PROJECT MUSE®

The Evolution of the Image of Genghis Khan in the Takarazuka Revue



Tianran Li, Lichun Sun

Asian Theatre Journal, Volume 43, Number 2, Fall 2026, pp. 420-442
(Article)

Published by University of Hawai'i Press
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1353/atj.2026.a998152

For additional information about this article
https://muse.jhu.edu/article/998152

[13.112.217.153] Project MUSE (2026-10-13 11:55 GMT) Login 'Li Tianran'

The Evolution of the Image of Genghis Khan in the Takarazuka Revue

Tianran Li and Lichun Sun

*This study examines three Genghis Khan-themed productions by the Takarazuka Revue—*Jingisukan *(1922),* Mongōru *(1941), and* Kono koi wa kumo no hate made *(1973)—through Homi Bhabha's postcolonial framework, tracing the transformation of Genghis Khan's image in modern Japan and its shifting political and cultural meanings. In the prewar era,* Jingisukan *recast the conqueror as a pan-Asian hero aligned with Taishō ideals, employing stage costuming and Ainu bear rituals to suggest cultural affinity. During the wartime period,* Mongōru *explicitly positioned Japan as the spiritual successor to the Mongol Empire, exemplifying what Bhabha terms the "menace of mimicry" (Bhabha 1994: 88) within the ideological logic of the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere. In the postwar context,* Kono koi wa kumo no hate made *shifted toward anti-war sentiment and personal emotion, though residual colonial ideologies remained embedded in its narrative. The evolving image of Genghis Khan thus exposes a central contradiction in Japan's modern nation-building: the attempt to assert national subjectivity through the othering of Mongolia, while remaining entangled in the hybridity intrinsic to colonial discourse. Ultimately, the study contends that the G=Y theory, as staged by Takarazuka, operates as a continually rewritten "cultural text," whose shifting trajectory vividly reflects Bhabha's insight into the ambivalence of colonial authority, oscillating between mimicry and menace (Bhabha 1994: 91).*

Tianran Li holds a PhD from Kumamoto University, Japan, and is currently an assistant researcher in the Department of Japanese, School of International Studies, Hangzhou Normal University. Research interests include modern Sino-Japanese literature and theatre, with particular attention to the incorporation of Chinese elements in the Takarazuka Revue.

Lichun Sun holds a PhD from Tianjin Normal University and is currently Professor of Japanese Studies in the Department of Japanese, School of International Studies, Hangzhou Normal University. Research interests focus on modern and contemporary Japanese literature and extend to Japanese popular culture, including anime and film.

Introduction

The Takarazuka Revue was born in an era deeply influenced by exoticism, and, therefore, many of its productions were based on

Asian Theatre Journal, vol. 43, no. 2 (Fall 2026). © 2026 by University of Hawai'i Press. All rights reserved.

[13.112.217.153] Project MUSE (2026-10-13 11:55 GMT) Login 'Li Tianran'

foreign culture. Among the historical figures featured, the Takarazuka Revue playwrights were especially enamored of Genghis Khan. From the 1920s to the 1970s, the Takarazuka Revue staged three major productions related to Genghis Khan: *Jingisukan* (『成吉思汗』, *Genghis Khan*) in 1922, *Mongōru* (『モンゴール』, *Mongolia*) in 1941, and *Kono koi wa kumo no hate made* (『この恋は雲の涯まで』, *This Love Will Last Until the End of the Clouds*) in 1973. While these three works share notable creative commonalities, most prominently in their consistent linkage of Genghis Khan with the Japanese military commander Minamoto no Yoshitsune (源義経), there are considerable differences in the way the authors—each from a different historical period—interpret the character. This essay examines these three works to reveal how the image of Genghis Khan evolved alongside Japanese popular culture from the 1920s to the 1970s.

Formation and Dissemination of the "Genghis Khan = Yoshitsune Theory"

Before examining the image of Genghis Khan in the three Takarazuka Revue musicals, it is necessary to first introduce the theory closely linked to these works—the "Genghis Khan = Yoshitsune theory" (henceforth: G=Y theory)—which claims that Genghis Khan was, in fact, the Japanese military commander Minamoto no Yoshitsune.

Minamoto no Yoshitsune was a prominent military commander in late Heian Japan whose brilliant tactics during the Genpei War led to the establishment of the Genji regime. However, viewed as a threat by his brother, he was forced to flee and ultimately committed suicide in Hiraizumi (平泉) at the age of thirty-one years.

