

Meiji Asian Studies

Online Journal of the School of Arts and Letters, Meiji University

Taisho Era Theater as Seen in *Shinengei* (New Theatrical Entertainment) Magazine

Akira KAMIYAMA *

abstract

A trend toward the popularization of discussions of urban culture in a variety of artistic fields, including literature, art, film, and architecture, occurred beginning in the late 1860s and early 1870s (early Meiji period) through the mid-1950s and 1960s (Showa 30s), but few such efforts were made in respect to the field of drama. Modern Japanese theater was spoken about as if it were something independent of urban culture in each era's own theories about drama, literary criticism, or acting, and usually such discussions focused on the conflict between *kabuki* and *Shingeki* (New Drama). However, the 10-year period beginning when the magazine *Shinengei* was first published in 1916 (Taisho 5) until it ceased publication in 1925 (Taisho 14), was a fascinating period in the history of urban culture from the perspective of drama.

The Taisho era has been described in forward-thinking terms leading to the Showa era, embracing concepts such as “democracy” and “*kyoyoshugi*” (cultivation), but at the same time, it was a period some fifty to sixty years after the Meiji Restoration, during which much of the remaining Edo culture and memory was wiped away by the Great Kanto Earthquake. This was an era in which a number of major figures reached the end of their lifespans and faded away from the cultural memory, including venerable figures such as Tomioka Tessai and Okuma Shigenobu, who were born in the Tempo period and seized the reins of the Meiji era, as well as people like Natsume Soseki and Mori Ogai, who were born in the late-Edo period.

The *Shinengei*, which both marked the Taisho era and faded away with it, is a magazine that allows one to sense the pulse and breath of the times.

In this paper, I examine the diverse culture of the era through the “joint review” specialty articles serialized in the *Shinengei*, which benefitted from the participation of many men of letters, theater critics, actors, and staff. In particular, more than things that flourished during the era, I would like to emphasize those things that were forgotten or that disappeared.

Keywords: *Shinengei*, Modern Japanese theater, joint review

1. Eyes and voices of the middle aged and elderly

Looking at Kafu's coldly smiling face, this looks like a cold ending ((1))

A trend toward the popularization of discussions of urban culture in a variety of artistic fields, including literature, art, film and architecture, occurred from the late 1860s and early 1870s (the early Meiji period) and persisted into the mid-1950s and 1960s (Showa 30s), but few such efforts were made in relation to the dramatic arts. Modern theater was spoken about as if it were something independent of urban culture in each era's theories about drama, literary criticism, or acting, and the focus tended to remain fixed on

* Professor, Department of Literature, Meiji University

the conflict between *kabuki* and *Shingeki* (New Drama). However, the 10-year period from the initial publication of *Shinengei* magazine, in 1916 (Taisho 5), until it ceased publication in 1925 (Taisho 14), was a fascinating period in the history of urban culture, viewed in terms of drama.

The *Taisho* era has been described in such forward-thinking terms as a time of “democracy” and *kyojo-shugi* (cultivation) and also as leading to the Showa era, but, at the same time, it was a period some fifty to sixty years after the Meiji Restoration, during which much of the remaining Edo culture and memory were wiped away by the Great Kanto Earthquake. This was, simultaneously, an era in which a number of major figures reached the end of their lifespans and faded away from the cultural memory, as in the cases of the long-lived Tomioka Tessai and Okuma Shigenobu, who were born in the Tempo period and seized the reigns of the Meiji era. This phenomenon also affected such figures as Natsume Soseki and Mori Ogai, who were born in the late-Edo/early-Meiji period.

The first *Shinengei* joint review was produced in 1918 (Taisho 7), the same year that the First World War ended, and Japan found itself given a boost by the war economy. During this time, the theater world suffered its first major loss with the death in October of Shimamura Hogetsu, which was followed by the death of Matsui Sumako and the dissolving of the Geijutsuza theater troupe the next year. Subsequently, the *Shinkokugeki* (New National Drama), *Soganoyageki* (Soganoya Theater), and Asakusa Opera became popular, and interest began to converge on the new kabuki of the Ichimuraza kabuki theater actors Onoe Kikugoro VI, Nakamura Kichiemon I, and Ichikawa Sadanji II. *Koshibai* (small theaters) also remained popular.

Taisho-era theater is usually discussed in the context of its revolving around and having been developed from the Tsukiji Sho-Gekijo (Tsukiji Little Theater) of 1924 (Taisho 13), but often forgotten is the acclaim given to actresses such as Izawa Ranju and Yamakawa Uraji, who were part of Shingeki Kyokai (New Drama Association) or Kindaigeki Kyokai (Contemporary Drama Association) and left a marked impression upon many prominent figures. *Kabuki* actors performed modern plays, one after another, at such venues as the Bungeiza Theater, where famed *kabuki* star Morita Kanya XIII acted in plays produced by the Shirakabaha (White Birch Society). In addition, the *Shin buyo undo* (New Dance Movement) also flourished with Nakamura Fukusuke V and Onoe Eizaburo VIII holding self-promoted performances.

Shinpa (New School) was considered to be in decline, but it still produced popular successes on a monthly basis. During this era, actor Hanayagi Shotaro found fame as a young *onnagata* (actor specializing in female roles), and Kikugoro invited him to join the Ichimuraza, which had lost Onoe Kikujiro and Kawarasaki Kunitaro in succession. *Shinpa*, as a result of the death of Takada Minoru in 1916 (Taisho 5), found themselves, in Ihara Seiseien’s words, in a period of moving away from the inclinations of hardline *soshi* (political) theater and moving toward the repertoire found in the pleasure quarters of the *Tojinba* (urban factions) of Ii Yoho and Kitamura Rokuro. However, Shinpa performed works with social themes as well. In Kansai, the *Takarazuka Shoyo Kageki* (*Takarazuka Girl’s Review*) grew in popularity, eventually expanded to Tokyo, where the Shochiku Girl’s Review in both the East and West also quickly made a name for itself. During this time, moving pictures continued to flourish, and, in July of 1919 (Taisho 8), the *Kinema Junpo* film magazine started publishing.

Moreover, this was the era in which *joyu* (actresses) achieved independent success. The subject of plays featuring actresses at the Imperial Theatre had been taken up in joint reviews, and the practice of actresses appearing onstage became firmly established despite unfavorable criticism. Despite their poor reception even among educated audiences, the comedies of Masuda Tarokaja, in which performers such as Mori Ritsuko appeared singing and dancing while reflecting electric lights with a hand mirror, were in tune with the social conditions of the time, including the increasing numbers of salaried men working in offices.

