

PART TWO

Case Studies

Stem Adaptations and Threats

Governing the Samurai Family in the Late Edo Period

Luke Roberts

On an early summer day in 1824, Fukuoka Shō (1792–1858), a samurai wife in the castle town of Kōchi in the southwestern domain of Tosa, submitted a report to the domain police. It read:

The foot soldier Sukegorō had earlier been employed in my house. Later he was given leave but even recently would come to the house. However, yesterday on the 25th he came after noon and I met him in the kitchen. [Our] son and heir Shōroku was away from home and the retainers of the house were not present at our meeting. Sukegorō said something rude and I reproved him but he became increasingly rude and turned upon me. I could not bear this and my only recourse was to kill him using the short sword of my husband Fukuoka Yūji.

The above statement is true.

Fukuoka Yūji's wife, Shō

*This person is Teshima Heijūrō's daughter. Her husband, Yūji, is the Edo ambassador at this time and is not present.*¹

Four months later, after much deliberation, the domain handed down its decision on punishments in the case: Shō's husband, Fukuoka Yūji (1790–1845), had his 200 *koku* fief reduced to 130 *koku*, he was relieved of his important office as ambassador for the domain in Edo along with its 450 *koku* supplementary office fief, and he was ordered to return home to Kōchi.² The domain also removed other relatives of Shō and Yūji from their government posts and banished the male household servants. The judges remanded Shō to the custody of her husband, who was ordered to “keep his wife under his strict control.” Two female servants of the household were explicitly absolved of responsibility.

What led to this series of punishments, and why did they take the form they did? After all, Shō had the right to dispatch Sukegorō under a law that allowed people of samurai status to kill those below them if they were deliberately rude. But the judges found other aspects of the case not to be right. The crux of the issue seems to have been the domain's finding that Shō was "living improperly." It is not clear what exactly this term meant, but it conveyed without doubt a negative judgment of Shō's behavior as well as the conduct of her entire family and household. Nevertheless, in the end, the domain's verdict restored peace. Shō and Yūji remained married, and after an interim of punishment the Fukuoka family prospered politically and economically well into the late nineteenth century. The neat ending provided by the official judgment and its outcome obscures, however, a set of complex private negotiations among family members themselves—notably Yūji, his mother, and his male kin—that, according to another source, preceded and followed the incident and its adjudication. These "inside" negotiations reflect a subculture of samurai family values and practices differing from official principles and laws; they show us that—much as with commoner families—samurai families perceived a clear distinction between government interests and their own, and they gave more authority to women than the government was willing to accord.³ Here I explore this tension while analyzing the organization and decision-making processes of samurai households through the story of the case and its family and communal contexts.

THE SOURCES

Any discussion of Shō's case must begin with a discussion of the sources, because they are not transparent and they fundamentally shape what we know—indeed, what it is possible to know—about the events, their background, and their repercussions. Shō's own voice is scarcely heard; her statement to the domain police, quoted above, is the only record of the events in her own words. Almost everything we know about the case comes from domain records of punishment and a lengthy confessional memoir recounted after the fact by Fukuoka Yūji to his close friend, a writer named Yamauchi (Maeno) Akinari (1762–1847), a junior elder of Tosa domain.⁴ In addition to his prestigious official position, Akinari was a local scholar and literatus who used the pen name Yōsha. His "Yōsha zuihitsu" (Yōsha's Miscellany), in which Yūji's story and punishment records appear, collects items of interest recorded over a period of about twenty years. Only one copy currently exists, and the absence of any reference to it in the writings of Akinari's contemporaries or late-nineteenth-century compilers of local historical documents suggests that it did not circulate.⁵ Indeed, some of the contents were highly sensitive and potentially damaging to people in Akinari's own family and social world, and it is unclear whether the author intended his miscellany to be seen by anyone during his lifetime. But as is the case with diaries, he may well have had an imagined

audience of close friends or even future descendants. Although the entries in “Yōsha zuihitsu” do not have dated headings, internal evidence suggests that they were written in diary form, ordered sequentially, and covered the years between 1813 and 1830. At some later point, sections became disordered or reordered during copying or rebinding. What survives is a neatly bound copy once consisting of seven volumes, of which five remain today.⁶ Each volume, with between 80 and 210 entries, comprises extremely diverse texts and images, including humorous poems, news from Edo, petitions, accounts of strange events such as comets crossing the sky, historical documents, parodic literature, announcements of punishments of retainers, samurai lineages, and many other topics mostly pertaining to Tosa domain and the Yamauchi daimyo’s household. Stories of commoners rarely appear in the text, unless they did something truly extraordinary such as catch mermaids, give birth to lizard-like children, or grow eight feet tall. The entertainment value of such fanciful stories notwithstanding, Akinari was most keenly interested in the affairs of the retainers of his own lord’s household.

The activities of Akinari’s peers were far from dull; life in Kōchi and the Edo mansions of the Yamauchi clan presented him with a surprising number of opportunities to record crimes and punishments. A domainal compilation of all punishments of ranking samurai of Tosa domain (fewer than eight hundred households) entitled “Gokachū hengi” (Disorders in the Household) shows that in the early nineteenth century an annual average of about five incidents of theft, murder, or fights required punishment.⁷ Many men were punished because either they themselves or subordinate male or female members of their households were “living improperly.” (This was, officially speaking, Shō’s crime.) The legal documents excerpted in “Gokachū hengi” offer little explanation of “living improperly” or what behavior was being policed. By contrast, “Yōsha zuihitsu” is particularly useful as a source because Akinari not only transcribed the domain announcements of punishments of various samurai but occasionally followed up with examples of related town graffiti or the “inside stories” that came to him from gossip, from those directly involved in crimes (such as Yūji), and, in instances dealing with his own kin group, from Akinari himself and his family members.

Although such juxtaposed inside stories constitute only a small fraction of his miscellany, they are of great interest as entries into how Akinari and his peers interpreted events. Akinari himself knew that his “inside stories” were not purely factual. Noting that we cannot “know if this story is true or not,” Akinari says he simply wrote down Yūji’s narrative “just as it was told to a close friend.” Likewise, historians know that no document, not even a hard gravestone, is an unmediated representation of the truth.⁸ They must carefully assess the truth claims of each of their documents by understanding the context of its production in order to discern the inherent biases; then they must compare various sources to uncover disjunctures and untruths. Finally historians must assess and write a plausible narrative, fully knowing that a new document, or even a new line of reasoning, can

overturn their carefully crafted stories. I have here compared Akinari's account of Yūji's narrative with the government documents of punishment, a brief mention in a bystander's diary, and various records such as lineages and gravestones to create a plausible narrative of the events and of the samurai family dynamics that gave rise to them, and to discover and query the places where the documents disagree so as to reveal the personal interests and larger ideologies that shaped their production.⁹

In Akinari's account, Yūji's telling of his wife's murderous attack on Sukegorō and events that came before and after it takes on a confessional tone. Yūji says he was relieved when he heard of the domain's judgment in the case; he had thought the incident would be the end of his household and was grateful for what he perceived as a lenient punishment. He also reported many other things, notably that, years before the murder, Shō had had an affair with Sukegorō when he was a servant in their household. A female servant discovered the affair and told Yūji's younger brother Sakonbei, who then disclosed it to their mother. Yūji himself was long away on official business. In his absence, Sakonbei and the mother conspired to cover up the affair, dismissing Sukegorō from the household and commanding Shō to act properly, under threat of divorce and public shame. Yūji claims not to have learned about the affair until several years later when, though unhappy, he forgave Shō at the urging of his mother and relatives. All was apparently well until, years later, Shō suddenly called Sukegorō back to her home and cut him down.

