

Staging Two Unperformed Nō Plays by Zeami: *Matsura* and *Furu*

Royall TYLER

The Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

With many people in many places experimenting variously with theatrical productions based more or less closely on Nō plays, one easily forgets that it takes a good deal of trial and error merely to revive a hitherto unperformed Nō play. This article discusses some of the problems involved in reviving *Matsura* and *Furu*, two plays for which no performance tradition exists, even though they are probably by Zeami himself.

Key words: JAPANESE THEATER, NŌ THEATER, ZEAMI, FURU, MATSURA

Western interest in the Japanese Nō theatre (to say nothing of kabuki, bunraku, butō, and so on) began in the first years of this century and has inspired all sorts of more or less experimental productions. Nō plays have been performed in English on a proscenium stage, to the original music and with authentic Nō dance, costumes, masks, and props.¹ They have been done with modern dance, electronic music, non-traditional costumes and masks, and extravagant sets. They have been adapted and reshaped in all sorts of ways. Meanwhile, ventures like the NOHO theatre group in Kyoto have been pursuing “Nō fusion theatre,” seeking to exploit Nō techniques in the performance of non-Nō plays. In a similar spirit, the Sydney-based dancer Chin Kham Yoke recently presented (1995) in Sydney and Melbourne a solo dance drama entitled *Inflamed* and derived from the Nō play *Kinuta*.

There have been many performances of Nō plays, or of plays derived from Nō, by actors unfamiliar with Nō and for audiences that may hardly have heard of Nō. In other projects, equally experimental in their way, non-Nō plays, or “new” Nō plays (*shinsaku nō*) in Japanese or English, are performed by trained Nō actors and musicians for audiences already familiar with Nō. Examples include *Takahime*, Yokomichi Mario’s Nō adaptation of Yeats’s *At the Hawk’s Well*, Janine Beichman’s *Drifting Fires*, and Allan Marrett’s Australian Nō play *Eliza*, all of which have been performed in Japan. In fact, *Takahime* itself was recently transformed by Okamoto Akira and his Renniku Kōbō group into a new, “contemporary Nō” entitled *Mizu no koe*.² Meanwhile, an entirely different, quasi-nō adaptation of *At the Hawk’s Well* has been performed in Japan by Chin Kham Yoke and others.

Projects like these place many unfamiliar demands on everyone involved. Even when the intention is to follow accepted Nō style and technique closely, the result is bound to differ somewhat from that achieved by any normally staged play from the standard Nō repertoire (*genkōkyoku*). All reach in one way or another beyond the established world and techniques of Nō. In contrast, one might assume that at least normal Nō performances (performances of authentic Nō scripts, by professional Nō actors and musicians, in dedicated Nō theatres, and for regular Nō audiences) are stable and no longer involve experimentation. Staging *Takahime* or *Eliza* as a full-scale Nō play is one thing, but a play from within the Nō tradition itself

should pose no novel problems. However, this is not so.

Nō actors have been experimenting for a long time. Take the example of *Matsukaze* and *Izutsu*, two masterpieces by Zeami (1363-1443), the classic genius of Nō and a major figure in the history of the theatre worldwide. No one knows how Zeami himself performed them, but documents show that in the sixteenth century they were done in a style quite unlike that taken for granted today. *Matsukaze* and *Izutsu* as we see them now on stage are an invention, or a reinvention, of the seventeenth century.³

The case of *Semimaru*, *Kinuta*, *Yoroboshi*, or *Koi no omoni* is even more striking. All are now accepted as major works, and they have always been available for study by amateurs devoted to Nō singing (*utai*). However, none is known actually to have been staged until the seventeenth century. When it was at last decided to perform them, there was no tradition on how to do so. All the problems they posed had to be solved at once, almost as though they were *shinsaku nō*. As a result *Kinuta*, for example, has an unusual number of performance variants even now.⁴ However, it was at least unnecessary to compose all the music for them (as it is for *shinsaku nō* or for the two plays discussed in this article), since they had long been sung.