Yoshitsune's early death and tragic fate led to his rapid mythologization. In particular, from the Muromachi period (室町時代) onward, the idea that "Yoshitsune did not die" began circulating in folklore, alongside tales such as "Onzōshi shimawatari" (御曹司島渡, The Journey of the Lord's Son to the Island), which claim that Yoshitsune did not die in Hiraizumi but instead traveled north to Ezo (present-day Hokkaidō) (Wang 2013: 42). This legend developed further in the mid-Edo period, giving rise to the claim that Yoshitsune escaped to the continent and became an ancestor of the Qing imperial family.

By the late Edo period, the theory became more specific and gave rise to a theory that Yoshitsune was, in fact, none other than Genghis Khan. Furthermore, the involvement of German physician Philipp Franz von Siebold[1]—who arrived in Dejima (出島), Nagasaki, in 1823, as a doctor for the Dutch East India Company—marked a crucial moment in the spread of this theory. Gaining considerable prestige

among Japanese intellectuals through his Western medicine classes, Siebold first encountered the Yoshitsune legend via his friend Yoshio Chūjirō (吉雄忠次郎).[2] In *Nippon: Archiv zur Beschreibung von Japan*, Siebold developed the hypothesis that Yoshitsune and Genghis Khan were one and the same (Wang 2013: 43).

After Siebold, in Japan, scholars began attempting to support the theory using geographic, folkloric, and archaeological evidence. Among these, the most influential was Suematsu Kenchō (末松謙澄),[3] a Cambridge-educated Japanese scholar. In his paper titled *The Identity of the Great Conqueror Genghis Khan with the Japanese Hero Yoshitsuné : An Historical Thesis*, published in 1879, Suematsu Kenchō argued that Genghis Khan was in fact none other than Yoshitsune. Six years later, the paper was translated into Japanese by Uchida Yahachi (内田弥八)[4] under the title *Yoshitsune Saikōki* (『義経再興記』, *The Revival of Yoshitsune*), published in 1885, and widely circulated in Japan.

In 1924, Oyabe Zenichirō (小谷部全一郎)[5] published *Chingisu Han wa Minamoto no Yoshitsune nari* (『成吉思汗は源義経也』, *Genghis Khan Is Minamoto no Yoshitsune*), representing the most systematic and assertive expression of the theory. Oyabe synthesized previous hypotheses with firsthand observations from his travels across Mongolia and Siberia, where he visited Vladivostok, Qiqihar, Mergen, and Aginskii Datsan (Miyawaki-Okada 2006: 131). Notably, these journeys were undertaken while Oyabe was serving as a military interpreter during the Siberian Intervention, providing him with the opportunity to conduct field research throughout Mongolia and Siberia.

As noted above, this theory circulated widely from the Meiji to the Taishō period yet remained highly contentious within academic circles. Despite exerting profound influence on the modern Japanese conceptualization of Genghis Khan, Siebold's theory was severely criticized by certain Japanese intellectuals, the most outspoken of whom was the Japanese historian Iwasaki Katsumi (岩崎克己).[6] He regarded the theory as an unfounded "delusion" and claimed that Siebold's academic prestige among Japanese intellectuals had lent undue credibility to an originally marginal legend (Iwasaki 1938: 3). Meanwhile, Oyabe's version of the theory was met with equally fierce criticism. In 1925, *Chūō Shitan* (『中央史壇』, *Central Historical Forum*) published a special issue titled "Jingisukan wa Minamoto no Yoshitsune ni arazu" (「成吉思汗は源義經に非ず」, "Genghis Khan Is Not Minamoto no Yoshitsune"), featuring rebuttals to Oyabe from experts in linguistics, history, archaeology, and folklore.

Despite ongoing academic controversy, the theory continued to gain wide traction in Japan. In particular, a major reason for its persistence lay in its alignment with the trajectory of Japan's modern

nation-state development: the legendary path of Yoshitsune—from Hokkaidō through Manchuria and Mongolia, eventually conquering the Central Plains and Western countries—closely mirrored Japan's geopolitical ambitions at the time. Perhaps no example better illustrates the deeper reasons behind modern Japan's enthusiasm for this theory than the concluding passage of Oyabe's work, where he links the theory to Japan's expansion into Manchuria and Mongolia as well as to the then-prevalent discourse within Japan regarding the confrontation between Eastern and Western races: "More than seven hundred years have passed since the death of Genghis Khan. The history of the world thereafter may almost be described as a history of white domination. (omitted) . . . The time has surely come, at this critical moment when the fate of Greater Asia hangs in the balance, for a second Genghis Khan to rise once again from the land of the rising sun" (Oyabe 1924: 299–300). Oyabe's claim, in a sense, illustrates why this idea gained such wide influence: by turning Genghis Khan into a "Japanese hero" who conquered the world.

