

Otojirô Kawakami and Yacco Sada:
Japanese Actors in America
at the Turn of the Twentieth Century

AARON M. COHEN
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK–NEW PALTZ

OTOJIRÔ KAWAKAMI, JAPAN'S FIRST MODERN ACTING MANAGER,¹ performing with his wife and costar, the former geisha Yacco Sada, appeared in Boston in December of 1899 and January of 1900, and in New York in March and April of 1900.² Supported by a troupe of not quite twenty persons, they then made their way to London and their ultimate destination, the International Exposition in Paris—as the first Japanese actors to perform outside of their country. Their tour was significant in terms of the history of Western influence on Japanese theater, reflected in their subsequent careers and theatrical contributions after they returned home;³ likewise, they stimulated interest in Japanese culture, particularly among the French.⁴

It was not only the turn of the century but also a turning point for them. During the early part of their tour in the United States, the troupe had encountered great difficulties and were left destitute when a Japanese manager absconded with their money. On the East Coast, Kawakami's newly-gained experience in producing plays for Americans, his political connections (helpful at the Japanese Embassy in Washington, D.C.), and luck reversed their fortunes. The turn for the better started with success in Boston. They had performed in public on the West Coast and in Chicago, but Boston and New York were the first cities where they had a significant opportunity to demonstrate what they had to offer—and to learn for themselves. They were a success in Boston despite the death of two of the performers⁵ and Kawakami's undergoing an appendectomy there. After that, they played in New York, later going on to greater success in London and yet greater success in Paris.

Activities of these performers in America have not been given close attention by theatrical historians or biographers of Kawakami and Yacco, with one exception.⁶ Almost all published materials dealing with activities of the two overseas have been based largely on what they themselves wrote or spoke for subsequent publication in Japan, and they make little or no use of materials from abroad. Published statements and recollections of Kawakami and his wife have

The author is a faculty member, School of Business Administration, State University of New York–New Paltz; <amc97@cornell.edu>

been recycled often enough to become accepted without question by many writers as to their foundation in fact, although some theatrical historians have remained alert to the possibility that part of the foundation was, in fact, fancy. These conditions are not suitable for the proper overall evaluation of the contribution these two made both to the theater in Japan and to Japan's cultural relations with the West during the early years of the twentieth century. This essay seeks to help correct the situation. In addition to relating part of what the performers did in America and how Americans reacted to the Japanese, the essay can be useful for any consideration of the activities and career accomplishments of the performers elsewhere, especially abroad. As such, the following, based on contemporary press reports, can contribute to the history both of Japanese performing arts and Japan's international cultural relations.

Information and Misinformation

The audiences, journalists, and critics in Boston and New York lacked a basis for evaluating Japanese acting and drama. This much was acknowledged when a Boston journalist explained the poor turnout for the first performances there by writing that

undoubtedly the company was considered by many to be merely a party of jugglers and acrobats, as up to this time no Japanese have been seen on our stage who did not belong to that category.⁷

Since 1867, many troupes of acrobats from Japan had toured American variety halls, but no *actors* had come to America, and no substantial book about Japanese theater had been published in English. Once it was known that the Japanese were not acrobats, after the first programs attendance rose, and before the troupe left Boston they almost filled the theater. But the lack of prior experience and information, the cultural remoteness of what Kawakami was attempting, and the language barrier not only meant Bostonians and New Yorkers had to be content with superficial appreciation (fraught with misunderstandings), but also meant they were susceptible to, or dependent on, whatever information they were fed by reporters, promoters, or the actors themselves.

Unlike Britain and France, America had produced no indigenous work of importance dealing with Japan and intended for performance on stage. Gilbert and Sullivan's *The Mikado* was hardly of value in anticipating what real Japanese might do. Another British import, an 1896 musical comedy called *The Geisha*, had been successful. Neither prepared Americans for the real Japanese. What information there was available regarding the tour may have included deceptions deliberately set before the public for promotional reasons. While the Japanese were in Boston (or possibly before they arrived), Kawakami was signed to a contract by Alexander Comstock, an East Coast theatrical manager,⁸ and it seems likely that some of the strange things that appeared in the press are better explained as the work of his office or the quality of contemporary journalism than the result of difficulties in translating comments made by the Japanese. Misinformation included the statement that

the twenty players were selected by the Japanese government from among the 800 students of the national theater at Tokio, for a brief tour in this country previous to . . . the Paris exhibition. They were also selected . . . with a regard to their social and political standing in their own country.⁹

Elsewhere, Kawakami was said to have been a member of the Japanese embassy in Paris,¹⁰ where he “became filled with desire to introduce modern methods to the Japanese stage.” He belonged to an “old and wealthy” or a “rich and influential” family.

While Kawakami did have some high connections, they were not because of family wealth, status, or influence. His previous association with the Japanese legation in Paris was limited to getting some local logistic support and financial assistance that enabled him to return to Japan. The number of “students” Kawakami had was greatly exaggerated: the 800 mentioned in Boston was doubled to 1,600 in the New York press. There was no national theater in Japan. In a published interview with Yacco (as she was most commonly called), the Kawakami Theater in Tokyo was presented as being “one of the most beautiful playhouses in the world.”¹¹ That was certainly a hospitable if not overly generous evaluation. The troupe, moreover, had no official backing in the sense of assistance from the Japanese government in Tokyo. Contrary to what Bostonians were told, it was a motley assortment of relatives and players whom Kawakami was fortunate enough to persuade to travel with him, and all but he himself were social and political nonentities in Japan. The Americans were being given a greatly exaggerated picture of the abilities of the performers appearing before them, in what may be called one of the flaws of the tour as an example of cross-cultural communication.