Although there is much about the incident that we cannot know with certainty, our access to Akinari's record and the official documents allows us to explore how samurai males viewed the inner workings of the household, how they narrated them for mutual consumption, and how they and their families responded as individuals to the public values that the samurai government enforced. For even though that government was made up of samurai, Tosa domain's institutional values and the family values of individual samurai diverged on many points, especially concerning the place and responsibilities of women in the home.

THE SETTING

The divide between the inner workings of households and their relation to the outer, public world is illustrated by the physical setting in which the events surrounding Shō's murder of Sukegorō played themselves out. The Teshima family house, Shō's natal home, survives in Kōchi to this day and helps us understand aspects of samurai life barely intimated in written documents.¹⁰

Immediately noticeable in the photo of the inside of the house (fig. 6.1) is the separation of the front or reception space (*omote*) from the private or family space (*oku*) by doorways with abnormally low lintels, which force one to bow deeply when passing between the two areas. Here is a clear sign that passage between the two spaces entailed a significant change of context. The rear of the house admitted



FIGURE 6.1. Interior of the Teshima house viewed from the front, showing two low doorways (right and left) separating the back from the front of the house. Photo by author.

only family members and, perhaps, very close friends. The separation between rear and front also was strongly gendered. The women of the house lived their lives primarily in the back portion, while the male head of the family would use the front of the house to receive guests. The wife of the household head (or his mother, if she still so wished) was normally in charge of managing the back of the house and the family economy.¹¹ The modern Japanese term for wife, *okusama* (“honored person of the interior”), derives from this gendering of space. In the Edo period, samurai wives were also called *naishosama* (“honored person of inside matters”), in reference to their responsibility for the internal aspects of the house. The spatial layout—and what acts took place where—is important because it influenced domain officials when they considered punishments for Shō and others involved in the murder case.

The main house was the residence for family, female servants, and, sometimes, dependent relatives; outbuildings were for other dependents and servants. Shō had a brother and a sister, and both her parents were alive when she married. Other relations may well have lived in the house, and perhaps male or female apprentices, as was common in many Kōchi samurai households.¹² A family of the Teshima’s status and income was also likely to have had one to three female servants as

well as two or three male servants. These servants, who filled many roles, added to the social complexity of the house. The longest-serving female servant would have been the wife of the chief manservant (the master's right-hand man), who held the only hereditary position among servants. Others, male and female alike, would normally have been hired on term contracts and been either unmarried or, if coupled, involved in discreet "commuter marriages."¹³ A large number of servants in samurai households were children of lower-level retainers, such as foot soldiers, or moderately successful villagers and townspeople. For most, service in a warrior house was a stage in late childhood and early adulthood, used to gain the income, connections, and social training that might eventuate in superior circumstances.

Female servants lived in the main house, tending to the kitchen and garden, spinning, weaving, sewing, washing, and engaging in other tasks. They also performed personal services for the wife, the husband, and live-in relatives. Servants of the wife ran errands or accompanied her when out of the home. Female servants of the master assisted him only inside the home. Many also served as the master's sexual partners. A child by the master of the house belonged to him and would remain in the home when the servant left for other employment or marriage. The child's mother would be listed as "concubine" (*mekake*) in government records. Regardless of age, the children of concubines were listed as younger than any child born to the wife (in order to suppress inheritance struggles) even as they were retained in the home as potential heirs in the event of the absence or early death of an elder male child. Wives were encouraged to accept the presence of concubines, but not all complied. Conflicts between wives, husbands, and female servants over sexual relations, as well as the status and treatment of children, were common. At the same time, in the interest of maintaining the patriarchal *ie*, samurai wives were expected to be chaste.

Male servants lived in the front gatehouse or other outbuildings of the property to reduce opportunities for sexual liaisons with the women of the house. The Teshima residence had a gatehouse with four small rooms for such servants. One job of male servants was to act as gatemen who controlled access. They also ran errands. Their most socially privileged job, however, was to wear weapons and accompany the master as part of his retinue whenever he left on business or pleasure. They were, of course, expected to look after the master's interests, and because he was deemed responsible for their behavior, they could bring upon him shame and punishment.¹⁴ Accordingly, the master had disciplinary authority and even the right (if rarely exercised) to execute a misbehaving servant. Firing a servant was the most common option in cases of serious dissatisfaction.

Yūji's natal home was a fifteen-minute walk from Shō's home. The family fief of 200 *koku* was greater than that of the Teshima, and Yūji's residential property was a bit larger. Still, the two families were of the same general status, and the basic architecture of their homes was likely similar as well.¹⁵ The big distinction lay in the size of the kin group. The Teshima were head of a kin group with two minor branches. On Yūji's side there were thirteen Fukuoka households, all well con-

nected; the most important served as domain elders of Tosa with a fief of about 2,800 *koku* at the time. Yūji's neighbor was his closest relative, Fukuoka Heima, who had a 500 *koku* fief. Heima and his ancestors regularly served in important posts in the domain and were allowed the privilege of maintaining those posts hereditarily. Yūji's line had been set up as a branch family of Heima's line two generations earlier and would customarily have deferred to Heima's advice and interests, just as both would have deferred to the Fukuoka lineage of domain elders. The heads of the various Fukuoka houses likely met regularly to discuss issues such as marriage and adoption plans and to protect their mutual interests.¹⁶

In sum, Shō and Yūji lived in a physical setting that mirrored a social world divided by crosscutting affiliations and divisions based on kinship, gender, seniority, status, and wealth. All of these factors came into play over the course of the several decades that preceded and followed the murder case, as individuals performed roles and duties appropriate to their status and gender but also improvised and sought advantage or alliance when they could to secure more desirable outcomes either for themselves or for their family.

THE FAMILIES

Shō was the eldest daughter of Teshima Heijūrō, a samurai with a fief of 100 *koku* and mounted-warrior status, which placed him in the broad middle level of ranking samurai. Heijūrō earned good positions in the personal service of various members of the lord's family. This meant he was often away in Edo on duty, but such posts increased his political connections and came with an additional 100 or 150 *koku* of office fief that more than doubled family income. The genealogy reveals that Shō's father initiated a period of successful appointments for the Teshima house lasting until the Meiji period. This success continued despite a number of domain punishments experienced by family members for misbehaviors.¹⁷

Yūji was the eldest son in his branch of the Fukuoka family. His younger brother Sakonbei (1796–1835) was also employed as a retainer and started his own branch family, something most noninheriting younger brothers could not achieve. Likely regarded as a man of talent, made more easily visible by the power of the Fukuoka clan, Sakonbei served as a page (*koshō*) of the daimyo, though with a stipend so small (15 *koku* and 4 rations [*fuchi*]) that he continued living in his natal home. Their father died in 1797 at the age of forty-five, when Yūji officially became household head, at age seven. His younger brother was one year old at the time. Because their mother had run the household for almost as long as either Yūji or his brother would have remembered, both sons likely felt particularly grateful and deferential to her.¹⁸ Yūji was appointed page to Yamauchi Toyooki, the young lord-to-be, in 1806, at age sixteen, and probably began journeying with him to Edo on alternate attendance at that time. He thus began a career of personal service to the lord that kept him away from home for long stretches.