The presence of actresses changed, limited, and transformed the meaning of “*onnagata*” from the modern period onward. Even more so, the popularity of actresses brought an end to and a transfiguration of the large role geisha had played since the Tokugawa period. The Taisho era was when models who ap-

peared in magazines and advertising media, such as posters, transformed from being thought of as geisha to being recognized as actresses.

In general, the magazine's characteristics, its readership and their interests were represented on its cover pages and in its advertisements and gravure printings. The cover of the first issue of *Shinengei* featured Danjuro IX, an actor who had embodied the Meiji era and had died 13 years before. The final issue, which included a special feature on “*Onnagata to joyu*” (*Onnagata* and actresses), was graced by the actress Murata Kakuko, a star of the Imperial Theatre. Thus, *Shinengei* received the honor of being the monthly magazine that best captured the tumultuousness of this era.

Until 1917 (Taisho 6), the magazine had decorated the last few pages with the figures of geisha, similar to the *Engei gabo* (Illustrated Magazine of Show and Entertainment) and *Engei kurabu* (Entertainment Club) of the Meiji era. However, in 1918 (Taisho 7), while the magazine carried articles and photos on the *Takarazuka*, geisha only appeared in a few issues. Around 1919 (Taisho 8), when *renju* (troupe) advertising in each region disappeared, geisha were replaced with actresses on the gravure, which made it seem as though an end had come to an era when the latest vogue was embodied by geisha, for whom everyone had previously yearned.

Connected to this “era of the actress,” without a doubt, were both the Asakusa Opera and moving pictures, which had captured the hearts of many common people of the era and had answered the entertainment desires of “the masses.” The theater of this era, while described as the trend of the “intelligentsia” turning towards the Tsukiji Sho-Gekijo, on one hand, is also noted for the craze of the masses for Asakusa Opera. In any case, this was definitely the theater experienced by the “young generation” living in Tokyo, a phenomenon not limited to this period. Modern theater of any era tends to be characterized as generally an experience for the young and the highly educated. However, this does not necessarily mean that it is always the younger generations who are filling the theaters. Theater of any era may also be regarded from the perspective of middle aged and elderly audiences, and this was actually the case with theater of the Tokugawa period. The realm of theatrical criticism was one in which connoisseurs with highly experienced eyes and ears commented with authority.

That being said, where were the “middle-aged” during this period, and what did they feel? I find the appeal of the *Shinengei* joint reviews is that they listened to the voices of the middle-aged theatergoers of the day. Let us look at how old the main attendees were in 1918 (Taisho 7), when the first joint review was presented.

Focusing on attendees in terms of age, the oldest was definitely Migita Nobuhiko, who was born in the late Edo and was 54 years old in 1918. That same year, both Ihara Seiseien and Matsui Shoyo were 49 years old. Oka Onitaro and Okamoto Kido were both 47 years old; Kubota Beisai was 45 years old; Kawajiri Seitan was 43 years old; Nagai Kafu was 40 years old; Okamura Shiko and Osanai Kaoru were both 38 years old; Okada Yachiyo was 36 years old; Kusuyama Masao was 35 years old; Ikeda Daigo was 34 years old; Kubot Mantaro a was 30 years old; and the youngest was Miyake Shutaro at 27 years old.

In terms of contemporary perceptions of age, these men were analogous to those in their mid-40s to mid-70s today. On one hand, at a *zadankai* (round-table talk), Osanai became angry with Kubota for calling him an old man, though Osanai was then assuming the position of “master” [January 1921 (Taisho 10)]. However, this joint review was also the dramatic setting in which Kubota Mantaro boasted of his newfound status, writing that he felt that here he had “attained maturity as a drama critic by joining”⁽²⁾ (*Watasbi no rirekisho* [My Resume]).

However, the authors of the *Shinengei* consisted of not just such masters and quarrelsome types. They greatly varied in age, with such artists and critics as Kobayashi Ichizo, Otaguro Motoo, Yamada Kosaku, Saito Kazo, Tanaka Ryo, Mizushima Niou, and Takehisa Yumeji each working to respond to the desires of the era, to strike a path forward, and to introduce foreign *shinshicho* (new currents of thought). The sketches of Sato Miezo, as well as the caricatures of Ikebe Hitoshi and Okamoto Ippei, are both precious and fascinating in conveying what was taking place both within and without the theaters of the time.

Spurred on by the war economy, this era experienced a publishing boom that produced works ranging from “one-yen” collections of complete works, such as *Kindaigeki taikēi* (Outline of Modern Drama) and *Nibon gikyoku zenshu* (Complete Japanese Plays), to extremely specialized publications, such as *Onanboku zenshu* (Complete Works of Onanboku) and *Nibon ongyoku zenshu* (Complete Works of Japanese Music). Otaguro Motoo is known for his distinguished contributions to music, but at the time he was also a translator and introducer of modern English drama, and, as a patron of Hasegawa Minokichi’s Daiichi shobo, he might also be called a benefactor of the introduction of modern drama. Some of these theatrical leaders appeared often in *Engei gabo* (Illustrated Magazine of Show and Entertainment), others only in *Shinengei*, and some did not appear even there. Comparing them is of some interest.

2. Genbunsha publishing – The scent of cosmetics and the smell of theaters

Even now I think longingly of the black collar you liked in Yanagibashi. For this you are to blame, not I.

Shinengei’s publisher, Genbunsha, was well known at the time for publishing books on theater, modern poetry, and novels. *Shinengei*’s editor-in-chief was Okamura Shiko, with Abe Yutaka serving as chief editor and Tsubouchi Shoyo acting as an advisor. The company published other theater-related magazines as well, including the compact magazine *Hanagata*, which held the subtitle “Small-form *Shinengei*” and focused mainly on *koshibai* (small theaters); *Geki to hyoron* (Drama and Criticism), which focused on *Shingeki*; and *Shin katei* (New Home). It is no wonder that Genbunsha’s publications leaned to theater, given that the editors at Genbunsha included many persons deeply involved in the theater scene, including Suzuki Senzaburo, Hasegawa Minokichi, Nakagi Teiichi, Hattori Susumu, and Horikawa Kanichi.

Thus, the Genbunsha publications included the hidden pleasures of the drama world as well as the intellectual curiosities of *Shingeki* (New Drama); moreover, they explored the family life of the idealized “good wife and wise mother,” valued during the Taisho era. Further still, the publications included books on the *demimonde*, such as *Toto no meigi* (The Famous Geisha of Tokyo, 1917 (Taisho 6)).