Even the Mikado was enlisted in the troupe’s promotional schemes. Yacco was quoted as saying that the friendship of the Mikado enabled her to overcome traditionalists’ opposition to her appearing on the stage with men, and that the Mikado had attended their performance.¹² These claims are, at the very least, stretching the point. Yacco had been “sponsored” by Hirobumi Itô, an aristocrat and prominent politician, and the Emperor had mistresses, if they may be called that, but it was unthinkable for the Emperor to show any interest in a woman who was not a courtier but a courtesan. Yacco also intimated to an interviewer that after Kawakami returned from Europe—he was away from Japan on his initial European trip during the first four months of 1892, but little is known of what transpired—and was trying to reform theater (this was true), the Mikado had supported his efforts. In a sense, the mere act of the Emperor’s witnessing a performance of actors was favorable to theater and to theatrical reform, but in a general way and not necessarily with the intention of aiding Kawakami. What actually had taken place was this: Kawakami had performed before the Emperor and Empress on 14 May 1892, through the intercession of Kentarô Kaneko, a Harvard graduate and high-ranking politician. It was Kaneko, who came from the same part of Kyushu as Kawakami, who had urged him to go to Europe in

1892. The actor was already seen as a reformer, at a time when Japan was obsessed with reform. That the performance, of Kawakami's version of *Cyrano de Bergerac* (*Hirano Jirô*), took place can by itself be taken as an endorsement. But Yacco did not make her professional debut until years later. Such glorification, or failure to correct glorification at the hands of others, was by no means rare nor was it limited to America, as similar misrepresentation was evident when the troupe was in Europe.¹³

The newspapers in both East Coast cities published a handful of articles about Kawakami but did not carry direct quotations or interviews with him. There is no mention, moreover, of his appendicitis operation, an event that could explain his being inaccessible. Nor was there any mention of the death of the two actors. These events are known through Japanese sources only. Nor is there much reliable information about Yacco, who was the center of attraction. She is called Japan's "greatest emotional actress." We are told that she met Mary Fenollosa, wife of Ernest Fenollosa (a curator at the Museum of Fine Art in Boston), who had lived in Japan and spoke to her in Japanese, but this is suspect;¹⁴ we know that she acquired a small black and tan dog in Cleveland; that she was entertained by Boston artists; that she met opera singers Emma Eames (who later sang as Madame Butterfly) and Emma Clavé, who had attended a performance; and that a reception was given by "Madame Yacco" and the company prior to a performance.¹⁵ Kawakami later wrote little about going out, so either he was a recluse, or ill, or Yacco stole all the scenes.

During the reception some of the Japanese actors were speaking in English, according to the press, but it is hardly likely that they could carry on a conversation, and this observation is suspicious. There were Japanese living in Boston, and among them there could have been some who interpreted at the reception. In early January, tickets for performances were available not only at the theater but also at the store or office of a curio dealer, Bunkio Matsuki. Matsuki is known to have assisted them in New York, and he must have also done so in Boston. It may be, nevertheless, that some members of the troupe could speak a little more than the others, and when Yacco was interviewed by one paper, the interpreter was named as female-impersonator "Shirgere" (an error for Shigeru) Mikami, who had played the merchant's daughter in Kawakami's version of *The Merchant of Venice*.

Costumes, Clothing, and Props

Superficial elements of the troupe's appearances, unrelated to actual performance on stage, are not to be lightly dismissed. All they made use of—the actors' clothing (especially Yacco's kimonos), props, and scenery—was authentic, a characteristic contributing to the value and significance of the performances. The troupe exhibited their props, including stage armor, masks, and musical instruments, after some performances, enabling members of the audience to examine them at leisure.

There can be no doubt that Yacco's kimonos were beautiful, especially to

women in the audiences. But in Boston, as in New York and London, the influence of Japonisme in general, and among creative artists in particular, was much weaker than in Paris—even then a fashion center. Because of this and other differences between the cities, the only lasting influence of the tour occurred in Paris, where they arrived later in 1900. In New York, no special fuss was made over her kimonos.

Press reports conflicted regarding the scenery and are suspect. After one report that scenery had been painted in Boston, comments were soon published that made it clear that the scenery in question had recently arrived from Japan and was used in Boston for the first time. Whether Kawakami had scenery on order or not, however, must remain open to question, especially given the lack of a financial base for the troupe's tour, and the fact that his ultimate destination was Paris, not the American East Coast.

Another claim that bears upon Boston's exposure to Japanese goods—as contrasted to Japanese performance—was the report that the Japanese had with them a large number of items for exhibition in Paris.¹⁶ But Kawakami was on his own, and not a part of Japan's official or private-sector participation in the Exposition. It defies business sense to think that anyone in Tokyo would have given him goods to trundle through America for display and sale in Paris. It seems unlikely that the troupe would have displayed their props as anything else, or that these (or some other) items were taken along by Kawakami with the idea of selling them in Paris, his ultimate destination and the place he would be longest on this odyssey. It is far more likely that Matsuki, thinking of the market in Paris, supplied the goods.

American Managers

Were it not for Comstock, the troupe is not likely to have obtained so many bookings or so much press coverage in Boston. But Comstock was not a producer-manager such as Augustin Daly or David Belasco, nor was he so influential; neither did he have a strong position in London—not that this necessarily means he was inferior in business acumen to the other two. There are several unresolved matters regarding Comstock. One was whether there was a business relationship between him and Yumindo Kushibiki, a Japanese promoter active on the East Coast, who is said, according to later Japanese sources, to have provided Kawakami with funds for the trip.

Of greater importance than that is the fact that the Boston press mentioned that Comstock was managing the troupe in America and Europe; in addition the *Boston Herald* on 9 January stated that Comstock had “closed a contract with the management of Henry Irving's Lyceum Theatre, London.”¹⁷ Comstock seems to have recognized the potential in representing Japanese actors, for in January there was a report that he planned to bring a troupe of seventy Japanese, including twenty geisha, to America in the following year. Whether or not he seriously considered this, it did not come to pass. The closest he came was to

manage a Japanese tea garden at Brighton Beach, New York, in 1907. For whatever reason, Comstock did not manage the Japanese in New York. There, they were represented by Mrs. Robert Osborne, whose major interest in the theater had been the design of stage costumes for the American producer Daniel Frohmann.¹⁸ This producer had signed her to a two-year contract to make gowns for those actresses who did not bring their own.

A Japanese Version of *The Merchant of Venice*

An important event in the American tour was Kawakami's on-the-spot creation of his "Japanese version" of *The Merchant of Venice*. This has received considerable mention in Japanese writing about Kawakami, but little of substance seems to have been discovered about how the play was created. He performed in this play after returning to Japan, where translations were readily available, but changed the play from time to time while overseas and after returning to Japan.

The sources of Kawakami's inspiration were Henry Irving, the prominent British actor, and his partner on stage for many years, Ellen Terry. They were playing a three-week engagement in Boston and, according to the Boston press, saw the Japanese perform. We do not know what they thought of the performance. Ellen Terry in particular might have had an interest in seeing them. It would have meant recalling the times of about thirty years earlier, when she was living with Edward W. Godwin, an architect and designer who was at the vanguard in Britain's initial flirtation with Japonisme. Among his circle of Japanophile friends was the American painter James MacNeill Whistler, who gave the young couple a kimono for their daughter. But Ellen had left the architect decades before, taking with her the daughter and son she had by him, and neither she nor Irving had later appeared in a Japan-related play. Their professional interests did not admit of becoming influenced by Japan or the Japanese. Whatever influence there was, it may have worked in the opposite direction.