Exactly when Shō and Yūji married is unclear, but it was at least as early as 1815. Shō bore a son, Shōroku (1816–1841), in the summer of 1816, when she was about twenty-four years old and Yūji twenty-six.¹⁹ They may also have had a daughter, mentioned in the official samurai lineages as wife of the samurai Murata Shōhachirō.²⁰ It is possible that Yūji's daughter was born to a concubine.²¹ Unlike Shōroku, a daughter is not mentioned in narratives of the murder incident, which might mean she was born afterward or that she was considered irrelevant in documents imbued with patriarchal discourse. Since Yūji was known as a man of talent with a promising future, we can imagine that his marriage to Shō was regarded publicly as appropriate for both parties and even advantageous for Shō.²² But that marriage was not happy, a factor in the violent incident of 1824.

THE AFFAIR

The inner workings of the families are intimated in "Yōsha zuihitsu," where Akinari records Yūji's description of the various debates among numerous interlocutors over what to do about Shō's purported affair with Sukegorō. According to this account, Yūji began his story not with the affair but a long discussion of what he saw as the problem of Shō's jealousy. He begins by saying, "My wife's character was filled deep with extreme jealousy, especially toward female servants of her husband [Yūji], such that they often asked for permission to leave employment because they could not stand the work. She was even so with my younger brother's female servants—wickedly jealous—and she generally abused young women so roughly that most requested to leave." Like most men of their status, Yūji and his brother quite likely had sexual relations with their female servants, and Yūji's emphasis on jealousy suggests that this disturbed Shō deeply. By beginning his story in this way, Yūji emphasizes Shō's role, not his own actions, as the source of marital unhappiness and discord in the household.

Women's morality primers of the day warned against jealousy toward concubines and mistresses, and against mixing with men who were not relatives, because both occasioned daily tensions between married couples in patriarchal households.²³ Female chastity was a virtue in samurai households, and female adultery a severely punished infraction in law codes. Male chastity was not an issue unless the man was an interloper or given to sexual excesses harmful to family finances or the performance of duty.²⁴ Yūji himself did not perceive any sort of double standard regarding marital fidelity and resented what he saw as his wife's unreasonable jealousy. In his account, he says that he frequently instructed her to control her behavior, but this was so unsuccessful that he often considered divorce.

Yūji's frequent absences from home may well have been another source of sadness and frustration for Shō. Yūji was likely away in Edo when Shōroku was born in 1816, leaving his mother, Shō, Sakonbei, and the servants to run the household.²⁵ In 1817 he was appointed to the demanding position of Edo representative of the

domain, which would have kept him in Edo most of the time thereafter. In Yūji's narrative his mother expresses her frustration with his extended stays in Edo, and the same narrative has both Shō's affair and the murder happening during his extended absence.

According to Yūji, Shō entered into an affair with Sukegorō while he was away, and the affair came to light in 1817 when the female servant of Yūji's brother, Sakonbei, discovered love letters the couple had exchanged. She showed these to Sakonbei, who immediately showed them to his mother, saying that they would have to inform Yūji when he returned to Kōchi from Edo. His mother objected: "If we tell this to Yūji, then it is clear as day that he will divorce her directly. I am getting older and it is becoming much more difficult to take care of the children. Promise me you will not tell Yūji when he arrives from Edo!" Sakonbei felt uncomfortable, thinking that Shō should be punished, but he acquiesced to his mother's will. On the one hand, Sakonbei felt the need to restore proper order through punishment of the offending woman. On the other hand, he was the dutiful son wishing to obey his mother. In the end the latter won out, a testament to the mother's ultimate authority over the internal dynamics of the household.

The mother's comments indicate that she assumed Yūji's reaction would be to divorce Shō rather than punish her. Indeed this was a common response to infidelity.²⁶ But punishment appeared undesirable in this case as it would have provoked gossip and shame in the Fukuokas' social circle. It would also have made Yūji culpable of the crime of mismanagement of his household, for which he, in turn, would have been punished. Domain law, in effect, encouraged families to resolve things quietly.

The mother likely had all this in mind when, after conferring with Sakonbei, she summoned the servant Sukegorō to tell him that she had learned of the affair with Shō but wished to keep things quiet. Then she dismissed Sukegorō from the household with good references, telling him he should never return. Next she severely scolded Shō, who "took the matter to heart" and thereafter behaved with propriety. Two years passed with Yūji knowing nothing about the affair (even after his return home to Kōchi) until one day in 1820 when Sakonbei's female servant confided to Yūji's female servant: "The wife is always saying this and that about other people, but earlier she had this and that, you know, with a man called Sukegorō, and at the end of the day she can't go on being jealous about what other people do. Sakonbei knows all about this but the mother kept things quiet!" The servant then passed this information on to Yūji himself, who pressed his brother to learn the facts and subsequently sent Shō back to her natal home. In discussion, his mother confirmed what Yūji had learned but urged, using the logic she had employed with Sakonbei: "Since then she has reformed her ways and has not committed the slightest impropriety. I am getting older and if you divorce that person, there is no one else to take care of the children. Furthermore, you have jobs that always take you away to Edo. Please just treat this as an old wound. If you don't

agree, I think I will just die.” She asked him to understand her request as performing his filial duty.

Yūji did not immediately acquiesce but discussed the situation with Sakonbei and other relatives, who all agreed that he should forgive Shō. Then he said, “I was very unhappy in the depths of my heart, but I called Shō back to my home.” The following aspect of this process deserves comment. Despite the fact that he was officially household head and living in a patriarchal political system that supported his authority, Yūji did not get his own way through a quiet divorce. All of the male relatives he consulted, well positioned to enforce patriarchy if they chose, apparently encouraged him to forgive Shō. They all appealed to the filial piety Yūji owed his mother, a widely accepted reason for a younger male to accept the authority of an older female in a samurai household.²⁷ In the end, the narrative portrays a Yūji who put aside personal enmity and wounded pride to do as the family advised.

Upon hearing Yūji’s version of the story, the writer, Akinari, made his own opinions on the matter clear in his comments: “If one does not know about an infidelity, then there is nothing to be done. But once one knows one’s wife does not hold to propriety, then even if one’s mother says she might die because of it, is it filial duty to not divorce the wife, or is it filial duty to have her leave? Well for the benefit of the household, I humbly think that divorce is the way of filial duty.” Akinari veiled the conflict by defining filial duty as honoring the rectitude and harmony of the ancestral (and paternally organized) *ie* rather than obeying one’s parents. In his view, divorcing a wayward wife was a better tactic for preserving the household’s long-term integrity. Half-hidden by this sleight of hand is Akinari’s anxiety concerning the disorder that might ensue if women actually controlled men. He makes this anxiety clearer in another concluding comment: “There are terrifying women in this world! Everyone must keep a wife, so they should definitely take [this event] to heart.” For him, Yūji’s forgiveness invited further disorderly conduct by wicked women down the line.

Comparison of this account of the actions and reactions of family members and servants, and the views of interested observers such as Akinari, with the official accounts of supervising authorities found in other records suggests a fraught interplay of gender and family dynamics in samurai families. As we shall see, the picture emerging from this document is far more complicated than the domain’s official policy of maintaining male control of the household and its women. The narrative represents, within an individual family, the strength of filial values encouraging obedience to the mother. Even a wife’s infidelity, moreover, could be forgiven in the interest of smooth family management. Because the domain regularly punished household heads (and even collateral relatives) for the crimes of servants and family members, it was effectively complicit in creating a culture in which families had a vested interest in quietly hiding misbehavior.

This culture of secrecy played an important role in the collective decision to forgive Shō. According to Yūji, many people expressed the desire to keep things

quiet so as not to shame the Fukuoka house. Indeed, managing secrecy was often at the heart of how Tokugawa governance operated.²⁸ As Amy Stanley has argued, many governments encouraged the private settlement of adultery disputes, and even more disputes were settled with the assistance only of village officials so as to avoid expense and the stricter punishments prescribed by law.²⁹ Samurai who wished to address adultery probably often decided among communities of relations to end things quietly with forgiveness or divorce. Such cases would normally not leave paper trails for modern historians. Yet, as Yūji's relatives found out to their detriment, when secrecy led to public incidents, many parties in the know could be subject to punishment.