However, the forebear of Genbunsha is, naturally, considering the interrelationships, the company Ito Kochoen (later Papilio Cosmetic). Magazines of the era and their readerships can truly be characterized more by their advertising interests than their content. This is also related to changes in theater audiences. Cosmetics were common in prewar entertainment magazines and program advertisements, while a marked contrast exists with theater programs and magazines that increased advertising of home appliances during the mid-50s to 60s (Showa 30s). However, analysis of the advertising allows us to sense the depth of the relationship between cosmetics companies and theaters throughout this period.

Ito Kochoen made its name with Misono Oshiroi face powder, which was featured on the back cover of every issue of *Shinengei*. In the Meiji era, the Hirao Sanpei Shoten Company, which made “Lait” cosmetics, was closely allied with dramatist Kawatake Mokuami. Moreover, Miwa Zembei, who ran the Marumiya Stores that sold Mitsuwa Sekken soap and Sawa Oshiroi face powder, was an adviser to the Kabukiza Theater. The Nakayama Taiyodo Company in Kansai, which made “Club” cosmetics, was a patron of Osanai Kaoru, supporting him from his first trip abroad and throughout his subsequent activities. The cosmetics company was also the parent of “Platon,” a publishing company in which Naoki Sanjugo and Kawaguchi Matsutaro participated with Osanai, publishing magazines that embodied the life of the era, such as *Josei* (Woman), *Kuraku* (Joy and Pain), and *Engeki eiga* (Theater and Film). It is worth noting that existing theater research lacks thorough analysis of the role of magazines. *Josei* in particular frequently printed dramatic plays, as did the later *Reijokai* (Ladies’ World) magazine.

The close relationship between these two entities is highlighted by the well-known fact that at the time, art discussions in the *kabuki* and *shinpa* playbills, would frequently transform midway into promotions for the cosmetics companies mentioned above. From the perspective of today, this simply seems laughable. However, in the context of the times, cosmetics were closely connected to lead poisoning, which was a

serious threat to the life and health of actors. Up through the Taisho period, many successful *onnagata* had their lives cut short by this affliction, so the development of non-lead-based face powder was an urgent need (lead-based face powders were completely banned by Showa 5).

Naturally, cosmetics companies were tightly connected to the women of the pleasure quarters, who, along with actors, made up much of prewar theater audiences and formed the consumer base for entertainment magazines.

Apart from the matter of the cosmetics advertising detailed above, discussion of theater in its pure sense, that is, in its role as a space apart from broader social life, seems to relate to what should be called the “purely self-contained historical perspective,” for example, discussing artistic merits independently, ignoring questions of the quality or popularity of a performance. For example, *shinpa* is said to have waned after its golden age during the late Meiji, but actually it was still being performed every month in large theaters all over the country from the Taisho era through to approximately 1975 (Showa 50). Kobayashi Ichizo declared the breaking off of relations with the pleasure quarters during the early Showa period, which is described mainly in terms of the breakup of the Tsukiji Sho-Gekijo and the changes in associated theatrical groups. Why, then, was he able to step into Tokyo at this time and establish a theater neighborhood in the Hibiya district? To describe the theater in terms of “purity,” solely in terms of the “artistic achievement” experienced in days of youth by artists destined for later greatness, while ignoring the types of plays that proved successful and affected countless audiences and left lasting memories, would be to misjudge reality. Apart from independent “artistic assessment,” plays should perhaps be considered structurally, in terms of the appeal of theaters as places valued for “socialization” and for the “popularity” of their performances.

Furthermore, this period is one in which the theater *chaya* (theater tearooms), which had existed since the Tokugawa period, found themselves disappearing, with the Great Kanto Earthquake as the turning point. Toita Yasuji, who was born in 1915 (Taisho 4), wrote that “going to see a show” was a new phrase, and that he would “go to a show” during his boyhood in the Taisho era.⁽³⁾ This indicates a sense of being accustomed to a life of enjoying one’s time and space both in social locations like *chaya* and in the areas around the theater.

Tokuda Shusei described the theaters in his hometown of Kanazawa, “Since things were done by candlelight, the smell would catch my attention. I feel more nostalgic for the air in theaters than the shows themselves.”⁽⁴⁾ Tanizaki Junichiro also recalls the impression of entering the Kabukiza from a tearoom: “The air was chilly, when creeping through the wooden door of an old hut, and a breeze penetrated under the collar and armpits of my fine clothes like peppermint.”⁽⁵⁾ However, such sensual theater reminiscences are only found up until the demise of theater *chaya* prior to the Great Kanto Earthquake. Their reminiscence was not due to problems of atmosphere or appearance.

Evocative memories of the theater, such as the smell of cosmetics and the cold feeling of an *obi* sash, experienced through the five senses, are represented by “externals” – the bodies of actors, the texture and charm of their voices, their movements, their sitting postures, the way they wore their costumes, and how they looked in the lights. The interpretation of these elements inspires thoughts on how to watch plays. Igami no Gonta, Yoemon, Naozamura, Benten Kozo, Kirareyosa, and other roles currently are only interpreted internally, but it should not be forgotten that actors showing off their bodies and skin are major elements of these roles. Orikuchi Shinobu would discuss this using the term “*bada jiman*” (skin boast).⁽⁶⁾

Attendees of the *Shinengei* joint reviews naturally touched upon specific elements such as make-up, movement, and positioning, but, unlike the reviews of the Meiji era, in addition to referencing the new era’s technology in set design and lighting, they characteristically discussed literary theory and internal interpretations in parallel.

Taisho was an era of coexisting vitality and sentimentality. Komiya Toyotaka, who was only loosely connected to *Shinengei*, compared Kichimon to August Rodin. From the outset, Rodin, even regarding his introduction in Japan at the time, was an artist who emphasized musculature, the thickness of a figure,

and its movement, and he stood in opposition to Kichiemon, whose sentimentality was appealing and who was far from the *Nikutaiha* (material faction). Komiya's theory of Kichiemon described his own projected "psychology," which was characterized by a lack of idioms, depicting nuances of Kichiemon's character. Thereafter, discussions of actors and literary works thus emerged, stipulating that "internal" aspects had a special, self-evident value, unconsciously confusing characters, real people, performers, and authors. Around this time, an era began in which the actors and thinkers who were considered excellent were those who employed their intellect in order to "consider" their emotional centers (i.e. heart and gut), even when they were not engaging the senses in seeing, hearing, touching, or smelling.

3. The pedigree of "Edo tastes"

I stand still before the Miyatoza sign. If only there were a way to bring back what existed long ago.