After World War II, some Japanese scholars continued to attempt to prove the theory, most of them deeply influenced by Oyabe and seeking to portray Genghis Khan as a Japanese hero who conquered the world. For example, *Yoshitsune densetsu no nazo: Chingisu Han wa Minamoto no Yoshitsune ka* (義経伝説の謎: 成吉思汗は源義経か, *The Mystery of the Yoshitsune Legend: Was Genghis Khan Minamoto no Yoshitsune?*) by Sasaki Katsu (佐々木勝三), Omachi Hokuzo (大町北造), and Yokota Masaji (横田正二) published in 1986 and *Chingisu Han = Minamoto no Yoshitsune datta kore dake no riyū* (成吉思汗=源義経だったこれだけの理由, *The Many Reasons Why Genghis Khan Was Yoshitsune)* by Nakasugi Hiroshi (中杉弘) published in 2008 have further contributed to the spread and persistence of this idea.

The long-standing circulation of the G=Y theory has significantly shaped modern Japanese literature and theatre. From the Meiji period onward, it was repeatedly reworked in literary texts, beginning with Shimizu Ichijirō's 1886 *Tsūzoku Yoshitsune Saikōki* (『通俗義経再興記』, *The Popular Revival Record of Yoshitsune*), an expanded adaptation of Uchida Yahachi' s translation Yoshitsune Saikōki, which narrates Minamoto no Yoshitsune's journey to the Asian mainland and his transformation into Genghis Khan. The theory continued to surface in later literature, appearing in prewar works such as Sakaguchi Ango's 1931 short story "Kaze Hakase" (風博士, "The Wind Doctor") and reaching a popular postwar audience in Akimitsu Takagi's 1958 detective novel *Jingisukan no himitsu* (成吉思汗の秘密, *The Secret of Genghis Khan*).[7]

This theory also circulated within theatrical circles. In June 1934, *Wakaki hi no Chingisu Khan* (若き日の成吉思汗, *Youthful Genghis*

[13.112.217.153] Project MUSE (2026-10-13 11:55 GMT) Login 'Li Tianran'

Khan), written by Maki Itsuma (牧逸馬) and performed by the Tōhō Opera Company at the Takarazuka Theatre in Tokyo, explicitly drew on the G=Y theory. In the program notes, Maki situated the play within what he described as an age that demanded a reexamination of "all things Oriental, all things Japanese," and characterized Genghis Khan as "the one truly global hero of the East" (Maki 1934: 29). While acknowledging both the legendary nature of Genghis Khan's historical image and the inevitable departures from historical fact required by theatrical representation, Maki treated the Yoshitsune–Genghis Khan identification as a suggestive hypothesis rather than a verifiable claim. He pointed to visual motifs such as the resemblance of armor styles and the sasa-ryūtan crest, as well as to alleged linguistic similarities, to support this imaginative linkage. Ultimately, he emphasized that, even if the theory amounted to no more than a "fanciful coincidence," it nevertheless offered "an extraordinarily thrilling notion for us Japanese," concluding that "the dream of Genghis Khan is the dream of us Eastern people" (Maki 1934: 29). Notably, the evidence presented by Maki Itsuma is drawn almost entirely from Oyabe's works, and his portrayal of Genghis Khan as a Japanese hero also clearly reflects Oyabe's perspective. This documentation provides concrete evidence of how Oyabe's theories permeated Japanese theatrical discourse. And the three Takarazuka Revue musicals produced in the prewar, wartime, and postwar periods, respectively, collectively illustrate the ways in which the G=Y theory was continually reconstructed throughout the course of modern Japanese history. In this context, we will reveal how the construction of Genghis Khan's image in the three works exemplifies what Homi Bhabha describes as mimicry infused with hybridity.

Ritual, Romance, and Expansion: The Political Subtext of Takarazuka Revue's *Jingisukan*

The first Genghis Khan-themed production staged by the Takarazuka Revue, titled *Jingisukan*, premiered in March 1922 as part of the Moon Troupe's[8] performance at the Public Hall Theatre (公会堂劇場). The play was written by Hisamatsu Issei (久松一声),[9] a prolific playwright during the Taishō and early Showa periods who provided many scripts for the Takarazuka Revue. Hisamatsu was adept at drawing inspiration from the social climate and public psychology. His interpretation of Genghis Khan catered to the intense public interest in the figure, from both cultural and diplomatic perspectives.