Yūji attempted to maintain honor through forbearance, maintaining silence, showing obedience to his mother, and accepting the opinions of relatives rather than through engaging in violence or overtly seeking justice. So Yūji remained in the marriage, and Shō's affair was relegated to the past and to gossipy whispers among the many people consequently in the know. Thanks to this silence, Sukegorō suffered no punishment in the wake of the affair save for dismissal from his job in the Fukuoka household, and he eventually came in line to inherit the position of a domain foot soldier from a man named Reikichi, who had adopted him and planned to have him marry his daughter Moto.³⁰ Even after Yūji's mother died late in 1822, Yūji remained married to Shō. All would likely have ended quietly but for what Yūji called, in retrospect, his foolish decisions and Shō's fierce, passionate nature.

In 1824 Yūji was to go to Edo again to serve as the ambassador for his daimyo. This time, his mother was no longer present in the home and his wife, Shō, would be running the house in his absence. Before departing, Yūji says, he told Shō in no uncertain terms, "You have that history, so it is absolutely essential that you behave well and take care of the place and of your personal behavior in my absence with unwavering care and discretion. Sukegorō has not shown up here since that time, but all the more you must be aware of your status, maintain discretion, and be without any misconduct!" Shō replied: "Of course I have been well aware of what I should be doing ever since that time, but now with Mother gone, what should I do if that man comes around?" Yūji then said, "If that man comes by and says anything improper to you, then you should cut him down right then! I will leave you one of my short swords in my absence."

Yūji's decision to entrust Shō with a short sword reveals a fascinating contradiction between status and gender, trust and mistrust. Given Sukegorō's long absence, Shō's anxiety seems strange, though perhaps it was customary knowledge that men did prey on women when their husbands were away on Edo duty. This trope certainly underlies Chikamatsu Monzaemon's play *Yari no Gonza Kasane Katabira* (*Gonza the Spearman*).³¹ Even so, it remains odd in terms of patriarchal values that, instead of ordering the chief manservant of the house to watch out for Sukegorō, Yūji entrusted his wife with his short sword and told her to use it. Few samurai

women were trained in the use of a weapon and, if any were familiar with one at all, it would have been the quaintly antiquated halberd (*naginata*). Although some women were taught how to use a dagger if threatened with rape, even samurai women were not normally entrusted with swords, since they were thought to be “manly” weapons. Thus, the story depends on an intimate complicity arising from the ties of their marriage and their superior status to the servants in the house. In Yūji’s story, Shō saw her salvation from shame in the trust shown her by Yūji, and he ended up regarding this grant of his trust to have been his mistake. Yūji told Akinari that after his words Shō “appeared obsessed with the idea that she could not uphold her chastity until she had killed Sukegorō with that sword.”

Yūji’s narrative suggests the servants later told him that, after he departed for Edo, Shō prayed daily at the shrine on the household grounds that she might cut down Sukegorō. If this is true, Shō’s anger was extraordinarily deep. It may have originated in an earlier rape that was kept out of the record by a pervasive discursive bias that erased women’s concerns, just as it did the concerns of servants. Or perhaps, as Yūji suggests, Shō’s anger originated in her anxiety over her chastity. We cannot know. Despite being aware of what they perceived as her obsession, the servants were unable or unwilling to stop it. Indeed, the punishment records indicate that the servant Kichizō served as Shō’s messenger to Sukegorō when she called him to the house. Sukegorō arrived and he went to the kitchen, in the back of the house, but the two remaining male servants stayed in the gatehouse at the front of the property, thus allowing a man from outside the family to enter the house’s inner sanctum. No record indicates why they allowed this trespass. Certainly Shō’s status as the wife of the house allowed her to give them orders concerning daily affairs. In this case the male servants paid dearly for Sukegorō’s arrival in the private half of the house, because the judges held them responsible for protecting household honor, as if they were, as males, not subject to Shō’s authority.

Few details of the immediate circumstances surrounding the murder exist. In her own statement to the domain police, Shō claimed that Sukegorō was “rude” to her, implying that he was being sexually forward and attempting rape. Legally, however, the matter was “rudeness.” In cases of slaying a person of inferior status for rudeness, it was important to show that the miscreant was deliberately rude, usually by including a statement confirming that the samurai had first reprimanded a rude party who nevertheless persisted. This is what Shō claimed. While slaying an inferior for deliberate rudeness was within Shō’s rights, the perpetrator had to behave properly and resort to violence only to defend the status order.³²

The only words we have from Shō suggest that Sukegorō attempted to rape her. Might this have been the actual case, and Yūji’s story an elaborate fabrication? This does not seem likely, because a wife’s successful defense against rape would not have constituted a crime.³³ Also, Yūji’s own honor would not have been at stake,

because he was hundreds of miles away at the time. The only person to gain by covering up or distorting an assault story was the dead man, Sukegorō. The male servants would have been punished in any event, since it was their duty to control access to the property and their mistress. For anyone else involved, the story of an attempted rape would not have precipitated nearly the degree of household shame that derived from their actual punishments. So the punishment of many relatives for not managing things well, and of one of the servants for acting as a messenger, makes sense only if we accept the accuracy of the basic outline of Yūji's story. It is not likely that so many men would have accepted a great loss of income, status, and prestige just to cover up an attempted rape by Sukegorō.

Another difference between the accounts of Shō and Yūji is Shō's representation, in her official statement, that Sukegorō "even recently would come to the house," as if visits were a regular occurrence. House servants sometimes did socially visit their former places of employment.³⁴ By making such a statement, Shō was most likely trying to make the fact of his presence in the house seem natural and hide the fact that she had called him to the house. If she had not called him, it seems unlikely that the servant Kichizō would have been banished for taking Sukegorō a message from Shō. The spatial context of the killing also is consistent with Shō's mission to kill Sukegorō. Her possession of her husband's short sword in the kitchen rather than in her room would have been strange if Sukegorō had appeared suddenly.

At any rate, as far as the domain investigation was concerned, two legally damaging facts could not be avoided: the meeting and the murder took place in the back of the house, and no men of the household were present. These two facts, and the more general and vague accusation that "her daily manner of living was not good," became key elements in the judgments that were handed down four months later.

Public judgment also was not favorable. The day after the murder, and the same day as Shō's official statement, the low-status domain retainer Kusunose Ōe briefly mentioned the murder in his diary and then closed with: "The word in the streets about this is not very favorable."³⁵ This rapid response suggests either that gossip of an affair between Shō and Sukegorō had previously circulated about town, or that people just assumed infidelity was behind a woman killing a man. A few days later Ōe also recorded in his diary a related tragedy: Sukegorō's fiancée, Moto, the daughter of his adoptive parents, killed herself by *seppuku*, cutting open her belly, three days after the murder. Her father, mother, and adoptive mother had all died recently, and then her fiancé, Sukegorō, had been murdered in circumstances engendering gossip. Moto was certainly left in a desperate state with no one to depend on. But it is also possible that she killed herself out of intense shame. Ōe's description of her death as *seppuku* suggests that she made an attempt to regain honor rather than simply kill herself out of desperation.

In government discourse, however, *seppuku* was a masculine act, as was Shō's use of a short sword to kill Sukegorō.³⁶ Indeed, in the whole incident the only two people to use weapons—and apparently for the purpose of restoring violated honor—were women. The samurai men were inclined to passive acceptance and filial piety. However, purpose aside, neither woman could actually be accorded public honor through her act—one of them because of an official judgment of misdeed, the other because the legal system denied women the option of honorable suicide.