The time of the joint reviews was the period in literary history and art history of the "*Pan no kai*" (Pan Society) and Art Nouveau. It was also the era in which modernism and exoticism were linked to "*Edo shumi*" (Edo tastes), as in the "Song of Edo in Young Tokyo," from the poetry of Kinoshita Mokutaro. The serialized publishing of *Sewakyogen no kenkyu* (A Study of Sewakyogen Style Kabuki) by the "*Kogeki Kenkyukai*" (Old Drama Study Group) in the literary magazine *Mita Bungaku* occurred in 1916 (Taisho 5), a time in which fewer than half of the century-old plays of the late Edo period were being studied as "*kogeki*" (old drama). I would like, therefore, to touch briefly on the course taken by *Edo shumi* from the Meiji period onward.

From the Meiji era onward, the study of Edo culture was pioneered by the activities of the "*Edo kai*" (Edo Society), which in 1889 (Meiji 22) launched *Edo kai zasshi* (later changed to *Edo kaishi*, Edo Society Magazine). The "*Edo kai*" was made up primarily of older *bakufu* (Shogunate era) journalists such as Kurimoto Joun, and it sought to study Edo culture comprehensively and to publish Edo history. *Edo kai zasshi* covered topics from editorials to government, particularly economics, foreign affairs, biographies, and statistics.

In that same year, *Fuzoku gaho* (Manners and Customs in Pictures) was launched, followed by the re-naming of the *Eiri Choya Shinbun* (Choya Illustrated News) as *Edo Shinbun* (Edo News). Aeba Koson wrote that, "We must courageously celebrate Edo style and cheer on the *Edokko* (Edo Native)." The following year, 1890 (Meiji 23), was the year that the Kenyusha company published *Edo murasaki* (Edo Purple).

Moreover, 1889 (Meiji 22) was the year that the Imperial Constitution was promulgated, and the government, which had been stable for 20 years following the Meiji Restoration, had developed the confidence to allow the Edo period to be remembered and Edo period culture to be revived. Even the old shogunate retainers who had lost their power were allowed space to recall, reminisce, and lament past memories.

Thereafter, in 1895 (Meiji 28), *Meika danso* (Stories of Nobility) was launched, followed by *Doho kaishi* (Doho Association Magazine) in 1896 (Meiji 29), and *Kyu bakufu* (The Old Shogunate) in 1897 (Meiji 30). Furthermore, in 1899 (Meiji 32), *Edokko shinbun* (Edo Native News) was published, while 1902 (Meiji 35) saw the emergence of *Bushi jidai* (Warrior Era), followed by *Edokko* (Edo Native) magazine in 1905 (Meiji 38). In addition, in 1902 (Meiji 35), *Bungei kurabu* (Literary Club) made a special "Tokyo" edition, and, in 1912 (Meiji 45), even the *Kokumin zasshi* (National Magazine), whose editor-in-chief was Yamaji Aizan, produced "Edo period and Edo flavor" as a "spring appendix." During this period, the compilation of *Tokyoshishiko* (History of Tokyo City) began as well.

As the Taisho era began, Tokugawa Yoshinobu died in 1913 (Taisho 2), and the "Edo period" was literally left to history. In 1915 (Taisho 4), *Edo* was launched by the *Edo Kyuji Saibokai*, and in 1916 (Taisho 5), *Rekishi chiri* (Historical Geography) compiled "*Edo to Tokyo*" (Edo and Tokyo) for the 50th anniversary of

the transfer of the capital to Tokyo.

In addition, in 1913 (Taisho 2), the *Edo kenkyukai* (Edo Study Group) published *Shumi kenkyu Oedo* (Study of Edo Tastes), while Yuasa Kanmei came out with *Tsujin monogatari shumi no Tokyo* (Story of a Man About Town: The Taste of Tokyo). The preface to the former says, “The Edo taste unthinkingly followed in society is often just a thinly-veneered weak imitation,” and “the highlights of so-called Edo taste are found in the flirtatiousness of its streets. This paper is mainly about the side observations of all Edo city tastes, offering an unapologetically comprehensive report on the research taken.” Furthermore, the preface explains, “There has been no research into true Edo tastes.” On the other hand, the latter describes how “Edo taste ... was long esteemed by the Meiji reign, but inevitably underwent a rapid decline. Out of Edo taste, Tokyo taste has been born.” The piece states, “This paper is a report resulting from the study of Tokyo taste.”

Thus, in 1916 (Taisho 5), a magazine literally titled *Edo shumi* was launched.

What was important in these events was that the stated objective of the *Edo kai zasshi* in 1889 (Meiji 22) was to “investigate the Edo period without omission, ranging from astronomy, geography, academics, commerce, industrial arts, customs, and language to historical anecdotes about great commanders, wise retainers, celebrities, and eminent figures. This includes systems both inside and outside the Shogunate.” However, in the Taisho era, the study of the Edo period turned into “*shumi kenkyu*” (the study of tastes), and the “flirtatiousness of the streets” became what was “comprehensively reported.” What *Edo shumi* concerned was “*nanpa no Edo*” (flirtatious Edo), which included folk songs, novels set in red-light districts, comic anecdotes, studies of the red-light districts, and explorations of how people dressed. In several ways, the previously “*koba*” (hardline) *Edo kai zasshi*, strangely, expanded and strengthened only in the areas of manners and customs and not in foreign affairs, economics, or editorials. This was the *Edo shumi* of 1916 (Taisho 5).

This culture is symbolized by the covers that essentially served as the faces of the two magazines. The cover of *Edo kai zasshi* was a family crest with a hollyhock in Edo purple, while that of *Edo shumi* had a dragon against a background that changed in each issue to colors such as *tokiuro* (pale pink with yellow), *uguisuiro* (greenish-brown), or *yamabukiuro* (bright yellow). Every issue also included a color-printed frontispiece from a wood block print of a beautiful woman by artists including Kunisada and Harunobu. Moreover, the format was A5 size. The hollyhock family crest of the Tokugawa family, which was imbued with the undying loyalty of the old Shogunate retainers of 1887 (Meiji 20), was nowhere to be seen in 1916 (Taisho 5).

This was clearly the result of the natural flow of time. When *Edo kai zasshi* was renamed *Edo kaishi*, most of the “Edo-raised” generation that had produced the Meiji era, typified by Katsu Kaishu, who celebrated the reopening of the magazine, had already lived out what was literally a “life of troubles” by the time of the Russo-Japanese War.