These four plays were Tokugawa-period revivals (*fukkyoku*). In the twentieth century there have been many more. Some Nō actors or groups of actors are particularly keen to revive plays for which no performance tradition exists. Recent examples include *Tōgan Botō* (revived at the National Nō Theatre in 1991)⁵ or the colourful *Kasui*, performed by Umewaka Rokurō at the National Nō Theatre in 1995.

And what of Zeami himself? Surely, by the twentieth century all plays known to be by him, or plausibly attributed to him, were established in the repertoire. But not at all. Some of the plays preserved among his own manuscripts have never become current. An example is *Unoha*, which was first performed by Ōtsuki Bunzō in 1991.⁶ Two more such plays are *Matsura* and *Furu*. *Matsura* was revived in 1963 by Kanze Sakon and *Furu* in 1984 by Yamamoto Nobuyuki. The staging of both is still in flux, as actors try one thing after another to meet the performance challenges that they pose. In the process, *Matsura*, at least, is showing signs of throwing up a wide variety of performance variants, just as *Kinuta* did in the Tokugawa period. If this is not yet true of *Furu*, that is only because *Furu* has been performed far less often and seems to be more intractable than *Matsura*.

Zeami dated his manuscript of *Matsura* the tenth month of 1427.⁷ Of course, the fact that he copied the script does not prove that he wrote it himself, and the play's flaws have led some people to doubt that he could have. *Matsura* is strikingly disjointed, largely because of the way the playwright used his source materials, and the various theatrical devices it calls for do not work very well together. Still, many passages in the script are to my eye characteristic of Zeami and remind me of specific plays by him; and the opinion of Itō Masayoshi, an outstanding scholar of Nō texts, supports this view.⁸ One may therefore assume that *Matsura* is by Zeami, although it may of course be his adaptation of an older play.

Matsura, an ancient harbor on Matsura Bay along the northwest coast of Kyushu, may be one of the petty kingdoms mentioned in the earliest Chinese accounts of Japan. In the earliest historical times, diplomatic missions and military expeditions set out from there for the continent, and it is from there that Hideyoshi's troops sailed for Korea in the closing years of the sixteenth century. *Matsura's* role as a gateway to the continent gave rise to the two

legends dramatised in the play. Both appear in the eighth-century *Fudoki* (gazetteer) of Hizen, the local province.

The first legend concerns Empress Jingū herself a legendary, fourth-century figure said to have conquered the Korean kingdom of Silla. The *Fudoki* tells how, before setting out from Matsura, she fished for *ayu* in the river there, and how the local women then took up the custom. This and a series of early poems about young women fishing for *ayu* at Matsura⁹ is the reason why, in the first part of the play, the *shite* (a young woman) carries a fishing pole and wears a broad, conical hat (*kasa*). Zeami's written instructions require both items.

The second legend concerns a nobleman named Ōtomo no Sadehiko and a local girl called Sayohime. Sadehiko, who had been sent to conquer the Korean kingdom of Mimana, stopped for a time at Matsura, where he became intimate with Sayohime. Before leaving, he gave her a mirror to remember him by. As his ship sailed away, Sayohime rushed to the top of a nearby hill and waved her scarf to call him back. (Since then, according to the *Fudoki* and later materials, the hill has been known as Hirefuri-yama, "Scarf-waving hill.") Then, clasping the mirror to her breast, she leaped into the river and drowned. Sayohime is the *shite* in the second part of Zeami's play.

The play goes as follows. A traveling priest, the *waki*, arrives at Matsura. (Zeami's manuscript specifies two priests, the *waki* and a silent *wakizure*, but the performance I saw omitted the *wakizure*.) The priest praises the beauty of the hilly landscape, on which snow is falling. A young woman then enters, carrying a fishing pole. She sings of awaiting the evening moon over the river and over Matsura shore.

Seeing her, the priest questions her about the place. In reply, she tells him the story of Sayohime and urges him to pray for Sayohime at the Kagami no Miya ("Mirror Shrine") of Matsura, where Sayohime's spirit is enshrined.¹⁰ She then narrates at greater length the sad parting of Sadehiko and Sayohime.

At this point the priest asks her about the mirror. In reply, she begs him to save her from sinful attachment and to give her the priestly stole that he wears. The priest complies. She then promises in return to show him the "sacred mirror." After this, she withdraws from the stage. The first part of the play is over.