Officially, *seppuku* was permitted only at the lord's order and only to male samurai as a way of maintaining household honor following a serious wrongdoing. It was otherwise a crime, which often led to the face-saving locution "suddenly died of illness" in reports of unsanctioned *seppuku* by samurai.³⁷ Cutting open the belly by women and commoners was regarded as merely "suicide" (*jigai*), and, indeed, the domain court referred to Moto's death in this way. Whether the elision of *seppuku* derived from her gender or the crime is moot, since the former would have preempted consideration of the latter. The official description also explicitly exonerated Moto of any guilt in the affair but interpreted her motive for death as sadness: because so many relatives had recently died, she "had no one to rely on" after she lost Sukegorō. However true, the verdict narrates her femininity as passive and leaves unanswered the question of why she chose *seppuku*.

THE PUNISHMENTS

Yūji told Akinari that when he heard of the incident, he "became prepared for the destruction of his household and the end of its fortunes, but is now grateful for the merciful treatment which the lord handed out." As noted earlier, Yūji was relieved of his post as Edo ambassador and its allowance, had his own 200 *koku* fief reduced by 70 *koku*, and was ordered to be prudent in his behavior and strictly control his wife. How, in fact, were such cases normally handled in the domain? Tosa's law codes regarding marital infidelity were extremely vague on the point. Until a new, more detailed code was created in the 1850s, the law merely promised that "failure to show filial respect or other immoral behavior will be punished as a crime."³⁸ We must therefore rely on case judgments to infer standards of punishment. Records of early-nineteenth-century cases in which a samurai was punished for a wife or mother or daughter "living loosely" show that the samurai was convicted of the crime of poorly managing his household. The punishments generally entailed removal from government posts, denial of associated income, and reduction in the household hereditary income (usually around 10 percent, less than in Yūji's case). Banishment from the castle town and loss of status occurred in one case, but even there the house headship reverted to the eldest son. In no case was a woman issued any direct statement of punishment by the domain.³⁹ In all cases

the man (or his son, if the principal was banished) was ordered to “strictly control” the woman. Thus, it seems that the punishments of both Yuji and Shō were within the norm for their peers.

Ordering a man to “strictly control” a household woman reinstated him as master of his household but rather shamefully instructed him that he needed to restore the order he had obviously failed to maintain. Although Shō herself was beneath direct address, her inappropriate meeting with Sukegorō and “outrageous behavior” were mentioned in every single indictment of the others. The judges described her crime thus: “Having the status of wife, it was inappropriate for her to have held that meeting at all, and we have heard of many aspects of her extremely outrageous behavior and improper lifestyle.”⁴⁰ Clearly, the authorities presumed the responsibility of various males for preventing female misbehavior. After four months of investigation, judgments were issued to Yūji as well as many other parties. His cousin Fukuoka Heima, the head of a collateral house also of mounted-guard status, was relieved of his post because “as a relative he should have been thinking properly on this issue but did not.” Probably implied is Heima’s participation in Yūji’s early consultations, although, it should be noted, Heima was not the family’s head at the time. Heima or his father certainly encouraged Yūji to keep matters quiet, which is evidence of the latent tension between samurai family values and samurai government values. A month after the initial punishments, Shō’s brother Teshima Kiroku (then head of her natal household) and Yūji’s younger brother, Sakonbei, were both relieved of their appointments as pages and ordered to exercise prudence.⁴¹ While we may infer that Yūji had consulted Shō’s brother Yorimichi about the issue, his punishment may have resulted simply from his status as current head of Shō’s natal home.

The three samurai household heads named above suffered loss of post and reduction in income, but the punishment for the male servants of the household was much more severe. The chief manservant, Wada Yusunojō, was deprived of family name and the right to bear a long sword and then banished to the domain’s western reaches. Although not quite a full-fledged samurai position in itself, “chief manservant” conferred hereditary military status on its bearer. This severe punishment made Yusunojō a commoner and ended his line. The severity of his punishment resulted from his role as chief male in the household when the incident occurred “in the back of the house without a single retainer present.” Yusunojō “was completely incompetent in this matter.” Despite his role as a servant of the household, the judgment conveys a domainal expectation that he had the ability and authority to control his master’s wife, something very unlikely in reality, which reveals yet another disjuncture between the internal ideologies of family and the formal expectations of government.

Two male servants of lesser status (*komono*) were both punished as well. With no hereditary status to lose, one, Ginbei, was banished to the western reaches for the same reason behind Yusunojō’s sentence. Even Kichizō, who might have

escaped punishment because he was not on the Fukuoka property at the time and was merely a child, was banished from the castle town and its four neighboring villages because he had served as Shō's messenger to Sukegorō. All males of the household, except the eight-year-old son, who was away at the time (perhaps sent away by Shō for his safety), were punished.

The domain also issued a judgment to one more male, formerly of the household. This was the murdered Sukegorō himself, who was treated as a criminal. The document explains: "If he were alive, we would certainly have punished him severely, but he was already cut down by Yūji's wife." The law codes of Tosa in the 1850s specify that a man who has an affair with his master's wife should be banished from the domain.⁴² Whether this was the standard in the 1820s is unclear, although the domain may have seen his death at Shō's hands as proper punishment. The domain declared that while his body would not be subject to further punishment (such as public display), his adoptive house and lineage were to be abolished. In this way the murder itself was treated as the legitimate climax of an incident that revealed a degree of "loose living" and "household mismanagement" that the domain could not ignore.

In marked contrast to the treatment of the men, all of the women of the household were exonerated of responsibility, despite their certain knowledge of Shō's affairs. As was the case with Shō herself, we find here a sign of the lesser legal autonomy and lesser responsibility that derived from the status of woman. The domain expected the men to punish their women using their paternal authority, and the direct punishment of women in samurai households was not part of the theater of government. In contrast to the inner workings of families as presented in Yūji's account, the government acknowledged no women's authority and responsibility at all.

The rupture in paternalistic control reflected in the incident became, in the domain's hands, an opportunity for the parties to reaffirm their commitment to its ideals, evident in Akinari's concluding opinion that men should not obey their mothers and should strictly control their wives. Yūji himself told Akinari that he assumed personal responsibility: "In the end she took my words the wrong way. . . . I told her to cut that man down if he sneaked into the property, but he had not been there for years and I did not imagine him actually coming. She being a woman I did not even dream that she would kill him in that way. As I am the husband, these events cannot be said to be just my wife's fault." Thus taking responsibility, Yūji also deprived Shō of the autonomy she might have claimed in restoring her honor through violence, much as the domain deprived Moto of her honor in dying by *seppuku*.

We are denied the opportunity to read either Moto's or Shō's own reflections on the incident, which surely would have presented rather different stories. If they wrote anything, it has not survived. The judgments inform us of the paternalistic household organization that the Tosa domain government wished to see

reaffirmed in the aftermath of the event. What mattered in the domain's narrative was the restoration of its order of things.