When *Shinengei* was launched in 1916 (Taisho 5), most of the people who had known about life in Edo first-hand, and who had spent their adolescence wearing their hair in topknots, had disappeared. As these tangible memories receded into the past, “Edo” affixed itself as the world of its “taste.” The image of “Edo” was thereafter the beautifully fabricated one of *Edo shumi*, where there had not been economy, foreign affairs, or even multiple episodes of natural disasters, fires, and disease. Thus, as often happens, notions that were created after the fact became retroactively the idea of the past. This was the era of *Shinengei*, which was haunted by people with sudden, newfound wealth, accrued by the occurrence of a great war.

This haunted sensibility was illustrated at the time by featuring Tsuruya Nanboku IV in *Sewakyogen no kenkyu* (A Study of *Sewakyogen* Style Kabuki; Tengendo bookstore, 1916 (Taisho 5)), and the comeback and assessment of Sadanji II. Nanboku was neither popular nor recognized in the enlightened Meiji era, and that is illustrated by the fact that Kusuyama Masao, who was born in Takekawacho in the Ginza district, first saw the play, “*Yotsuya Kaidan*” (Ghost Story in Yotsuya), performed in 1918 (Taisho 7).

On the occasion of Nanboku's "Nazō no obi chotto tokube" revival, Kafu praised Sadanji's reading of *Onanboku zenshu* (Complete Works of Onanboku) in *Shinengei*.⁽⁷⁾ Today, this rather ordinary article is all that remains; however, scenes of kabuki actors silently reading Nanboku from the complete works volumes, printed with the largess resulting from the war economy, are truly Taisho-esque. Dovetailing with the Taisho-era Nanboku craze, Oscar Wilde's *Salome* was performed seven or eight times during this era, appearing everywhere from *Shingeki* to Shokyokusai Tenkatsu and the Asakusa Opera. Oka Yasuo points out that the foundation of Oka Onitaro's aesthetic sense is not only refinement but a deeply rooted preference for "rational thought, led by his connections both with his father, who accompanied a late Edo delegation to Europe, and with Nakae Chomin from his youth. Together, this led to."⁽⁸⁾ In the production of Nanboku revived by Sadanji, ghosts do not appear on stage. Ideas like "rational Edo tastes," which seem like adjectival contradictions, are characteristic of the Taisho era.

Naturally, there were reactions. Several hundred new religions were established during the Taisho and early Showa periods. Osanai Kaoru came to believe in the Shiseiden cult in the year that *Shinengei* launched, and in Omotokyo in 1920 (Taisho 9). In the two years following, he declined to attend joint reviews. Mushanokoji Saneatsu and Kurata Hyakuzo wrote many religious plays that were performed by kabuki actors. Starting with Shojiro Sawada, many actors played Christ or Nichiren. On the other hand, labor movements and the proletariat theater also rose to prominence. In the Honjo Fukagawa district, in a distinctly non-Edo *shumi* turn of events, pollution due to factory smoke and dirty water became a topic of significant discussion.

Edo shumi also felt the influence of these various reverberations that were occurring in the background of the era.

4. Gazing at the decline - Women plays, small theaters, and theater tearooms

People are stating casually that they are returning from the worship of Shoten-sama. The 10-year period in which *Shinengei* was published is one that began approximately half a century after the Meiji Restoration. Looking at the Meiji Restoration and the Second World War in parallel, this period would correspond to the 10-year period, starting in 1995 (Heisei 7), that came half a century after the end of that war. In other words, this was a period when many of those who were born during the Meiji and Taisho eras and who were responsible for postwar culture joined the ranks of the dead.

The character of this period is manifest not only in its fads but also in what was in decline. Although the fads of the Heisei world give no real sense of the times, an effect is strongly felt due to the people who departed and the things that disappeared during this period.

If we limit the discussion to kabuki in the Taisho world, then we would talk about *koshibai* (small theaters) and *onna shibai* (women kabuki plays). This is followed by the old theater *chaya* (theater tearooms). Representative of one aspect of this period is the fact that special actress-themed and *koshibai* editions of theater-related magazines were declining in inverse proportion to the establishment of plays featuring actresses at the Imperial Theatre and to the launching of the Takarazuka and Shochiku Girl's Revues. Close to the time that *Shinengei* ceased publication, it ran a "Boryu wo iku hitobito" (People Off the Beaten Path) series, which had limited appeal.

Shinengei played a role in reeling in people who felt alienated either by the "Edo shumi," which was adored by the press, or by the enthusiasm of the "wakai sedai" (young generation), that is, members of the older generation and those who could not reconcile themselves to contemporary fads.

In a class of its own among many of the *koshibai* was the Miyatoza theater, described by Yoshii Isamu as "theater stuck at the bottom of the city," depicted vividly by Nagai Kafu in *Sumidagawa* (The River Sumida), and loved by Kubota Mantaro. As Asakusa-born Mantaro wrote in "Mukashi no Asakusa, Ima no Asakusa" (Asakusa Then, Asakusa Now), these places were represented by mixed movie-and-theater houses, the Asakusa Opera, and cinemas. This was far from the subtle atmosphere of old. The partici-

pants of the joint reviews implicitly hated the “Asakusa six-district.” What they did like was the gentle and quiet Asakusa, in which locals had long made a living finding joy in daily life, as in “casually” going to see Shoten-sama (not the Goddess of Mercy) in Matsuchiyama, noted in the lines cited above by Yoshii Isamu. Naturally, the Miyatoza theater is not in the six districts. This idea runs through a statement by each member of the joint review held at the opening of Minamiza theater in the Azabu neighborhood of the Yamanote area, where actors of the Miyatoza theater performed after having been pushed out of crowded Asakusa. Such a unified expression was distinctly conspicuous in this joint review (August 1920 (Taisho 9)).

People today refer only to kabuki when talking about *koshibai*, but during the Taisho era there was still a flourishing of *koshibai* for *Shinpa* plays. Kumehachi Ichikawa, the most celebrated of the *onna shibai*, died in 1913 (Taisho 2). Since she was highly acclaimed even by critics such as Oka Onitaro and Okamoto Kido, who despised “*doncho kusa!*” (low-class) sensibilities, Kumehachi was not only popular but was considered a person of both craft and skill. In joint reviews, Oka Onitaro commented on the Ofune in *Yaguchi*, and said that Kumehachi was the only actress in recent years to do a good job with the difficult *ningyoburi* style of kabuki acting.

Thereafter, Nakamura Kasen, who was the leader of a troupe based at the Kanda Theater, the successor to the Misakiza Theater, became popular and was active in motion pictures. Kasen also appeared repeatedly in *Engei gaho* and in *Hanagata* (Shining Star), which was known as the compact *Shinengei*.