During the interlude that follows, a local man (the *ai-kyōgen*) enters. In answer to the priest's questions, he repeats in colloquial language, and in a good deal of garrulous detail, the tale of Sayohime.

The priest now knows that the girl he saw was in fact the phantom of Sayohime. As the second part begins, he sings of awaiting a dream vision of Sayohime. Sayohime then enters and shows him the mirror. On looking into it, he sees the face of Sayohime's beloved Sadehiko. Meanwhile, Sayohime laments her attachment to her love and summons up the past. In the play's final passage, she reenacts waving her scarf and drowning herself with the mirror. Dawn then breaks, and the priest wakes from his dream.

Between 1427 (the date of Zeami's manuscript) and 1963 (the date of the play's first modern revival), the only confirmed performance of *Matsura* took place in 1722. However, the script itself, which went by several variant titles, was fairly well known and was probably sung at times by amateurs. In 1771 it was rewritten, perhaps for an unrecorded performance, by Kanze Motoaki, the major Kanze school actor of the time. In an attempt to give the play greater unity, Motoaki eliminated the business with priest's stole and suppressed the mirror.

Instead, he stressed the motif of waving the scarf. He called the revised version simply *Sayohime*.¹¹

Kanze Sakon revived *Matsura* in 1963, under that title, for the 600th anniversary of Zeami's death; the companion piece on the same bill was a *shinsaku nō*. The performance script was provided by the Nō scholar Ikeda Hiroshi, who retained some features of the 1771 version. He also supplied the interlude text, for which Zeami gave only a one-line summary. This version of *Matsura* has been performed a good many times since then by various actors in the main Kanze line.

Other revivals of *Matsura* have followed, independent of the first but still within the Kanze school. The two most notable actors involved have been Umewaka Rokurō (in 1984) and the Osaka actor Ōtsuki Bunzō (also in 1984). Bunzō established the script for these performances in close conformity with Zeami's original. The Kyoto kyōgen actor Shigeyama Sennojō wrote the interlude text. In subsequent years both Rokurō and Bunzō have done the play several times. For example, Bunzō performed it at the National Nō Theatre in April 1996. In February 1995, I saw it done at the Umewaka Nōgakudō (Tokyo) by the young actor Umewaka Shin'ya, who followed Rokurō's performance practice.

The first lesson I learned from Shin'ya's performance was that even when the script is by Zeami himself, and even when it lacks any hallowed performance tradition, what one hears from the stage may not be exactly what one sees on the page. I had with me a printed version of Zeami's original script. The performance omitted several passages; the cuts affected both *waki* and *shite* speeches. For example, in part one of the play, the *shite's* short, opening song (an *issei*) is followed by a fairly long *sashi* passage, which was cut. Moreover the words actually spoken by the priest were not Zeami's.

Later on, the theatre kindly sent me a xerox copy of the *utaibon*, which had been sold out at the time of the performance. The *utaibon* is in principle the actual performance text, and I hoped that it would reflect these changes, but it did not. The cuts, presumably made by Rokurō himself, had been unofficial, like those made for a particular performance of a Shakespeare play. Published discussions of the play—ones involving Rokurō himself—do not mention them. As for the priest's speeches, the actor (Takai Matsuo) or a predecessor in the role had probably rewritten them himself. Zeami's *waki* speeches are so different in style from what *waki-gata* actors are now used to that Takai would have felt uncomfortable declaiming them.

In short, the text of *Matsura* as actually performed is not identical with Zeami's, even though Zeami's text is that of the *utaibon*; and the differences between it and Zeami may well vary with each performance. The same is probably true of the interlude text written so recently by Shigeyama Sennojō. Other kyōgen performers (including Sennojō himself) are entitled to modify it at will.¹²

As for staging and props, many matters remain unsettled and continue to be discussed among performers and scholars. As Nishino Haruo has pointed out, this is a common problem with old plays that lack a performance history, for they may pose problems that are not addressed by established practice.¹³ For example, it seems to be widely felt that something should be done about the first half of the play. The *shite* (the young woman) has to stand in the same place for too long after her opening speech. (Perhaps this is why the *sashi* I mentioned was omitted.) Several authorities have suggested bringing a boat on stage, although

Zeami's manuscript says nothing about one and no one seems actually to have tried the idea out. (This "boat" would be the sort of light framework prop, evoking the outline of a boat, that is characteristic of Nō.) A boat would provide some variety and movement, and some feel that it would also help to give the play greater unity. Of course, it would also create staging problems of its own.