THE AFTERMATH

Although the immediate impact on the household and its relatives was significant, the incident did not have long-term consequences on Fukuoka fortunes in the public world of Tosa. Yūji's cousin Heima was restored to his position the very next year and, within a few more years, was appointed as Edo ambassador. Yūji recovered good graces by 1832, when he was appointed as aide to a Yamauchi prince and his income increased. Thereafter, he served in a number of well-remunerated positions as aide to the Yamauchi family. Nor were the fortunes of the children adversely affected by the parents' crimes. The daughter of the household married Murata Shōroku, head of a family of higher income and importance.⁴³ By 1836 Yūji's and Shō's son, Shōroku, married into and became heir of the main Fukuoka lineage in the domain (as one of twelve domain elder houses, with an income ten times that of Yūji).⁴⁴ Because Shōroku was the only son of Yūji and Shō, they, in turn, needed to adopt an heir. This child, in the household already, was Fukuoka Takachika (1835–1919), Yūji's nephew and the second of Sakonbei's two sons. When Yūji died in 1845, Takachika became family head, at age ten, and was subsequently raised by Shō. He later pursued an extraordinarily successful career, becoming one of the central officials and leaders in Tosa domain by the early 1860s and throughout the final tumultuous years of the Tokugawa period. In 1867 he was a coauthor of the Meiji emperor's "Charter Oath," and afterward gained the rank of viscount and served as a high public official in the new Meiji government.⁴⁵

Patterns of documentation make it easy to say what happened to the important men in a woman's life. Of Shō herself we have only a few sparse facts. Yūji and Shō remained married and later shared the same gravestone, which states that Yūji died at age fifty-five in 1845 and Shō at age sixty-six in 1858 (fig. 6.2). By that time the family fortunes were far better than they had ever been. Shō's full posthumous name, Jihōin Seishitsu Meijū Daishi, translates as "Upholder of the Buddhist Law, True Wife of Bright Fortune who is as a Great Elder Sister." Each detail of the name seems to propose a resolution to the many problems tangled in the 1824 incident: her proper place in the household, her guilt or righteousness, and her moral authority. She likely began using the moniker Jihōin, "Upholder of the Buddha's Law," from the time of her husband's death in 1845; the remainder was added at the time of her own death. The end of the name, Great Elder Sister, reflects a posthumous ranking above the norm for samurai women (commonly "female believer" [*shinjo*]), suggesting that she had devoted herself to Buddhist faith and study during the remainder of her life. It might just as well reflect the greater wealth of a family able, at the time of her death, to pay the priests for a high-ranking name respectful of her position as the mother of a flourishing household. As with so many things, we cannot be sure.



FIGURE 6.2. The gravestone of Fukuoka Shō and Fukuoka Yūji, viewed from the side (a) and the front (b). Photos by author.

Perhaps the most surprising event of Shō's later life occurred in 1854. When she was sixty-two, the lord of Tosa granted her a pardon and she became free to live the normal life of a samurai widow and eldest woman of the house. No other case of female crime in the early-nineteenth-century record of domainal punishment occasioned such intercession.⁴⁶ The political power of the Fukuoka offspring was surely behind this absolution. Quite likely it was due to the efforts of the nameless daughter whose husband, Murata Shōsuke, had been appointed grand inspector (*ōmetsuke*) of the domain and was in a position to recommend who would be pardoned. Of course, the domain shaped the event to reinforce the patriarchy at the government's ideological core. The moment of pardon was the celebration of the sixtieth birthday of the retired lord of Tosa. Because age sixty marked a particularly felicitous "completion of the calendric cycle" and was a perfect occasion for the lord to reveal his munificent care for those beneath him, the pardon took the form of an order to Shō's son, Takachika, that he no longer had to "keep his mother under strict control." The person of Shō was obscured, identified not by name but as "mother" to the key male, her son. Takachika almost certainly found this an occasion to appreciate the generosity of his lord, as well as the erasure of a black mark from the household record. But the uncommon nature of this pardon also points to members of a samurai family working hard for its own particular interests and recognizing the important place of the mother as authority in the household and conduit of the lineage.

The sad tale revolving around the murder of Sukegorō provides a number of insights into samurai family values and government law concerning samurai households. The story of the incident and Shō's life reveals how the conflicts among family and household members were shaped in complex ways at the rifts and intersections between the values of samurai families and the values of samurai government. Samurai families were organizations in which women could actually hold much authority, most especially women in the position of mother of the household, and this seems to have been a generally respected value among male samurai. However, the government clearly desired—particularly in moments of crisis—to absolve women of most responsibility to the state and require patriarchs and other men of the household to be responsible for women's actions. This disjuncture between samurai government values and samurai family values led families to conceal their inner workings and present safe public images of patriarchal stability. Furthermore, government documents in general discursively erased the identities, desires, and activities of women. This documentary problem creates much difficulty for historians who desire to understand the actual workings of the samurai family and the place and experiences of women therein. Private and family documents are essential for historians interested in recovering some of the reality that was discursively whited out in government documents, and using both allows us to analyze the tension between the two fields of interest, government and family, that produced the narratives, silences, and secrets that sustained the gender and status hierarchies of the "Tokugawa Great Peace."

NOTES

1. "Yōsha zuihitsu." I am using a photocopy of a portion of the document that the owner, Kattō Isamu of Kōchi city, kindly allowed me to make in 1990. Mr. Kattō has since passed away, and the fate of his extensive document collection remains in flux. The entry for this incident includes official records of punishment and Fukuoka Yūji's narrative and is in vol. 5 on folios 24 and 49–51. Unless otherwise noted, all information comes from these four folios.

2. Shō's and Yūji's dates are based on gravestones in Kōchi on Hitsuzan hill behind Myōkokuji temple. Their location is noted in Yamamoto 1987, vol. 1, p. 65. No family documents are currently publicly known, as attested in Gakushūin Daigaku Shiryōkan 1993, vol. 4, pp. 110–11. The family lineage since Shō and Yūji's time can be found in Kasumikaikan 1996, vol. 2, pp. 434–35.

3. Walthall 1991, 50–51, 70; Stanley 2007, 321–23; Mega 1995, 15–48.

4. Yamauchi Kamon Akinari was head of the highest ranking of twelve junior elder (*chūrō*) lineages of the domain and had a fief of 1,100 *koku*. The family name is Maeno, but the head of the family used the bestowed name of the Yamauchi daimyo in documents used externally to his own house. Information about Akinari and this document comes from Kattō 1967. Kattō's article discusses a different 1821 incident, caused by Teshima Jungo, a distant cousin of Shō.

5. Such massive document collections as *Nanroshi yoku* (c. 1880), *Hakuwansō* (1881), *Tosa no kuni gunsho ruijū* (c. 1881), *Tosa no kuni gunsho ruijū shūi* (c. 1881), and *Kaizanshū* (c. 1900) contain no mention of “Yōsha zuihitsu.”

6. Volumes 2 and 3 went missing in the late nineteenth century when they passed into the hands of Tosa samurai and scholar Tani Kanjo (1837–1911). Kattō 1967, 106. Based on my own photocopies (which cover only about a third of the pages of Mr. Kattō’s volumes), there is no informative notation about the copy process, but the formal and consistent calligraphy and other stylistic evidence suggest it was made in the late Edo period by a professional scribe. Kattō regards the document as original, but the only two library seals inside are those of Tani Kanjo and Kattō Isamu, making it possible that the copy was commissioned by Tani.

7. “Gokachū hengi (1795–1852); “Gokachū hengi (1600–1803).”

8. Roberts 2012, 74–104.

9. This chapter approaches family dynamics by applying Edo period notions of spatial arrangements of authority, group autonomy, and performance of obedience to superiors, as explored in Roberts 2012.

10. Okawasuji Bukeyashiki Shiryōkan, <http://www.city.kochi.kochi.jp/soshiki/39/buke-yashiki.html>. The current house may have been rebuilt soon after the 1854 Ansei earthquake, and in the early postwar period it lost one to three original rooms on its west side, but it remains a good example of Kōchi samurai household architecture. The gatehouse, in which male servants lived, was built in 1855. Kōchi-ken Kenchikushikai 1995.