In addition, in terms of the Showa era, I believe that not just *onna shibai*, but even *onna kengeki* (women’s sword theater) differed in character from their post-war contexts, as seen in the praise from Utaemon V for the former Takarazuka star, Oe Michiko I and Fuji Yoko in *Kaigyoku Yawa* (Night Stories by Kaigyoku).

It is my opinion that the reason for the subdued popularity of *koshibai* is that the big theaters of the time actually featured a significant number of new works and very little older programming. Furthermore, at that time, the term “*koten kabuki*” (classic kabuki) still did not exist, and it is interesting to note that the joint reviews always refer to “*furui mono*” (old things), “*furui tokoro*” (old places), and “*kata mono*” (formulaic performances) in contrast to “*shinsaku*” (new works). *Koshibai*, however, also featured performances of new work.

I wonder from where in the audience the joint review participants watched plays. In the Meiji era, drama critics’ seats were in the gallery; in other words, the joint review participants would have been watching at a diagonal while enjoying food and drink, as one might do today at a sporting event (the “*Rokuniren*” (“6-2 Group” of theatergoers) watched from box seats, but they were more patrons than critics). Seiseien Ihara recalled the conspicuous appearance of only Miki Takeji watching shows from the front *doma* (pit) while frantically taking notes.⁽⁹⁾

Prior to the Great Kanto Earthquake, Taisho-era Tokyo was a time of compromise in the sense that, for audiences, whether viewing plays from seats or *doma* depended on the theaters, some of which followed the all-chair seating in the Yurakuza and Imperial Theatres. This was not simply a matter of form. As I discussed earlier, theater tearooms changed from spaces where people casually passed the time, enjoying themselves in private, to places where time was limited. Thus, tearoom patrons became just like audiences, rushing to catch the opening of a play, watching the show, and then promptly returning home.

Watching kabuki from the *doma* was not about enjoying the atmosphere according to contemporary theater theory. It was connected to watching plays in a relaxed manner with time to spare, which *chaya* offered, and this was the way time was perceived there. It was about watching a play without any restrictions on arriving in the middle of an act or standing up while a show was in progress. At the Shintomiza Theater in 1920 (Taisho 9), when smoking in the audience became prohibited, there was a real sense of the times changing amid the remarks of many audience members, who headed to the lobby during intermission. During this era, the “*zadan*” (round-table talks) of these joint reviews shimmers like a reminder of the old *Rokuninren* and the former, sporting event-styled atmosphere.

5. The *Shinengei*-era of Kafu, man of the theater

Stating regretfully that one is more nostalgic about Asakusa than one's hometown. The connection between Nagai Kafu and theater tends to be discussed only in terms of the performances of "*Katsushika jomū*" (*Katsushika Love Story*) at the Showa era Opera-kan (different than the Asakusa Opera) and appearances at the post-war Furansuza (French Theater). It is well known that Kafu spent the Meiji era training in writing new kabuki drama for the Kabukiza, but thereafter, during his time at *Shinengei*, he made many declarations about theater in relation to his own playwriting and dance pieces.

Below is a simple listing of relevant developments in the life of Nagai Kafu during this period.

- 1914 Publishes "*Edo engeki no tokuchō*" (*Characteristics of Edo Drama*). Marries Shinbashi Tomoeya, geisha Yaeji, in match made by Sadanji.
- 1915 Divorces Yaeji. Launches the "*Kogekikenkyūkai*" (*Old Drama Study Group*).
- 1916 Resigns from Keio University. Publishes *Sewakyogen no kenkyū* (*A Study of Sewakyogen Style Kabuki*). Genbunsha sponsors the "*Tozai Meiryū Engei Taikai*" (*East-West Celebrity Entertainment Tournament*).
- 1917 Starts writing his diary, *Danchoteinichijō*. Yaeji sponsors the first "*Fujikage Kai*" as Fujikage Shizue (named by Wada Eisaku). Kafu learns *kiyomotobushi* music from Umekichi and Eiju Dayu.
- 1918 Learns *Miyazonobushi*. The following year, visits Shinai Wakatayu. *Shinengei* selects prizewinning script with Sadanji as lead.
- 1919 July Attends first *Shinengei* joint review.
September After the return to Japan, happens to see first opera to come to Japan at the Imperial Theatre after his return.
December Writes in his *Nichijō* (diary) of a detachment from *Edo shūmi*, saying "Neither women nor the *shamisen* calm my anxieties; only French literature."
- 1920 Moved to Henkikan ("House for the Eccentric"). A dearth of writings on music in *Nichijō* coincides with this development.
- 1921 Performs *Yoru no ami tareka shirauo* (*Night Casting and White Salanx Fish*) at the Meijiza theater. Spends time going to Russian opera at the Imperial theatre. Inaugurates the "*Nanakusa kai*" (*Seven Herb Club*).
- 1922 Performs *Tabisugata omoi no kakeine*, *Hakushaku* (*The Earl*), and *Aki no wakare* (*Fall Farewell*). Attends most *Shinengei* joint reviews. Advises dress rehearsal of *Nazō no obi chotto tokube*, starring Sadanji (Meijiza theater), and accompanies performances of *Oda Nobunaga* at the outdoor theater of Kyoto Chion-in.
- 1923 From January attends Italian opera at the Imperial Theatre and loses interest in musical performance. Attends "joint reviews" until July.
- 1925 Spends four days in February as director of *Kachizumo ukina no hanabure* (Hongoza theater).

Kafu wrote in his diary on December 10, 1924 (Taisho 13): "Despite being invited to the *Shinengei* trip to the Hongoza theater for a performance and joint review, I am not going, as the quake has given me the opportunity to turn away from the theater for the time being. I have not been looking at monthly literary magazines or performances very much for as long as a year." Thereafter, although finally working as the director of *Umegoyomi* (*Plum Blossoms*, by Kimura Kinka, at the Kabukiza) in 1927 (Showa 2), he no longer had anything to do with performances of kabuki or large theaters. Naturally, he still maintained an acquaintance with Sadanji, but when his own work, *Sumidagawa*, was dramatized by Kimura Tomiko and performed in 1928 (Showa 3) at the Hongoza Theater, he said, "I am avoiding any relationship with the practical matters of the stage these days."⁽¹⁰⁾

In this light, during the time he was attending the joint reviews, Kafu was concentrating on his training

in musical performance and his contact with kabuki stagings. This differs from the paradoxical attitude of his later years in Asakusa, trying to avoid “society,” including performances of his own work. Kafu, during his time with the *Shinengei*, in contrast, actually had three of his works performed in succession at the Imperial Theatre in 1922 (Taisho 11), so this may be said to have been a period when he ventured to consort with “society.”