The mirror, which is central to the story told by the play, seems to raise particular difficulties. Zeami himself is perfectly clear about it. His instructions for part two specify that Sayohime appears carrying the mirror, that she displays it to the priest, and that in due course she gives it to him. Nevertheless, Kanze Sakon in 1963 did not use a mirror. In 1984 Umewaka Rokurō used a mirror, but in later performances he gave it up. The combined manipulation of the mirror and of Sayohime's scarf is simply too tricky. Ōtsuki Bunzō adopted, instead, a plain gold fan (one made especially for the play) that Umewaka Rokurō found excessively "kabukiesque." Rokurō and, following him, Umewaka Shin'ya, now use a plain silver fan, equally special to this play. However, the matter of the mirror remains unresolved. For myself, I regretted its absence in the performance that I saw. Shin'ya's Sayohime displayed her silver fan to the priest across the full diagonal width of the stage (from *jōza* to *wakiza*), which rendered implausible the idea that the priest could recognise *anyone's* face in it. Perhaps in the future someone will find a better solution. At any rate, the mirror seems to be as difficult to handle as any odd prop that might be required by a *shinsaku nō*.

Another focus of concern is the priestly stole in part one. Neither the priest nor the stole appear in the play's pre-Buddhist source material, but the motif is normal for Nō, being found in such plays as *Miwa* or *Teika*. From the standpoint of current practice it looks odd for the priest himself to place the stole around the young woman's neck, as Zeami's instructions require. The actors find the whole business awkward, and as noted earlier, in some performances it has simply been suppressed.

The scarf, too, poses difficulties, for it is unique to this play. So does the *kasa* worn by the young woman in part one. Not that a *kasa* is unusual in Nō, but in *Matsura* it seems to be in the way. Since the text says that it is snowing, the actors have sometimes sprinkled it with "snow," but there is no consensus on the subject so far. For the time being, the play as a performance event remains, as it were, under construction. Such is the distance that can separate even one of Zeami's own plays, transmitted to us in Zeami's hand, from the Nō of today.

The same distance separates present Nō from the play *Furu*. Zeami's manuscript of it is dated to the second month of 1428, and a mention in a document dated 1524 suggests that it may have been performed in that year. Otherwise, the play has been performed only at the Isonokami Shrine in 1984, and in Tokyo in 1989 and 1995. *Furu* is even more convincingly by Zeami than *Matsura*.¹⁴ It celebrates the deity of the Isonokami Shrine, south of Nara, and it may have been written for the shrine festival of 1428.¹⁵ This shrine is one of the oldest and most venerable in Japan.

In the play, a priest (the *waki*) bound for Kumano stops on his way at the Isonokami Shrine. A nameless young woman, the *shite*, then enters carrying a length of cloth. After describing an early winter scene with light snow on the hills, as in *Matsura*, she says, "Come, come, I must wash the cloth."

The priest asks her why. She explains that the “cloth” is the deity’s robe; she is washing it because *Furu*, the name of the spot where the Isonokami Shrine stands, means “stops [*ru* 留] in the cloth [*fu* 布].” This deity, she says, is the sword with which the god Susanoo slew the eight-headed serpent in Izumo, and with which the first emperor, Jinmu, quelled evil deities at Kumano. It protects the realm and destroys all enemies. It is called the “Sword of *Furu*,” she goes on, because long ago a maiden was washing cloth at this spot in the river when it came rushing down the stream and stopped in her cloth. Can one see this sword? the priest asks. No, the young woman answers, but it may manifest itself in a vision to a suitable pilgrim. Whether or not one has this vision depends entirely on one’s faith.

The first part of the play is now over, and the woman vanishes behind the shrine fence.