Kawakami made an adaptation of *The Merchant of Venice*, a play that the British couple was then presenting. We can presume that he had been to the play, since he was avidly interested in learning from Western theater and Irving was one of the best actors then on the boards. The Boston press gives evidence that Yacco met the couple, but no mention is made of Kawakami's being present or meeting them. A lengthy interview-based article includes the statement that "Madame Yakko went to see Irving and Terry in 'The Merchant of Venice' here in Boston."¹⁹ The absence of mention of Kawakami casts some doubt on what Kawakami later wrote—that Irving came to see him in his dressing room, shook his hand, and gave him advice. The press and most biographers or writers who have devoted space to the troupe's American tour made much of the meetings between these two couples in Boston, as well as a letter Irving is said to have given to Kawakami, introducing him to the others at the London Lyceum theater. In New York, Matsuki told the audience one night that, in Boston, "Sir Henry Irving invited the Japanese players to hear his company."²⁰ That is reasonable

enough, but Matsuki made no specific mention of Kawakami. Still, from the foregoing, even though direct evidence is lacking, we can tentatively conclude that Kawakami saw Irving perform, and may have met him. Neither the contents, nor the intent, nor the tone of the letter, much less the reaction of the Lyceum management, is known.²¹

Irving and Terry were giving other plays as well as *The Merchant of Venice* in Boston. Kawakami may not have been able to make a prolonged, detailed study of the play, even if this had been his wont. It is possible, though not highly probable, that he saw only part of it: on some occasions Irving and Terry performed only the main scenes of plays, in a composite performance. It can be argued that because of Kawakami's ignorance of the English language he would not have obtained a good grasp of things in any event. And yet, he hardly would have felt this to be the case, as we may conclude from the way he patched together bits and pieces of Kabuki plays. Making use of an interpreter such as Matsuki could have resulted in some improvement of understanding. It is even vaguely possible that he knew about the play from having read of it while in Japan, or perhaps even had seen an adaptation of it there.

Irving and Terry opened their last week in Boston, at the Hollis Street Theater, on 4 December 1899, a Tuesday. During that week they revived *The Merchant of Venice* on Thursday and Friday nights, and again for the Saturday matinee. The Saturday performance was announced as a program of two short pieces—one act from another play, and the fourth act, or trial scene, from *The Merchant of Venice*. It would have been one of these performances that Kawakami saw, for on 9 January the *Boston Herald* stated that “the Japanese artists promise a production of ‘The Merchant of Venice’ should they be able to stay in Boston for another week.”²² That is, this announcement, the timing of Kawakami's presumed arrival, Irving and Terry's schedule, and the subsequent performance of the adaptation, are such that it is most likely that he saw one of those three performances. Further, the earliest mention of a Japanese version of *The Merchant of Venice* is considerably later; a review after it was given on 25 January stated that the program was to be repeated on 26 January.²³ Irving and Terry would have left Boston by that time, and would not have been able to see their Japanese counterparts. This too makes Kawakami's writings appear all the more an exercise in self-promoting hyperbole. Alternately, Kawakami's style may be taken as being ambiguous, and so favorable to him when taken at face value. It was his grand assertion that he engaged Irving in a friendly competition by putting on his version of the Shakespearean tragedy, but it has thus far been established that there were only two performances, they were late during the Japanese stay in Boston, and it is unimaginable that Irving would have had more than a small degree of passing curiosity in the contortions of the Japanese. To Irving, Kawakami was no competitor. The Japanese were a novelty; Irving and Terry were doing Shakespeare. Nevertheless, we may conclude that the adaptation of the Shakespearean play by Kawakami was based on Irving and Terry's performance.

On the basis of Irving's performance schedule, Kawakami probably saw *The Merchant of Venice* on 6, 7, or 8 December 1899, or the fourth act (the trial scene) on 9 December, although it is possible that he saw an earlier performance. He was appearing in matinees at the time. Of course, he may also have seen this play more than once. The earliest known date of a performance of Kawakami's version is 25 January. He thus had ample time in terms of calendar days to prepare the one-act piece. Scholars in Japan seem to have taken Kawakami's figure of speech literally, assuming he had done the job "in one night" (*ichiyazuke*) but they may be in error. It seems unlikely that the Japanese version was truly an overnight creation, and the lapse between one event and another may be explained by the booking schedule, the death of the two actors, and Kawakami's hospitalization and recuperation, singly or in combination. Because many pieces featuring Yacco were given in January, he could have been recuperating most of this time, or perhaps he had his operation in January, rather than December as has been thought.

The two couples were also in New York at the same time, but there is no evidence of any contact between them in that city.

A Japanese Version of Alphonse Daudet's *Sapho*

An English-language production of an adaptation of Alphonse Daudet's novel *Sapho* opened in New York on 1 February, but it was held to be immoral and had to close after performers were arrested.²⁴ The immorality question kept many New York newspapers buzzing; reports were published on the policy of public libraries' keeping the book; a burlesque, *Sapolio*, was given at the Weber and Fields Theater from 8 March; and sheet music for "Sapho waltzes" was advertised. When the performers were acquitted, *Sapho* reopened, and at roughly the same time Kawakami, ever the opportunist, presented his version. Billed as *Sapho in Japan*, it opened on or about 14 April and was favorably received.²⁵ Japanese sources give *Sapho = Japanese Idea* as the title, with the second and third words written phonetically.

The couple performed in this play on various occasions after returning to Japan. Prior to this, European playwrights such as Ibsen, Pinero, and Dumas had achieved success and provoked controversy with plays that gave central roles to women, and challenged existing formal standards of morality. It appears likely that the Kawakamis' witnessing the play's love scene—the focal point of conservative New Yorkers' criticisms—was an important event in their education regarding Western acting and drama. It certainly was significant in the context of Yacco's prominence as the first Japanese actress to perform with men.

Contemporaneous Japanese Attractions

The Japanese players opened in New York on 1 March 1900, a Thursday. The following Monday, David Belasco added a one-act play to share the bill with his ongoing production of *Naughty Anthony*, that had not done well: it was *Madame*

Butterfly, adapted by him with the cooperation of John Luther Long, author of the original story. This was successful and made a star of Blanche Bates. Although Belasco withdrew the play after a short period in order to present it in England (where Giacomo Puccini saw it performed), it attracted critical and popular attention and put Japan in the minds of theatergoers. Kawakami asserted that Bates attended performances by the Japanese for a week.²⁶ There does not appear to be any corroboration of this.