Broad “social relationships” are one element of drama. Individuals of one world connecting with those of another society all play a major role in the various meaningful “social relationships” shared between theaters and the people of the pleasure quarters.

Regarding Kafu’s training in musical performance in the context of mingling with the world of the pleasure quarters, in *Danchouteinichijo*, he visited “*Sonobachibushi* master Miyazono Chiharu” on September 7, 1918 (Taisho 7), and began his training. On the 14th, “Returning from early morning *kiyomotobushi* music practice, I dropped by Sanjikkenbori kasuga, called upon an elder geisha, Nobeen. to review Sonohachibushi, but she did not come ... Today, only the three elder geisha of Nobsono, Riki, and Yufu shall conduct a fine performance of Sonohachi at the Shinbashi pleasure quarter”. Kafu’s love of old music was through his training, in 1910 (Meiji 43), in *utaawana* music with Yaeji, who was a Shinbashi geisha and who later became his wife. However, Kafu was apparently not happy with Yaeji. She later divorced him and made a name for herself as “Fujikage Shizue” in the world of Taisho “*shin buyo*” (modern dance). From the late Meiji, the theoretical leader in connecting “*shin buyo*” to “*kokumin engeki*” (national theater) was Tsubouchi Shoyo, whom Kafu disliked. As observed by Ichikawa Miyabi, this was because “some of Shoyo’s theories were being carried out reliably by Shizue.”⁽¹¹⁾

Incidentally, in 1920 (Taisho 9), the “*Kokyoku hozonka?*” (Old Music Preservation Society) organized by Machida Hirozo, Hattori Huhaku, and others, became known in *Shinengei* advertisements for engaging in “gramophone record distribution,” using Genbusha as an agency.

In the joint reviews, Kafu criticized Shoyo, who was also a consultant to *Shinengei*, and, interestingly, followed up with his public declaration that he “hated Waseda” (January 1921 (Taisho 10)). One of the appeals of Shoyo, who was born in Mino in 1858, was his character. His experiences with the Tokugawa era were like autobiographical reminiscences, and he had grown up in theater that was far from the refined environs of the area around Nagoya, one that was dark and bloody. What Kafu loved was the “Edo” that had been completely bypassed by modernity. Shoyo’s words and actions, on the other hand, might have reflected the actual ugliness that lay within Edo. Even more so, Kafu was strongly inclined to be contemptuous of the many Meiji era-born Tokyoites who had come from other regions and to dislike those from Kansai. Even further, it is believed that he was unhappy with his former wife Shizue’s inclination towards Shoyo’s theories. Most of all, his public declaration that he “hated Shochiku” in front of Shochiku associates of the time, Kawajiri Seitan and Matsui Shoo, is unmistakably based upon his dislike of Kansai, the birthplace of Shochiku [July 1920 (Taisho 9)].

Far from being impartial, the joint review was undoubtedly biased. To an amusing degree, it is stunning how the three former Tokyo Yamanote retainer clans of Kafu, Kitaro, and Kido all generalized Kansai performers as being “bad actors” [January 1922 (Taisho 11)].

On the other hand, aspects of the Tokyoites behavior that were actually snobbish and petty can be felt to an embarrassing degree. With their abundant cultural resources, they tended not to feel any desire to escape their origins. Two people—Miyake Shutaro, who came from outside Tokyo, and Kubota Mantaro, who rose up from working class origins in Asakusa—spoke candidly of their joy in being able to “climb the ladder” by participating in the joint reviews. Judging from the signs, the three above, with Osanai Kaoru, seem to sneer at this.

Thus, it is no wonder that a Kansai native such as Ishiwari Matsutaro would express himself so freely with such apparent bad manners against Tokyoites. In general, although it is accepted that memories of the old domain of one’s birth would considerably influence tastes, including likes and dislikes, this was particularly true through the generation born during the Taisho era. Indeed, in the attitude of Kafu and

others, there is no interest or understanding of Kansai modernism to be found among those who moved to the West after the Great Kanto Earthquake, such as Tanizaki Junichiro, Yoshii Isamu, Kishida Ryusei, or Nagata Mikihiko. Moreover, looking at these four Kansai immigrants, it is interesting that they were born and raised in Nihonbashi and Ginza. Kobayashi Nobuhiko was born in Higashi-ryogoku in Nihonbashi. In “*Nihonbashi Chuka shiso*” (Nihonbashi Sinocentrism), he talks about the amazing confidence held by people born in central Japan during the Meiji era. They felt that no better place, economic power, beauty, or history could be found, even if they went to the center of the West, Keihan (Kyoto and Osaka region). In the joint reviews, only Kusuyama Masao, who was born in Takekawacho in Ginza, is actually warm and magnanimous, though naturally he was inclined to worlds other than the theater in later life. When it came to intolerance, haughtiness, and hypocrisy, if one lacked two out of the three, then it seems one might never have achieved excellence in the theater.

Furthermore, four joint review members—Matsui Shoo (Shiogama), Ihara Seiseien (Matsue), Okamura Shiko (Kochi), and Miyake Shutaro (Kakogawa)—were “provincials”; not one of them came from Keihan. Kafu, in an essay titled “*Miteite kimochi ga yoi*” (Feels Good Looking at It), expressed his opinion that Uzaemon was not the “number one” actor who conveyed the essence of Edo, and instead mentioned Dan-shiro, Gennosuke, and Kangoro. It is typical of Kafu, who admires the Miyatoza theater, that he appreciates venerated actors in “*Shibai kanwa*” (Chatting About Plays). However, Kafu’s fondness for the Miyatoza theater is different from Mantaro Kubota’s self-loathing, which resulted from Mantaro’s sense of betrayal against his origins in his desire to advance in the world, resulting ultimately in a decline in his fortunes. Unlike Mantaro, Kafu had no harsh memories of wanting to escape from some place even though he was comfortable in his surroundings. Kafu might have shared in the sentiment of Count Yoshii Isamu that “I am more fond of Asakusa than my hometown.” However, exactly because it was not his “hometown,” Kafu moved against the cultural tide by going from Ginza to Asakusa, while many Asakusa-raised artists seem to have loved and hated Asakusa, leaving Asakusa for Yurakucho (Toho theater) in the beginning of the Showa era. On the one hand, he suggested that actresses “should move their bodies more” (“*Joyu nitsuite*”; Concerning Actresses),⁽¹²⁾ and he even insisted in 1921 (Taisho 10) that “*Shingeki*” performing Ibsen “in boxes under vulgar banners with actors’ names printed on them” should “thoroughly imitate Western theater” (*Shingeki to gekijo*). Even more so, however, Kafu truly revealed himself with his imprudent and anti-democratic statement that kabuki “should be focused on lineage to the utmost” in his essay “*Hitomakumi*” (One Act Viewing).