In part two, the woman reappears as a divinity, or perhaps as a medium in a state of divine possession. Zeami’s instructions have her holding both cloth and sword so as to display the moment when the sword lodged in the cloth. The sword is blazing with light. The divinity then dances, amid offerings of white and green sacred streamers and among waving green, snow-dusted branches of the sacred *sakaki* tree, while firelight gleams on the red shrine fence, and the chorus sings of “the sword that shines like the sun” and that forever confers peace and prosperity on the realm. At dawn, the divinity reenters the portals of the shrine.

Furu follows the same “dream-vision” (*mugen nō*) pattern as *Matsura*. In mood it is clearly a “god play” (*waki nō*), that is, a congratulatory play of which the central figure is a divine being. However, the defining criteria for a god play seem to have been settled only in the seventeenth century, long after *Furu* was written, and the play lacks several of them. It is set in late autumn, not spring; the *shite* figure is female, not male; and the *waki* is a Buddhist monk. As a result, *Furu* is now unacceptable as a god play and in fact fails to fit any of the five categories into which the repertoire is divided.

There seems to be little or nothing published about performing *Furu*, but I saw the third performance of it, on February 12, 1995, in the National Nō Theatre. Koyama Hiroshi, a senior Nō scholar, told me at the time that it was quite different from the two previous ones. Clearly, *Furu* is more disconcerting to perform than *Matsura* and poses problems to which no consistent approach has yet been worked out.

The *shite*, especially in part two, is particularly unusual. Nothing in the current repertoire prepares the actor to play a goddess who is at once a sword deity, a sacral woman, and a divine robe. Her appearance recreates the moment at the winter solstice when the sword (a ray from the life-giving sun) impregnated a divine woman, thus bringing about the spiritual rebirth of the sovereign.¹⁶ So impossibly hermaphroditic a *shite* is outside a Nō actor’s normal range. In fact, confirmation of the strangeness of this *shite* can be found in the repertoire plays *Tatsuta* and *Sakahoko*. *Tatsuta*, probably a youthful work by Zeami’s son-in-law, Komparu Zenchiku, is modelled on *Furu*.¹⁷ However, the *shite* in *Tatsuta* is purely female: the female aspect of the deity of the Tatsuta Shrine. The male aspect of the same deity appears in *Sakahoko*, a completely separate play.

Technically, the performance that I saw was extremely accomplished, and most of the actors and musicians were strikingly young. The *shite*, Yamamoto Nobuyuki, was an outstanding representative of the Kanze school. The costumes were beautiful and the masks exceptional. In this performance, the *shite* had a *tsure*, or “companion,” in accordance with Zeami’s instructions, and even the *tsure*’s *ko-omote* mask was unusually fine, while the

wakaonna worn by the *shite* was a rare treasure. Together, the *shite* and *tsure* looked perfectly lovely. The music was expert and lively, and the *shite*'s dance in part two was a long display of complex Nō dance technique.

But while I admired the performance, I did not like it. The confusion over how to treat the play, and the *shite*, seemed all too plain. The solution had been sought in fast-paced virtuosity, overly dramatic staging, and excessively emphatic gesture. The performance seemed jazzy and overdone. For example, the arrival of the *ai-kyōgen* (the interlude character, in this case a minor sword deity) was announced by a tattoo on the *taiko* drum—an unorthodox device. And why was a *taiko* introduced in the first place? This drum is used for strong, dramatic dances, but it sounded odd accompanying a beautiful young woman dressed all in white, even if she was at the same a sword deity. Moreover, the major dance in part two made it clear that the sword in *Furu* is just as troublesome a prop as the mirror in *Matsura*. In order to be able to dance properly, the actor had to get rid of it.