This was not the only coincidental presentation of a Japanese work for the stage. An elaborate musical “vaudeville-ballet spectacle,” *Broadway to Tokio*, opened at the New York Theater on 23 January. The book and lyrics were by George V. Hobart and Louis Harrison; music was by Reginald de Koven and A. B. Sloane. Koven was a prolific composer of operetta-like works who frequently used exotic settings. A review described the finale on opening night:

The stage appeared peopled by hundreds. . . . The temple was marvelously beautiful and so large as to require the throwing back of the scenery almost to the walls. Massed at the back in ascending terraces were rows and rows of gorgeously armored soldiers in quaint Japanese costumes, forming a dark green and gold background to the crowds of dancing girls in front . . . framed on all sides with enormous cherry trees.²⁷

By 19 March, while the Japanese were playing at the Bijou at Broadway and Thirtieth Street, *Broadway to Tokio* had its seventy-fifth performance—after which the people behind the latter gave a reception for the visitors from Japan. The show’s closing was reported on 13 April.

On 24 February New York’s *Mail and Express* reported that the Tokio Royal acrobats had been held over for a second week at Huber’s Fourteenth Street Museum, but they were only one act on the bill. On 21 April *The Mikado* was announced for the American Theater, in a production by the Castle Square Opera Company, owned by Henry Savage, who had recently agreed to team with Maurice Grau to make the Metropolitan Opera Company, which would give performances at New York’s Metropolitan Opera House.

The Plays and Schedules

The reconstruction of the Japanese performances from the American press is as described below.²⁸ Only fragments of later Japanese texts are extant, and the plays were not published as such. For a fuller overview, reference can be made to publications in England and France when the troupe performed there.²⁹

In Boston there were at minimum twenty-two performances on twenty days, and eight plays (including dance performances) were given. There was only one report of a cancellation, so it may be presumed that all of these were given as announced, except for a performance of *Soga* that had been announced prior to 9 January but was cancelled. The reason given for the cancellation was that the scenery had not arrived, but it could have been caused by Kawakami’s hospitalization. Not enough information is available, however, to determine if

Kawakami performed in all of these plays. The press had very few mentions of Kawakami or Yacco appearing in specific plays. There were minor spelling variations and alternate titles for some plays, but the following listing has been standardized for convenience.

For the 5, 7, and 8 December performances, the troupe was advertised as The Imperial Japanese Dramatic Company, but subsequently only as the Japanese Dramatic Co. In New York at one time they were advertised as Otojiro Kawakami, Sada Yacco & Famous Japanese Players, and referred to as the Imperial Japanese Company. This inconsistency may owe as much to the style and space limitations of the press as the intentions of the performers and their managers.

On 14 December, a Friday, it was made known that the troupe would stay in Boston another week—as it turned out, they stayed much longer. That is, there probably were, singly or in combination, booking problems in New York, or good performance possibilities in Boston, and health problems among members of the troupe. On 21 January, when it was announced they would open in New York on the 29th, their appearance in the latter city had been postponed four times. After the last performance in Boston, Kawakami made a trip to Washington, where he was welcomed by Jûtarô Komura, feted, and introduced to President McKinley.

The change from one theater to another can be explained by business considerations not determinable from the daily press (including Comstock's bargaining position) as well as competition with other productions. It is mentioned, for example, that the players had to move from the Tremont Theater to Copley Hall because the former had been booked for a production of *Becky Sharp*.

In New York, the players were announced as opening at the Berkeley Lyceum Theater, with *The Statue Maker*, *Takamori the Loyalist*, and *The Geisha and the Samurai*; two days after the opening it was reported that they would also give *The Loyal Wife*, *Sairoku*, and *Scarlet Snow*.³⁰ From Monday, March 10, they were engaged at the Bijou, which had a larger stage and gave them a better opportunity to use their scenery. On 17 March they were extended at the Bijou. But by April the Japanese were no longer able to draw enough people to evening performances and were shifted to matinees for two weeks, together with an American appearing as a Chinese magician, Ching Ling Foo, while a comedy was given at night. Declining popularity may have been the reason it was reported on 13 March that Yacco would hold a public reception in the front parlor of the theater on Thursday and Saturday nights, and that on the following day souvenirs would be distributed. The popular-appeal newspapers gave frequent enough attention to the Japanese, but had to report on 11 March that "the Imperial Japanese Company has failed to arouse the interest it deserves,"³¹ suggesting that this was a factor behind the change to matinees.

In New York, Matsuki provided verbal explanations before the plays and in the intervals. He was described as having a sense of humor, and being "witty" and "droll"; his English also put the audiences in good humor, as it was laughable. Their applause for him may have been a thank-you for making them laugh.

BOSTON PERFORMANCES

December

5	(W)	Tremont Theater	Matinee	<i>The Statue Maker, The Geisha and the Samurai</i>
7	(F)	Tremont Theater	Matinee	?
8	(Sa)	Tremont Theater	Matinee	?
11	(Tu)	Tremont Theater	Matinee	<i>The Statue Maker, The Loyal Wife</i>
12	(W)	Tremont Theater	Matinee	<i>The Statue Maker, The Geisha and the Samurai</i>
13	(Tu)	Tremont Theater	Matinee	?
14	(F)	Tremont Theater	Matinee	?
18	(Tu)	Tremont Theater	Matinee	<i>The Loyal Wife, Sarashi</i>
19	(W)	Tremont Theater	Matinee	<i>Soga (only?)</i>
21	(F)	Tremont Theater	Matinee	<i>The Statue Maker, The Geisha and the Samurai</i>

January

2	(Tu)	Copley Hall	Twice	<i>Sambaso, The Geisha and the Samurai</i>
4	(Th)	Copley Hall	?	<i>Sarashi, The Statue Maker, The Loyal Wife</i>
6	(Sa)	Copley Hall	?	<i>Sambaso, Sarashi, and "a new play"</i>
9	(Tu)	Copley Hall	?	?
10	(W)	Copley Hall	?	<i>Sarashi and ?</i>
13	(Sa)	Copley Hall	Twice	<i>Soga, Sambaso</i>
18	(Th)	Boston Theater	?	Two or more from among <i>Soga, The Loyal Wife, (and possibly) Sairoku, Scarlet Snow</i>
19	(F)	Boston Theater	?	Same as above
25	(Th)	Boston Theater	Matinee?	<i>Sairoku, Scarlet Snow</i>
26	(F)	Boston Theater	Matinee	<i>Sairoku, Scarlet Snow</i>