The members of the joint reviews were bad people, at least as far as those actually working in theater, but their individual “character defects” and less savory characteristics were laid bare when they met together. There are many exquisite examples of people alternately cursing and praising, lifting up and putting down with eloquence and refined rhetoric. The fact that so many dangerous, toxic statements were made completely in defiance of “*ryoshikiha*” (persons with good sense) might actually have been a major appeal of the joint reviews.

When Kafu made cynical comments that abandoning a play is Kangoro’s appeal, it is truly funny to point out that Miyake Shutaro indicated that such remarks themselves represented Kafu’s own theories (January 1922 (Taisho 11)). Miyake’s extremely explicit “*taibei tsuisho*” (compliance with the U.S.), immediately after Japan’s defeat in World War II, and the tediousness of his subsequent supposed good intentions, together make me extremely uncomfortable with the world’s adoration of him. However, Miyake’s uninhibited, over-ambitious, exuberant enthusiasm and biting frankness in his earliest joint reviews is fascinating to read. In a one-year retrospective chat, Miyake quipped, “it seems that now is the time for you to decide to retire” to Onitaro, Shiko and Kafu, who had said they had barely seen, or did not feel like seeing, a play for most of the year [January 1921 (Taisho 10)].

Eventually, in 1925 (Taisho 14), following the Great Kanto Earthquake, commercial radio broadcasts began, which Kafu had hated his whole life. The era of *rokyoku* (sung narrative recitations), *minyo* (folk songs), and *kayokyoku* (popular songs), which are “vulgar” expressions, in the words of Oka Onitaro, had

come. Radio, unlike newspapers and film, was the first “simultaneous mass media” to penetrate the sensitivities of the entire populace without care or consideration.

On the one hand, during the year that the Shinbashi Enbujo theater opened, *Shinengei* had already ceased publication, followed by Genbunsha the next year. It was the closing year of the era known as the Taisho. It was now the period in which the ears of people nationwide became accustomed to *kayokyoku* and *rokyoku* broadcast both day and night over the radio; the so-called *uguisu geisha* (“nightingale geisha”) singers from the emerging licensed red-light districts became well-known, and the voices of kabuki actors were heard over the airwaves. At the same time, Kafu led his life against the world at his home, the Henkikan (Home for the Eccentric) in Ichibecho in Azabu, and the “pleasure quarters” played a new role in a form that had changed from the previous era.

During this period, Osanai Kaoru, who had indulged in the world of the pleasure quarters and devoted himself to the Shiseiden and Omotokyo religions, wrote a bizarre treatise that may be considered an opinion on the spirit of performance in Genbunsha’s *Geki to hyoron*,⁽¹³⁾ and thereafter he discovered a path through to the worlds of the Tsukiji Sho-Gekijo and film. Given the later lives of all these figures, including Kubota Mantaro, who “went authoritarian” over time, many of the remarks in these joint reviews can be keenly felt.

The *Shinengei*, which charted the Taisho era and eventually disappeared, was a magazine that closely sensed the unique pulse and breath of the age.

NOTES

- (1) The tanka poems cited at the start of each section are all from *Tokyo koto shu* [Collections from the Tokyo Red-light District] by Yoshii Isamu, Kawade Bunko, 1951 (Showa 26).
- (2) Kubota, Mantaro. “*Watashi no rirekizho*” [My Resume]. *Kubota Mantaro Zenshu* [Collected Works of Kubota Mantaro]. Vol. 14. Chuokoron-Shinsha, Inc., 1967.
- (3) Toita, Yasuji. *Kabuki – Nihon no dento* [Kabuki – The Tradition of Japan]. Vol. 5. Heibonsha Ltd., 1968 (Showa 43).
- (4) Tokuda, Shusei, “Rosoku no niohi ga wasurerarenai” [The Scent of a Candle is Unforgettable]. *Engei gabo* [Illustrated Magazine of Show and Entertainment], January 1911 (Meiji 44) issue.
- (5) Tanizaki, Junichiro. *Yosho jidai* [Childhood Years]. Bungei Shunju Shinsha, 1957 (Showa 32).
- (6) Orikuchi, Shinobu. “*Tenarai Kagami hyobanki*” [Written commentary on the puppet play “*Tenarai Kagami*”] [Secrets of Calligraphy]. *Orikuchi Shinobu zenshu* [Orikuchi Shinobu Complete Works]. Vol. 18, *Geinoshiben* [Compiled History of Performing Arts] 2 Chuokoron-Shinsha, Inc., 1976 (Showa 51).
- (7) Nagai, Kafu. “*Nazo no obi chotto tokube wo miru*” [Looking at the traditional kabuki play *Nazo no obi chotto tokube*]. *Shinengei*, October 1922 (Taisho 11) issue.
- (8) Oka, Yasuo. “Dokuzetsuka • Oka Onitaro” [The Sharpest Tongue – Oka Onitaro]. *Kindai Bungaku Ronshu 2—Suimyaku no uchisoto* [Modern Literature Collection 2 - Inside and Outside the Vein]. Shin-tensha, Inc., 1989 (Heisei 1).
- (9) Ihara, Seiseien. “*Boyu Miki Takeji kun*” [To my late friend Miki Takeji]. *Kabuki*, Vol. 100, February 1908 (Meiji 41).
- (10) Akiba, Taro. *Kosho Nagai Kafu* [An Investigation of Nagai Kafu]. Iwanami Shoten, Inc., 1966 (Showa 41).
- (11) Ichikawa, Miyabi. “*Ishii Baku to nijunendai*” [Ishii Baku and the 20s]. *1920 nendai nibonten* [1920s Japan Exhibition], Asahi Shimbun, Inc., 1988 (Showa 63).
- (12) Citations from Kafu other than those from *Shinengei* are from *Kafu zenshu* [Kafu Complete Works]. Iwanami Shoten, Inc., 1962-1974 (Showa 37-49).
- (13) Sasamaya Keisuke’s *Engijutsu no nihonkindai* [Modern Japanese Acting]. Shinwasha, 2012 (Heisei 24), discusses in detail the connection between Osanai Kaoru’s dramatic theory of the time and the doc-

trine of new religions.

Editor's note

The original Japanese text of this article was published in *Bungei Kenkyu* 121 (2013), pp.1-17. The revised version was translated by Editage Co. Ltd. under the supervision of the author.