The solution adopted was to have the goddess hand the sword to the priest a short way into the dance, then take it back just before the end. For the actor, this may have been an adequate solution, but as a spectator I found it shocking. Nothing in Zeami's manuscript authorises it, but more than that, it short-circuits the play. I suspected contamination from the repertoire play *Nomori*, which is also by Zeami.¹⁸ In *Nomori*, the *shite* figure (a demon) has a magic mirror that the *waki* (another priest) wants keenly to look into for himself. However, when the *shite* first displays it to him he recoils, for what he sees is too awesome to endure. He can withstand the sight only after gathering into himself all the powers of the deities whom he honours, so that when the *shite* actually hands him the mirror, the moment is one of supreme, triumphant insight—a personal triumph that he has been actively seeking. In *Furu*, on the other hand, the priest seeks only to behold the divine sword and to receive its blessing, not to derive personal mastery from wielding it himself. Besides, properly speaking, the sword is separable neither from the divine woman's "cloth" nor from the divine woman herself; so that Yamamoto Nobuyuki's handing of the sword to Hōshō Kin'ya (the *waki*) destroyed—at least for me—the vision that is the explicit point of the play. Perhaps a better solution will have been found by the next time *Furu* is performed.

In this way, two Zeami plays that lack any performance tradition have in the last thirty-three years (in the case of *Matsura*) or in the last twelve years (in the case of *Furu*) begun at last to acquire one. Whether either will enter the established repertoire remains to be seen. In the meantime, the actors who perform them are trying out different approaches to the problems that they pose. Some repertoire plays have been through this process too, but long ago. Many of them have accepted, named performance variants known as *kogaki*, most of which involve staging and the choice of costume or mask. A few *kogaki* are surprisingly recent, and the choice of one can at times produce startling results. For example, *Miwa* can be transformed by a Kanze school *kogaki* known as *hakushiki* into a completely different performance event. Just this sort of thing is happening with *Matsura* and *Furu*, as the actors attempt to assimilate their various flaws, strangenesses, and possibilities into the received tradition.