NEW YORK PERFORMANCES

March

3	(F)	Berkeley Lyceum (?)	?	Perhaps all of <i>Zingoro, The Loyalist, The Geisha and the Samurai</i>
10	(S)	Bijou	?	?
13	(M)	Bijou	?	?
14	(T)	Bijou	?	<i>Sairoku, The Loyalist, The Geisha and the Samurai</i>
15	(W)	Bijou	Twice	<i>Sairoku, The Loyalist, The Geisha and the Samurai</i>
17	(Th)	Bijou	?	<i>Teijo and Scarlet Snow (?)</i>
18	(F)	Bijou	?	?
19	(S)	Bijou	Twice	<i>Teijo and ?</i>

April

9	(M)	Bijou	Matinee	?
20	(F)	Bijou	?	<i>Sapho</i>
21	(S)	Bijou	?	?

The Plots

The plots and related information as given in the press are as follows. We must apply here, too, the usual caveat regarding the accuracy and completeness of American comprehension of whatever the Japanese were doing or wished to communicate. However, comparison of the summaries with accounts of performances elsewhere (none of this being within the scope of this essay) can reveal changes that Kawakami made while on tour, as well as enable a fuller reconstruction of the contents of the productions.

(1) *The Geisha and the Samurai*

This three-act tragedy was also advertised as *Geisha to Samurai* and *The Geisha and the Knight* in Boston; in France it was *La Geisha et le Chevalier*. The manner in which it was related in the press leaves some room for doubt as to the sequence of the acts. The samurai is in the service of the Mikado at a time when two competing clans have power and the Mikado is a figurehead. The samurai, a member of one of the clans, seeks out the Mikado, who has been hidden in a mountain lodge by the other clan.

The opening scene is a grand battle. After it is done, two peasants come by, and while they are examining the “blood and deep footprints” left behind, the samurai comes along, takes one peasant’s straw cloak and the other’s straw hat, and continues on his way, in disguise. In the second act, he succeeds in entering the enemy’s camp and is close to the cottage where the Mikado is being kept, but he cannot make contact. He does manage to inscribe a message of devotion on the bark of a tree, after cutting away some of the bark with his sword. He is discovered and has to kill four men in order to make his escape. Although the samurai is betrothed, he is in love with a geisha, in competition with another samurai from his clan, whom he fights in a duel, until the geisha stops it by throwing herself between them. Subsequently, the woman who is betrothed to the samurai finds him, and they take refuge together in a Buddhist temple, fearful that they may invoke the wrath of the geisha. The geisha gains admittance to the temple (against the rules, as she is unmarried) by dancing for the priests, kills her rival, and then dies herself.

If this description is accurate, it means that not only did Kawakami combine *Saya-ate* (presented earlier in the American tour) and *Dojoji* to concoct this play, but also included a key scene from *Kojima Takanori* as well. Interestingly, photographs of the French production can be found on the website of the French National Library.³² These may be taken as representative also of the productions in Boston and New York.

(2) *Sairoku*

For this near-burlesque or parody-adaptation after Shakespeare’s play, Kawakami adroitly transformed personal names into passable Japanese ones—as indeed most Japanese of his age would have been prone to do—use ad hoc transcriptions or approximations written in ideographs rather than purely pho-

netic *kana* transpositions. Thus, Shylock becomes Sairoku in the play of the same name that Kawakami devised while in Boston. Although *Sairoku*, like his other works, is generally described as “a play,” it is one only in the Japanese sense that a “short” but self-standing excerpt from a Kabuki play, which would require an entire day if performed in entirety, is given separately. From a Western viewpoint, *Sairoku* was just the fourth act of *The Merchant of Venice*.

The setting is moved to Hakodate, where Sairoku is an old fisherman who has enriched himself by charging other fishers for the navigation assistance provided by his lighthouse at the entrance to the harbor. His daughters, Osode (Portia, acted by Yacco) and Omitsu, do not approve of his avarice. When Ando Nisuke (Antonio) borrows 3,000 ryo (*ryō*) from Sairoku but cannot repay him, the court scene ensues; it is in “the form of court-martial about 1860, at the time of ‘the Russian aggression’ in Yezo.”³³ When the younger daughter, who enters accompanied by a Buddhist priest (an omen of death), fails to stop Sairoku from exacting three square inches of flesh nearest the heart, she kills herself. Osode, however, saves Ando’s life, true to Shakespeare.

Audiences enjoyed a Kawakami innovation when Sairoku uses a Japanese brush to make a circle on his opponent and demarcate where he intends to cut the flesh. It is enticing to think that Kawakami may have been acting out his appendectomy in the guise of an adaptation from Shakespeare!

(3) *Scarlet Snow*

This play dealt with political history, that is, it is a *sōshi* play based on the Sakuradamon Incident, and at the same time it was an exciting display of violence and murder. The action occurs some time after the Ansei Treaty was signed, in 1858 (Ansei 5 on the Japanese calendar). Because the “premier” (Ii Naosuke in real life, and bearing the title Tairō Komon) has signed it without formal approval of the Mikado, nationalists assassinate him and his retinue. In the first act the Japanese take the roles of Commodore Perry and some of his men by whitening their faces and gluing a fake beard on Perry. In act one, international differences of class and customs are represented in passing, by having Perry treat Japanese nobles and servants as if they were equal to each other, to the contempt of the former and amusement of the latter. The attack, battle, assassination, and murders occupy the second act. The fighting showed no accommodation to the West; it was blood-and-thunder Kawakami, with the highly stylized acting of the Kabuki stage—another kind of Japanese acrobatics in the eyes of the real Americans, combined with whiteface.

(4) *The Loyal Wife (Teijo or Tajo or [later] Kesa Gozen)*

Few details were given about this vehicle for Yacco, except that it was referred to as a “dancing comedy” and “a vivid and realistic drama.” It was cited in various spellings. The hero enters a cave occupied by a robber band and sends them scurrying by deft use of a folding fan, saving the maiden.

(5) *Soga*³⁴ (later, *Two Brothers Soga*)

No details are given of this vendetta play that was a vehicle for Kawakami

and first given in Boston. The story is a well-known vendetta tale of the twelfth century and is the basis for Kabuki plays.