11. For useful explorations of the lives of samurai wives, see Suzuki 1993; Mega 2011.

12. The lineage of the Teshima family found in vol. 54 of the “Osamuraichū senzoshō keizuchō” refers occasionally to both males and females as apprentices (*yōikunin*).

13. For an excellent discussion of the sexual and marital relations among servants, see Mega 1995, 15–48.

14. Kamata 1970. Many examples of Kōchi samurai being punished for servant crimes are found in “Gokachū hengi (1600–1803)” and “Gokachū hengi (1795–1852).”

15. Location of the residence is from an 1801 town map shown on pp. 32–33 of Tosa Shidankai 2001. The income figure is from the Fukuoka lineage in “Osamuraichū senzoshō keizuchō,” vol. 50.

16. No direct evidence of the Fukuoka kin group activities survives, but the diaries of similar mounted warrior-class samurai, Mori Hirosada and Mori Yoshiki, held in Kōchi Prefecture Library, reveal that the heads of the thirteen different Mori households met periodically to socialize, and consulted on marriages, adoption, and occasional crises. Akinari’s “Yōsha zuihitsu” also frequently refers to consultations on issues affecting the Maeda kin group. Domain punishments of relatives also encouraged kin group self-policing. Kamata 1970, 63–78.

17. Punishments and subsequent forgiveness were common among samurai families in the early nineteenth century because overall stability seemed to be the main goal of domain government. The Teshima lineage is in vol. 54 of “Osamuraichū senzoshō keizuchō.” Shō’s father, Teshima Heijūrō Magaki, died in 1818/7/14, and her mother lived until 1852/6/12 (notes of gravestone taken by Doi Toshimitsu). Her brother Kiroku Yorimichi was head of her natal family at the time of the incident. Shō’s younger sister married Mutō Jinbei Yoshi-nao (vol. 39 of “Osamuraichū senzoshō keizuchō”).

18. Early mortality was common among samurai and meant that the domain frequently gave nominal headship of samurai houses to children such as Yūji, but the practical management of households required placing actual control in the hands of mothers. Yūji's mother's name is not mentioned in any documents that I have found. She may have acquired and used the retirement name Anshōin from the time of her husband's death. This name appears on her gravestone. My reading of a similar kin group's nine lineages, "Mori-shi keifu," shows that more than 30 percent of heirs were younger than sixteen when they inherited headship, suggesting that mothers were frequently in charge, not even including consideration of the stretches of time that a samurai served away in Edo.

19. Shōroku's gravestone records his birth date as Bunka 13 (1816/7/7). His gravestone is in the Nishikuma area of Kōchi, on the same site as that listed for Fukuoka Kunai Takamochi, described in Yamamoto 1987, vol. 1, p. 175.

20. Murata Shōhachirō Yoshitaka represents generation eight in the lineage entry under his name, in "Osamuraichū senzoshō keizuchō," vol. 38. He had a large income of 450 *koku*, a very successful employment record, and the couple raised three sons.

21. Because paternity was the salient issue for Tosa domain records, only a child's father was listed in government-maintained lineages. If a son was adopted, his original father of record was also listed, but no mention of his mother was made. Women appear only in the position of "wife" and even then as the nameless daughter of a named father, because the domain's interest was in marriage alliance rather than maternity. Shō, for example, appears as "Teshima Heijūrō Magaki's daughter." Only those daughters who married can be located when they are mentioned as wives of other samurai in official genealogies. The card catalog index to the "Osamuraichū senzoshō keizuchō" in Kōchi Prefecture Library lists every appearance of a man's name, and can be used to find when a man is listed as father of someone's wife. Daughters who died young or did not marry cannot be identified in this way.

22. Fukuoka Yūji Takaharu is the second-generation head in the lineage entry for Fukuoka Fujitsugu in the "Osamuraichū keizu chō," vol. 50.

23. Yonemoto 2016, 93–98.

24. Mega (1995, 125–53) shows that in Okayama domain the official punishment for a wife's infidelity was death and that this penalty was still invoked in the late Tokugawa period. Most domains used such penalties early on in the era but lightened punishments by the nineteenth century. Stanley 2007; Inoue 1965, vol. 2, pp. 65–67.

25. The familial problems caused by long absences of many samurai is discussed in Vapori 2008, 192–96. Yūji was a page and likely accompanied the daimyo when he left for Edo in the spring of 1816. "Osamuraichū keizu chō," vol. 50. Alternate attendance dates are from Yamauchi-ke Shiryō Kankō Iinkai 1999, 143, 146.

26. Divorce was the result in a similar case involving another Tosa retainer, named Hattori Zenzaemon. According to Akinari's description in "Yōsha zuihitsu," one day Zenzaemon departed in the middle of the night to go hunting. Suddenly realizing he had forgotten something, he returned early, only to discover "four feet sticking out from under the covers of his wife's futon." Rather than killing them, as was his right by law, or taking them to officials for punishment, or even speaking to them, he quietly left unnoticed and, "wishing to resolve things quietly," the next morning sent his wife home with a divorce letter. Both he and she later separately remarried. "Yōsha zuihitsu," vol. 1, folios 20–23, in two sections titled "Sakamoto ke tōzoku hairi saijo e tekizu owase sōrō shidai todokekata nado" and

"Naijitsu no hanashi." The reason for the woman's divorce from Zenzaemon would not have been discussed but for the fact that in her second marriage she took on other lovers, and was stabbed by one of them in 1830. That incident and associated punishments are recorded in the "Gokachū hengi (1795–1852)," entry for 1830.

27. At this same time Akinari recorded his involvement in another dispute in which a mother played a similarly key role: a wife of one of his nephews wanted a divorce but he would not grant it. At first her family urged her to return to his house, but once her mother supported her, the men of the house and a half-dozen branch families mobilized on her behalf and the divorce was finally attained. "Yōsha zuihitsu," vol. 5.

28. The dynamics and discursive structure of this political culture are explored in Roberts 2012.

29. Stanley 2007, 325–26.

30. This information comes from the official punishment documents presented in "Yōsha zuihitsu," and also from the diary of a contemporary, Kusunose Ōe; Kusunose 1972–91, vol. 8, p. 44.

31. Vaporis 2008, 195–96.

32. For two other cases of slaying for rudeness in Tosa in which lack of propriety was the reason for punishment, see Roberts 2002, 30–35; and Kattō 1967.

33. Ōta 1994, 21–22, offers an example of a woman absolved of crime in a murder because it was an attempted rape.

34. The eighteenth-century Kōchi samurai Mori Hirosada notes many such instances in his diary, "Nikki."

35. Kusunose 1972–91, vol. 8, p. 44.

36. Ōe describes in detail and with admiration a samurai youth's *seppuku* that was treated by the domain as suicide to prevent it from being considered a crime. Kusunose 1972–91, vol. 2, pp. 96–97.

37. For example, it was widely known in Kōchi that the senior administrator, Gotō Kazoe, killed himself in 1797 to atone for a serious governmental mistake, though the government record says he retired and died of illness the next day, as in "Sendai gyōjo."

38. Shōno 1990, 298–99. A detailed code known as the *Kainan ritsuryō* was enacted in the 1850s. Compared to the codes of many other domains, it was lenient, stipulating light levels of local banishment for first offenses between most people, but banishment from the province for servants who had an affair with the wife of the house. Second offenses incurred one hundred lashes, and third offenses incurred the death penalty. Inoue 1965, vol. 2, p. 66. The phenomenon of authorities in Japan leaving the punishment of the wife up to the husband was common enough but not uniform. Stanley argues that following Tokugawa Yoshimune's legal reforms of 1742, the Tokugawa state punished women in adultery cases regardless of the husband's wishes, and punished with greater severity than before, but that many domain governments were moving toward less severe punishments. That seems to have been the case in Tosa. Stanley 2007, 314–20.

