesized by Nishikawa Kōji, with an excessive emphasis on egalitarianism in the temple urban district, is greatly mistaken. I feel that it is necessary to rethink both the distinctive characteristics of Tenma and Rokujō as temple urban districts, and the ubiquitous characteristics that they had in common with cities in general.

2) Professor Goble has described Yamashina Tokitsune as a *machi i* (town physician), but I believe that it is necessary to verify whether this is an appropriate characterization. For this era, as there are no other sources like this that

inform us of the detailed activities of *machi i*, analysis is difficult, but nonetheless it may well be that Tokitsune's life was exceptional rather than the norm. If so, then it is necessary to give some thought to the significance of drawing an image of the history of medical culture using Tokitsune as a standard.

In this period, which corresponds to the era of transition from the medieval to the early modern, there are no other providers of medical treatment who, as a resident of Japanese urban society, has left such a detailed record. For that reason, I'd ask for a more detailed inquiry into and exploration of the relationship between the nature of the city within which medical treatment was provided and the character of the medical providers.