(6) *Three Colors (Sarashi)*

No details; this was called a “ballet d’action” in the press. One role was that of a merchant’s daughter. A vehicle for Yacco, this may have been a dance piece called *Sarashime*.³⁵

(7) *The Statue Maker (Zingorô)*

Among the attractions of this curtain-raiser was the way the actors were able to stand immobile a long time. At the time, variety hall acts included what was called “living statues,” wherein the performers would pose, immobile, as part of scenes based on mythology or other sources. The Japanese also stood immobile for long periods during *The Geisha and the Samurai*. By chance, a British musical comedy, *The Greek Slave*, wherein a statue comes to life, was being given elsewhere in Boston when the Japanese were there. The Japanese play was a scissors and paste job, and apart from the standstill portions had ample sword-play to entertain audiences.

(8) *The Loyalist*

Also cited as *The Royalist* and *Kojima Takamori*. No details were given in the Boston and New York papers. A Kawakami sword-swinging based on a familiar tale of a well-known (to the Japanese) historical hero, it had been performed by him in Japan as *Bingo Saburô*.

(9) *Sapho (Sahoro)*

This was given in two acts and without the famous stairway scene. The *Evening Telegraph* reported as follows:

The first act is a garden party at Dechelette’s in Tokio, terminating with a sort of game of blind man’s bluff. Sapho and Gaussin indulge in a little love making, and are neatly caught in the mosquito netting—this in Japanese drama means that the other guests at the garden party are “on to” the love making.

A good deal happens in the second act, including Dechelette, garbed like the others, in Japanese costume, topped off with an up to date Broadway derby hat by way of couleur locale. Flamant brings in a property baby, borrows some small change from Sapho, and leaves. Gaussin and Sapho quarrel, and Gaussin also departs, first stepping on the baby’s face—a Japanese suggestion that he is very much provoked.³⁶

Kawakami was prone to seizing current events to add interest to his productions, ever since he was successful in Japan in using the Sino-Japanese War (1894–95) as a source. He had used Admiral Dewey’s defeat of the Spanish fleet in Manila Bay in West Coast performances.³⁷ A derby combined with Japanese clothing would not have been out of place in Japan at the time, and thus would have been readily conceivable to Kawakami, who had enough chutzpah to override criticisms of incongruity.

Reaction to the Plays

There were conventional reactions to the plays in the press, but perhaps more impressive was the reaction at other Boston theaters. That is, the presence of the Japanese players in Boston led to announcement of the spurious "Japanese Theater Co.," supposedly "From the realms of the Mikado Direct," at an all-day variety hall,³⁸ but it is not at all clear if this was a minstrel show, midget show, or something else. Elsewhere in town, at Keith's Vaudeville, a man-and-woman comic team presented "a new and original Japanese comic operetta" as their act. Such imitations were ephemeral and of no great import. They do not seem to have been repeated in New York, where there were other stage performances with Japanese themes being presented.

Press reaction in Boston must be read with care. Subject to influence from Comstock's publicity efforts, it tended to gush over Yacco to the point of overdoing praise, reflecting the level or nature of journalism at the time and the lack of a foundation of accurate information and understanding on which to base reviews. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that the Japanese were a hit.

The plays were not represented as being traditional Japanese drama. Yacco made it clear in her Boston interviews that Kawakami was a reformer who was modernizing and shortening Japanese plays on the basis of his experience abroad. This was true (but he was by no means the only modernizing force nor was he updating and shortening all he presented). He is controversial to this day with regard to his significance in the history of modern Japanese theater. Certainly, his methods and their results are difficult to evaluate in terms of the canon of traditional (and modern) Kabuki.

After the opening in New York, the *Evening Post* reported as follows:

The little sketches . . . are chiefly interesting as marking the stage of development which the drama has reached in Japan. . . . The three plays may be described as elementary in every way. The emotions represented are simple, and they are simply interpreted by the aid of explanatory pantomime, with such attention to detail and with so much insistence as to be perfectly intelligible despite the hindrance of an unknown tongue.³⁹

Although not complimentary, these observations appear to be suitable, under the circumstances as described. *The Herald* reported, with some disdain:

Of the three little plays . . . the best that can be said is that they were truly Japanese and utterly unimportant from a Western point of view.⁴⁰

The only detailed reaction to the plays that was published described *The Geisha and the Samurai* in Boston and *Sapho* in New York. In Boston, the fighting in *The Geisha and the Samurai* was deemed "worth going miles to see." The hero kicks one of his adversaries in the stomach, killing him; the dying man "quivers like a fish." Another man is killed by the same technique, and the next is thrown for a full somersault, and "comes down on the stage like a log" (a Jap-

anese theatrical method of falling dead rigidly, called *jizô taoshi* in Japanese). At this point the hero is being choked by another, but

With the slow, bitter grasp of utter strength, the fighter breaks the man's hold on his throat, and then, forcing him down on the ground, stabs him thrice in the back, with thumping, flashing blows that make the heart thump for realism. There is no symbolism here. The hero kicks the various victims to make sure they are dead, and turns to go, but is rewarded by just a brief glimpse of the Emperor he is come to serve.⁴¹

The same description includes the only romantic view of Japan, one that links the performance to the image of Japan as represented by woodblock prints, with a few statements such as, "Photograph the play at any moment of its progress, and you will have a replica of a Japanese print." Such observations were made later by the British critic Max Beerbohm and French sculptor Auguste Rodin, and they were simply the result of prior familiarity with Japan through art.

From the *Evening Telegram*, on *Sapho*:

The New Yorker unfamiliar with the dramatic art of Japan would have some trouble in connecting yesterday's performance—dainty, pretty and a bit ludicrous at times—in any way with the "Sapho" of Daudet.⁴²

In New York, the *Evening Telegraph* comment after the troupe opened in that city seems to be a good representation of the reaction to experiencing an evening of Japanese plays:

The performance was unique in every way, intensely interesting, and in spite of the unknown tongue which made the spoken words merely one feature in a pantomime, positively thrilling. Between the plays the audience was given a taste of the vocal and instrumental music of Japan.⁴³

The *Evening Post* critic wrote

Otjiro [sic] Kawakami, the leading actor, is a man of somewhat imposing presence; he is possessed of some dignity of mien and has a fairly adequate knowledge of the value of repose. . . . Yacco [is] a graceful slender woman. . . . It must be said, however, that the methods adopted to indicate stress of emotion by these players seem crude and at times even ludicrous to Occidental eyes. In comedy more success is achieved, but both plays and players are elemental, even rudimentary. Their novelty and what they represent in the development of dramatic art alone entitle them to consideration.⁴⁴

After *Sairoku* was given, a review stated that

The small audience thoroughly enjoyed the strange performance, not the least odd of the many odd features was the manner in which the actors expressed emotion. . . . They . . . "sissed" and sputtered.⁴⁵

Conclusions

“To understand” was hardly a relevant working objective of audiences in Boston, as they had no basis for evaluating what they saw other than by comparison to woodblock prints, as far as can be determined from the press. The situation was somewhat different in New York, where one paper was stimulated to publish a lengthy, illustrated, and accurate feature on Kabuki, “How They Run a Theatrical Show in Japan.”⁴⁶ Printing of synopses of the plays facilitated viewing the performances, and alert, experienced theatergoers may have been able to discern something of what was taking place without the ability to understand Japanese. No small amount of assistance in the cross-cultural communication process was provided by Bunkio Matsuki.