39. "Gokachū hengi (1795–1852)" cases for the following dates: 1817/9/18–12/18 (loss of post, fief reduction, the father strictly control his daughter); 1821/7/29 (fief reduction and brother should strictly control his elder sister); 1824/9/29 (fief loss, banishment from castle town but son inherits fully, son should strictly control his younger sister); 1829/3/7 (fief reduction, the husband should strictly control his wife); 1830/1/29 (fief reduction and brother

should strictly control his older sister); 1830/3/7 (fief reduction and husband should strictly control his wife); 1834/7/23 (fief reduction and husband should strictly control his wife); 1841/1/28 (accused is banished from the castle town and loses status, but son allowed to inherit and he should strictly control his mother).

40. As quoted in "Yōsha zuihitsu," and also found in "Gokachū hengi (1795–1852)" and in Kusunose 1972–91, vol. 8, p. 44.

41. These punishments are not listed in "Yōsha zuihitsu," which likely was recorded in the intercalary 8th month, but are listed in the Teshima's official lineage in "Osamurai chū keizu chō," vol. 54, for Teshima Kiroku, and vol. 50 for Sakonbei, and also in "Gokachū hengi (1795–1852)" for 1824/9/15.

42. Inoue 1965, vol. 2, pp. 65–67.

43. "Osamurai chū keizu chō," vol. 14.

44. "Osamurai chū keizu chō," vol. 50 (fact of adoption). The date of adoption is unknown, but the family grave shows that Shōroku's adoptive father, Takayasu, died in 1834.

45. Beasley 1972, 275, 277, 323; Jansen 1961, 75, 299, 317, 401.

46. "Osamurai chū keizu chō," vol. 50, noted in Takachika's career record for the first year of the Ansei era. The pardon is noted as an addendum in the "Gokachū hengi" entry for 1824/8/23. No such notation appears in any of the other female crimes in the volume.

REFERENCES

Beasley 1972

Beasley, W. G. *The Meiji Restoration*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1972.

Gakushūin Daigaku Shiryōkan 1993

Gakushūin Daigaku Shiryōkan, ed. *Kyūkazoku-ke shiryō shozai chōsa hōkokusho, honpen 4*. Tokyo: Gakushūin Daigaku Shiryōkan 1993.

"Gokachū hengi (1795–1852)"

"Gokachū hengi (1795–1852)." Vols. 22–26 in "Nanrōshi yoku." 50 vols., doc. 4141.84/5/51.

In Tokyō Daigaku Shirōhensanjo.

"Gokachū hengi (1600–1803)"

"Gokachū hengi." *Tosa shidan*, no. 54 (March 1936): 152–63; no. 55 (June 1936): 209–32; no. 57 (December 1936): 123–32; no. 59 (June 1937): 131–40; no. 62 (March 1938): 140–47.

Inoue 1965

Inoue Kazuo. *Han hō, bakufu hō to ishin hō*. 3 vols. 1940. Reprinted, Tokyo: Gannandō, 1965.

Jansen 1961

Jansen, Marius B. *Sakamoto Ryōma and the Meiji Restoration*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.

Kamata 1970

Kamata Hiroshi. *Bakuhantaisei ni okeru bushi kazoku hō*. Tokyo: Seibundō, 1970.

Kasumikaikan 1996

Kasumikaikan Kazoku Kakei Taisei Henshu Iinkai, ed. *Heisei shinshū kyūkazoku kakei taisei gekan*. Tokyo: Kasumikaikan, 1996.

Kattō 1967

Kattō Isamu. “Yōsha zuihitsu’ kara miru Teshima jiken no shinsō.” *Tosa shidan* 118 (November 1967): 105–11.

Kōchi-ken Kenchikushikai 1995

Kōchi-ken Kenchikushikai Ōkawasuji Bukeyashiki Chōsa Tokubetsu Iinkai, ed. *Ōkawasuji bukeyashiki chōsa hōkokusho*. Kōchi: Kōchi-ken Kenchikushikai, 1995.

Kusunose 1972–91

Kusunose Ōe. *Hiuchibukuro: Kusunose Ōe nikki*. 17 vols. Kōchi: Kōchi Shimin Toshokan 1972–91.

Mega 1995

Mega Atsuko. *Hankachō no naka no onna tachi: Okayama-han no kiroku kara*. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1995.

Mega 2011

Mega Atsuko. *Buke ni totsuida josei no tegami*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2011.

“Mori-shi keifu”

“Mori-shi keifu, 9 vols. Uncatalogued, Kōchi Prefecture Library.

“Nikki”

Mori Hirosada. “Nikki.” Kōchi Prefecture Library (call no. K298 mori).

“Osamuraichū senzoshō keizuchō”

“Osamuraichū senzoshō keizuchō.” Multivolume set of copies in Kōchi Prefecture Library (call no. K288 osa).

Ōta 1994

Ōta Motoko. *Edo no oyako: Chichioya ga kodomo wo sodateta jidai*. Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1994.

Roberts 2002

Roberts, Luke S. “Mori Yoshiki: Samurai Government Officer.” In *The Human Tradition in Modern Japan*, edited by Anne Walthall, 25–44. Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, 2002.

Roberts 2012

Roberts, Luke S. *Performing the Great Peace: Political Space and Open Secrets in Tokugawa Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2013.

“Sendai gyōjo”

Mori Masana. “Sendai gyōjo.” Kōchi Prefectural Museum of History.

Shōno 1990

Shōno Takashi. *Tosa-han Genroku ōjomoku no hōseishiteki kenkyū*. Tokyo: Tōyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1990.

Stanley 2007

Stanley, Amy. “Adultery, Punishment, and Reconciliation in Tokugawa Japan.” *Journal of Japanese Studies* 33:2 (2007): 309–35.

Suzuki 1993

Suzuki Yuriko. “Jukajosei no seikatsu: Rai Baishi no shigoto to shussan, ikuji.” In *Josei no kinsei*, edited by Hayashi Reiko, 129–66. Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1993.

Tosa Shidankai 2001

Tosa Shidankai, ed. *Kōchi jōkamachi yomihon*. Kōchi: Kōchijō chikujō yonhyakunen kinen jigō suishin kyōgikai, 2001.

Vaporis 2008

Vaporis, Constantine. *Tour of Duty: Samurai, Military Service in Edo, and the Culture of Early Modern Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2008.

Walthall 1991

Walthall, Anne. "The Life Cycle of Farm Women in Tokugawa Japan." In *Recreating Japanese Women, 1600–1945*, edited by Gail Bernstein, 42–70. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.

Yamamoto 1987

Yamamoto Taizō. *Tosa no haka*. 2 vols. Kōchi: Tosa Shidankai, 1987.

Yamauchi-ke Shiryō Kankō Inkai 1999

Yamauchi-ke Shiryō Kankō Inkai, ed. *Rekidai kōki kōbunshū gekan*. Kōchi: Yamauchi-ke Hōmotsu Shiryōkan, 1999.

Yonemoto 2016

Yonemoto, Marcia. *The Problem of Women in Early Modern Japan*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2016.

"Yōsha zuihitsu"

Yamauchi (Maeno) Akinari. "Yōsha zuihitsu." 7 vols. (vols. 2–3 missing). Private collection of Kattō family of Kōchi city. Photocopies of portions in possession of the author.