NOTES

- 1 For example, a production of *Funa Benkei* at the University of Wisconsin (Madison) in 1983, using a translation that I made for it. The translation was attuned phrase by phrase to the music, in consultation with the production director, the Kita school Nō actor Matsui Akira. Also in 1983, Mr Matsui directed an equally authentic production of the same play, done in the original Japanese, at the University of Michigan (Lansing). The performers were students in each university's drama department.
- 2 Okamoto Akira, "Gendainō *Mizu no koe no kokoromi*," *International Symposium on the Conservation and Restoration of Cultural Property: Nō—Its Transmission and Regeneration*, Tokyo National Research Institute of Cultural Properties, 1991, pp. 115-133.
- 3 Nakamura Itaru, "Matsukaze no henbō: Muromachi makki shodenbon o chūshin ni shite," in *Gengo to bungei* no. 7, May 1974 pp. 47-66; reprinted in Nihon Bungaku Kenkyū Shiryō Kankō Kai, ed., *Yōkyoku, kyōgen* [Nihon bungaku kenkyū shiryō sōsho], Tokyo: Yūseidō, 1981; and in Nakamura Itaru, *Muromachi nōgaku ronkō*, Tokyo: Wanya Shoten, 1994. On *Izutsu*, see also Nakamura Itaru, "Muromachi makki no onna nō to 'yūgen'," in *Muromachi nōgaku ronkō*, pp. 206-226.
- 4 See Omote Akira, "Kinuta no nō no chūzetsu to saikō," *Kanze*, Oct. 1979, pp. 19-24.
- 5 A book on the background and production of the play, entitled *Kokuritsu Nōgakudō jōen shiryōshū 3: Tōgan botō*, is available from the National Nō Theatre.
- 6 *Unoha* has been translated by Jeanne Paik Kaufman in Karen Brazell, ed., *Twelve Plays of the Noh and Kyōgen Theatres*, Ithaca: Cornell East Asia Program, 1988, pp. 8-21. The original text appears in Nihon Meicho Zenshū Kankōkai, ed., *Yōkyoku sanbyaku gojū ban shū*, Tokyo: Nihon Meicho Zenshū Kankōkai, 1928, pp. 652-655; and in Itō Masayoshi, ed., *Yōkyokushū*, vol. 1, Tokyo: Shinchōsha, 1983, pp. 169-181.
- 7 Neither play has been translated. The text of *Matsura* is found in *Yōkyoku sanbyaku gojū ban shū*, pp. 719-723 or, in a reproduction of Zeami's manuscript, in Kawase Kazuma, ed., *Zeami jihitsu nōhon jūchiban shū*, Wan'ya Shoten, 1994 pp. 107-114; the current *utaibon* was published by Ōtsuki Bunzō (Osaka: Nō no Kai) in 1985. *Furu* appears in *Yōkyoku sanbyaku gojū ban shū*, pp. 655-658 or, in facsimile, in *Zeami jihitsu nōhon jūchiban shū*, pp. 121-130. For a study of *Furu* and a fuller summary than the one below, see Royall Tyler, "Korean Echoes in the Nō Play *Furu*," *East Asian History*, no. 7 (June 1994), pp. 49-66.
- 8 See Itō Masayoshi's introduction to the *utaibon* cited above.
- 9 *Man'yōshū*, poems no. 853-856. These are translated in Nippon Gakujutsu Shinkōkai, tr., *The Man'yōshū: One Thousand Poems*. New York: Columbia U. P., 1965 (reprint), pp. 258-259.
- 10 Kagami no Miya, well known throughout premodern Japanese history, is mentioned even in *The Tale of Genji*. Similarly, Sayohime figures in a complex of folktales found in many regions of Japan.
- 11 This treatment of *Matsura* and its difficulties is drawn from Itō Masayoshi's introduction to the *utaibon* and from round-table discussions between Nō scholars and Umewaka actors. These include "Jūgatsu Kyūshū teishiki nōbutai: *Matsura Sayohime* no kadai," *Umewaka*, no. 113 (August 1994), pp. 30-34; "Nigatsu Umewaka-kai teishikinō ni mukatte: *Matsura Sayohime* no kadai (2)," *Umewaka*, no. 314 (December 1994) pp. 30-38; "Shijō kyōyō kōza: *Matsura Sayohime* no haikai—sono shiryō to kaisetsu," *Umewaka*, no. 313 (December 1994), pp. 24-29 and "Nigatsu teishikinō *Matsura Sayohime* o ron-zu," *Umewaka*, no. 315 (April 1995), pp. 36-45. I did not have access to two older articles on the play: Ikeda Hiroshi, *Fukkyoku Matsura kaisetsu*," *Kanze*, June 1963; and Nishino Haruo, "*Matsura Sayohime* no kadai" (publication information unavailable).
- 12 The revival of an old play involves writing and experimenting with an interlude text, since the interlude (performed by a kyōgen actor) has never been considered a part of the play proper. Nishino Haruo describes experiments with different interlude texts in revivals of Zeami's original version of *Unrin'in* (Nishino Haruo, "Fukkyoku no imi," *International Symposium on the Conservation and Restoration of Cultural Property: Nō—Its Transmission and Regeneration*, Tokyo National Research Institute of Cultural Properties, 1991, pp. 255-256).
- 13 Nishino, "Fukkyoku no imi, p. 255.
- 14 See Kanai Kiyomitsu, "*Furu*," in Kanai's *Nō no kenkyū*, Ōfūsha, 1969, pp. 309-323; and Tyler, "Korean Echoes in the Nō Play *Furu*," pp. 50-51.
- 15 Tyler, "Korean Echoes in the Nō Play *Furu*," pp. 52-53.
- 16 This topic is discussed at length in "Korean Echoes in the Nō Play *Furu*."
- 17 See the introduction to *Tatsuta*, and the translation, in Royall Tyler, *Japanese Nō Dramas*, London: Penguin, 1992, pp. 293-308. *Sakahoko* has not been translated.
- 18 *Nomori* is translated in Royall Tyler, *Pining Wind: A Cycle of Nō Plays*, Ithaca: Cornell East Asia Program, 1978, pp. 177-

189. A concerted discussion of it appears in Royall Tyler, "The *Waki-Shite* Relationship in Nō," in James Brandon, ed., *Nō and Kyōgen in the Contemporary World*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1997.

—— 復曲「松浦」と「布留」の諸問題 ——

—— ロイヤル・タイラー ——

要旨：日本にも欧米にも、能をもとにした、実験的な劇がさまざまに演じられることがある。しかし、そのカタや舞台上のしぐさなどが伝承されていない能を「復曲」する場合にも、色々な実験が必要となる。この論文は世阿彌の「松浦」と「布留」の例を取り上げる。