But the unusual nature of the plays as they were given must have been a major appeal. The press made little mention of romantic notions of Japan, nor suggested that exoticism was a major source of appeal, and this suggests that there was a fundamental stance of being prepared to somehow accept the Japanese dramas on their own terms.

Nevertheless, in the absence of any qualifying experience, there was merely acceptance of enjoyable superficialities, an acceptance that was combined with little useful information in the press, so that the performances did not contribute to improved cultural relations by means of understanding of the content and object of the plays, or of the production and acting techniques. This is a natural consequence of the realities of history up to that time, and it is valid to say that one cannot be critical of the lack of understanding, and that one can think that these appearances made it possible for there to be better understanding afterward. The plays and level of Japanese dramatic art, nevertheless, were judged by what was presented, and they were found to be elementary, or even rudimentary. This view was expressed in New York, not in Boston, and the inability of the Japanese to generate much attention in New York must represent a difference in the discernment and preferences of audiences in the two cities, as well as the more competitive theatrical environment in New York.

On the whole, a lack of deep understanding (but polite, favorable reactions just the same) and the propagation of misinformation stand out as two fundamental aspects of Boston’s first contact with performers from Japan who were not acrobats, jugglers, or wrestlers. Considering the prevalence and doings of press agents today, it is not appropriate to overly criticize entertainment in terms of the quality of cross-cultural communication of accurate information.

The importance of the performances in Boston and the United States in general is largely a matter of record, and not of influence on the United States. But these were the first series of events in a more or less serious dramatic interchange. A New York writer noted in a simultaneous reference to *Sapho* and *Sairoku* that both Japan and America looked abroad for inspiration. Kawakami and his wife were able to acquire a British play in Boston and a French play in

New York, to take to London and Paris, and thence back to Japan. They, more than the Americans who were exposed to Japanese plays, were beneficiaries of exchange.

In Boston, the troupe presented eight plays or dance performances (dance-pantomimes) a total of twenty-two times on twenty days, between 5 December and 26 January. This was a busy schedule for them. In New York there were at least twelve performances on ten days between 3 March and 21 April.

Reports in the press must be read with caution as they may be deficient in subjectivity. The stories of several plays appeared in the newspapers, and it is possible to compare these to other accounts to obtain a fuller grasp of them and determine if changes were made over time. I have not attempted this in my essay. Strictly speaking, not all of the pieces performed were or may be called plays. Some were dance pieces featuring Yacco, for example, and *Sairoku* was only the fourth act of *The Merchant of Venice*. The battle scenes were impressive, but there was no mention of the word “hara-kiri” in the newspapers, nor allusions to it being performed on the stage. When the troupe played in Paris, under the management of the American dancer-manager Loïe Fuller, she had them increase the belly-slitting scenes, with great success. That ritual suicides increased in their presentations in Paris might be a matter of learning curve effects, or a matter of differences in the national character of audiences.⁴⁷

In Boston the Japanese players were popular, and successful, but were not taken very seriously. They did provide vividly realistic acting, plenty of action including acrobatics, and dance-pantomimes by Yacco. But their plays were only interesting oddities there and in New York. In New York, standards were higher; competition was tougher, the press less enthusiastic than in Boston. But the experiences that Kawakami and Yacco had in those two cities, including the contact with Irving and Terry, were advantageous as they went on to England, where they gave a command performance, and then to Paris, where they were a sensation. Boston was important for Kawakami and Yacco as a turning point.

To the American audiences, the Japanese did not offer traditional theater—although there were bits and pieces of Kabuki and of Japanese dance—but the beginnings of *shimpa* or “new school” drama, still evolving from the politically inspired *sôshi* plays. American audiences, totally ignorant of Japanese theater, were deceived in details, but not on this point. But the real beneficiaries were the visitors to the Paris Exposition, where the addition of hara-kiri scenes provided the exotic thrill of aesthetic suicide—and the two performers themselves. When poet-publicist Yone(jirô) Noguchi interviewed Yacco in 1906, Yacco, with impressive ambivalence, told him (in Japanese; the English is Noguichi’s):

I owe everything to America. My American trip was my education. America, America, what a great sound America has!

America taught me that naturalness was the foremost art. . . . In Japan a laughing face is forbidden while dancing. But in America we must appear smiling and happy in dancing. Japanese art is to make one as a doll. And on the

American stage we have to show ourselves as living women. . . .

American criticism was an education for us. We learned much from it. And it gave us hints and points which were new and adoptable.⁴⁸

As a cluster of events of cultural exchange between the West and Japan in the performing arts, Kawakami and Yacco in Boston and New York accomplished a good deal after all.

Notes

¹ Acting managers managed a theater and its personnel and also performed.

² The two performers are the subject of several books, nearly all in Japanese (see note 4). The best starting point for a serious inquiry into Japanese sources is the pertinent information in Yoshio Ōsasa's *Nihon Gendai Engeki Shi: Meiji-Taishō Hen* (Tokyo: Hakusuisha, 1985). Also in 1985 the Japan Broadcasting Corporation (NHK) used Yacco's life as the basis for its year-long "taiga drama" *Haru no Hatō*, and this brought on several of the books, some of them readable but not scholarly. See the Bibliographic Note at the end of this essay.

³ A few comments must suffice as this essay is concerned primarily with a specific aspect of the activities of the Kawakamis. They were the first performers to succeed in presenting Shakespeare's plays in Japan; they founded a school for actresses; they introduced naturalism to Japanese theater; they were instrumental in the establishment of "new school" (*shimpa*) modern drama; and they were true celebrities. Kawakami died in 1911; his wife retired from the stage in 1933.

⁴ The recent publication of an English biography of Yacco, *Madame Sadayakko: The Geisha Who Bewitched the West*, by Lesley Downer (New York: Gotham, 2003), may contribute to a wider appreciation of Yacco and Kawakami.

⁵ Both were men who as actors specialized in impersonating women; one died of lead poisoning caused by the white make-up and the other died of a sexual disease.

⁶ This is a study by Shelley C. Berg, "Sada Yacco: The American Tour, 1899–1900" (*Dance Chronicle*, vol. 16, no. 2, (1993): 147–96. Berg uses only English and French sources; no other scholar has researched the American tour using local, primary materials. Also useful for readers without easy access to Japanese materials is Yōko Chiba's article, "Sada Yacco and Kawakami: Performers of Japonisme," *Modern Drama*, vol. 35, no. 1 (March 1992): 35–53.

⁷ *Boston Herald*, 17 Dec. 1899, p. 14.

⁸ Comstock, a native of Albany, had managed Haverly's Minstrels, and the Academy of Music and Niblo's Garden, both in Manhattan. See *The New York Times*, 23 Dec. 1909, p. 9, for his obituary. About six years later, the poet Yone Noguchi wrote that Yacco told him they had met Comstock in Chicago. See Yone Noguchi, "Sada Yacco," *New York Dramatic Mirror*, 17 Feb. 1906, p. 11, available at <http://www.h.ehime-u.ac.jp/~marx/YN/articles/Sadayacco.htm>.

⁹ *Boston Herald*, 5 Dec. 1899, p. 9.

¹⁰ *Boston Herald*, 18 Dec. 1899, p. 10; *Boston Sunday Journal*, 7 Jan. 1900, IV, p. 4; (*New York Mail and Express*, 2 March 1900, p. 7.

¹¹ *Boston Herald*, 18 Dec. 1899, p. 10.

- ¹² *Boston Herald*, 18 Dec. 1899, p. 10; *Boston Sunday Journal*, 7 Jan. 1900, V, p. 4.
- ¹³ It is amazing that in those days of emperor-cultism, when schoolteachers would rush into burning schoolhouses to rescue the photograph of the Emperor (and sometimes die in the process), that prominent Japanese diplomats assisted Kawakami after these comments were published.
- ¹⁴ In a personal communication, Ellen P. Conant, a scholar of Japanese art who is preparing a critical study of Ernest Fenollosa, notes that the couple's diaries provide no proof that Mary was in Boston at this time.
- ¹⁵ *Boston Herald*, 18 Jan. 1900, p. 9.
- ¹⁶ *Boston Evening Transcript*, 1 Jan. 1900, p. 9.
- ¹⁷ *Boston Herald*, 9 Jan. 1900, p. 9.
- ¹⁸ B. M. Sherman, "A Pioneer in Managerial Fields," (New York) *Evening Telegraph*, 3 March 1900, p. 4.
- ¹⁹ *Boston Sunday Journal*, 7 Jan. 1900, IV, p. 9. The source of the statement may have been Yacco herself.
- ²⁰ "The Japanese Players," in the Music and Drama column, *Evening Post* (New York), 13 March 1900, p. 7.
- ²¹ Whatever the case, they did not perform in London's Lyceum.
- ²² *Boston Herald*, 9 Jan. 1900, p. 9.
- ²³ *Boston Evening Transcript*, 26 Jan. 1900, p. 9. It may have been given on 18 or 19 Jan., but this has not been confirmed and is based on an ambiguous newspaper reference.
- ²⁴ See, for example, "'Sapho' Immoral and Disgusting, Swear Women Who Have Seen It," in the *New York World*, 28 Feb. 1900, p. 14.
- ²⁵ *Evening Telegraph*, 13, 20, and 21 May 1900.
- ²⁶ Berg, "Sada Yacco," p. 185, quoting "Otojiro Kawakami and Sada Yacco," in *The Era* (a British theatrical magazine), 2 June 1900.
- ²⁷ *Evening Telegraph*, 24 Jan. 1900, p. 4.
- ²⁸ Berg does not provide this kind of tabulation or detail on the plays.
- ²⁹ A starting point would be Shelley C. Berg's "Sada Yacco in London and Paris, 1900: Le Rêve Réalisé," *Dance Chronicle*, vol. 18, no. 3 (1995): 343–404. Material on their reception in France is extensive as they were a great hit there.
- ³⁰ *Evening Telegraph*, 3 March 1900, p. 4.
- ³¹ "At the Theaters," *World*, 11 March 1900, p. 2E.
- ³² The page <http://gallica.bnf.fr/anthologie/notices/00809.htm> is a series of 12 picture postcards dealing with American dancer Loïe Fuller, who uses Kawakami and Yacco's *La geisha et le chevalier* as a backdrop for her dance. The Japanese feature in nine of the pictures. The site <http://gallica.bnf.fr/anthologie/notices/00808.htm> has Yacco's picture.
- ³³ *Boston Evening Transcript*, 26 Jan. 1900, p. 9.
- ³⁴ Hiroshige's version of the story is at, and the story is summarized at, <http://homepage1.nifty.com/aby/2002/soga-no-taimen-mays.htm>.
- ³⁵ Berg, "Sada Yacco," p. 177.
- ³⁶ *Evening Telegraph*, 17 Apr. 1900, p. 4, where Flamant's role was said to be taken by Tsoosaka Furumatsu (*sic*), Sapho's by Sada, and Jean Gaussin's by Ingo.
- ³⁷ Berg, "Sada Yacco," p. 162.
- ³⁸ Austin and Stone's on Tremont Row, Scollay Square.
- ³⁹ *Evening Post*, 2 March 1900, p. 7.

⁴⁰ *Herald*, 2 March 1900, p. 10.

⁴¹ *Boston Sunday Journal*, 7 Jan. 1900, IV, p. 9.

⁴² *Evening Telegraph*, 17 Apr. 1900, p. 4.

⁴³ B. M. Sherman, "A Pioneer in Managerial Fields," *Evening Telegraph*, 3 March 1900, p. 4.

⁴⁴ "The Japanese Players," *Evening Post*, 2 March 1900, p. 7.

⁴⁵ *Evening Telegraph*, 13 March 1900, p. 4.

⁴⁶ *The Herald*, 4 March 1900, p. 10.

⁴⁷ Fuller made use of the Japanese troupe for her own dancing, and she is featured along with the Japanese actors in the photographs accessible through the website given in note 32.

⁴⁸ Noguchi, "Sada Yacco."