The story of *Jingisukan* is set just before Genghis Khan leads his army to attack Western Xia. Genghis Khan's daughter, Karishin (可理真), falls in love with Tobokukan (菟木旱), a prince of the Uighur tribe that Genghis Khan once conquered.[10] To help Tobokukan exact

revenge, Karishin agrees to assassinate Genghis Khan with a poisoned arrow. However, on the night of the planned assassination, Karishin, taking pity on a bear intended for sacrifice, secretly releases the animal and is subsequently captured by soldiers. Genghis Khan orders Karishin's execution according to the law. Tobokukan, who had tried to assassinate Genghis Khan with a poisoned arrow, is also captured. Upon learning that the person in front of him is his former enemy's son, Genghis Khan orders that Tobokukan be handed the poisoned arrow and given a chance to try to kill him. Tobokukan, moved by Genghis Khan's noble character, gives up his desire for revenge and chooses to follow Karishin in death by piercing his own chest with the poisoned arrow.[11]

The young lovers in the play, as well as the ritual ceremony that serves as the backdrop for the assassination, are fictional creations of the author. Although Genghis Khan's stage presence in the production is limited, he is undoubtedly the central figure. Furthermore, the author contrasts the immature romance between two young characters with the grandeur of Genghis Khan, highlighting his stature as a leader.

Notably, while the play does not explicitly state that Genghis Khan is Yoshitsune, it subtly hints at this possibility through cues such as those reflected in the costuming—judging from the stage photos of the time, the actors' costumes did not have Mongolian characteristics; instead, they resembled traditional Japanese styles.[12] As Oyabe meticulously documented in his seminal work, the armor styles of Genghis Khan's Mongol warriors shared remarkable commonalities with late Heian-period Japanese battle attire—particularly in their distinctive rounded helmets, iron-plated armor adorned with animal hide embellishments, and signature weaponry including longbows, arrows, curved swords, spears, and iron clubs (Oyabe 1924: 294). When compared with Oyabe's descriptions, the costumes in *Jingisukan*—including the iron armor, fur accents, and archery equipment—closely match the Heian-period samurai style he documented. This deliberate stylistic choice would have readily evoked associations with Yoshitsune for contemporary audiences.

Moreover, the implication that Genghis Khan is Minamoto no Yoshitsune is embedded in the background of the story—the Bear Ceremony. Let us now attempt to reconstruct the general sequence of the Bear Ceremony based on the descriptions in the script. First, after Karishin and Tobokukan finish plotting, "At this moment, from the far edge of the mountains, the shouts raised by the crowd at the Bear Ceremony can be heard (omitted) . . . The voices of the Bear Ceremony procession gradually draw nearer, and the songs, gongs, and drums begin to be heard distinctly. Before long, many Mongolians enter, leading a single bear cub" (Hisamatsu 1922: 37). From the subsequent

lyrics, we learn that the bear will be shot with poison arrows, and its meat will be offered to the gods, to Genghis Khan, and to the women they love. The Mongolians then leave to prepare the rest of the ceremony. At this point, Karishin arrives in secret, intending to steal the poison arrows and release the bear. From her lines, we learn another key detail about the ceremony: the bear to be sacrificed was raised with her.

> Karishin: "Ah, you are the sacrificial bear, the offering to be killed in today's ceremony. You and I were born in the same year, grew up in the same place, under the same roof." (Hisamatsu 1922: 39)

Notably, this is the extent of what we—and the audience at the time—can infer about the ceremony. All the elements described here strongly evoke the Bear Ceremony (熊祭り)—a cherished Japanese custom at the time—whose dissemination accompanied the Meiji government's colonization of Hokkaidō. In 1869, the Meiji government established the Kaitakushi (開拓使)[13] and incorporated the northern frontier, formerly known as Ezochi (蝦夷地), into direct central governance, renaming it Hokkaidō (北海道). During the process of Hokkaidō being incorporated under Japanese government administration, the Bear Ceremony became widely known in Japan as a representative ritual of the Ainu people.[14] The 1892 edition of the *Nihon Daijisho* (『日本大辞書』, *Great Japanese Dictionary*) had already included an entry for "Bear Ceremony" (熊祭).

> Bear Ceremony – A ritual in Ezo regions. A captured bear cub is breastfed by women, then ceremonially killed and offered to the gods after three years. (Yamada 1892: 609)

It is evident that the episode in *Jingisukan*—in which a bear cub is raised and then sacrificed to the gods during a ceremony—closely parallels the Ainu bear ceremony. In fact, beyond the similarities in costume and ritual sequence, external evidence further supports the connection between the bear ceremony in the play and the Yoshitsune legend. In October 1920, two years before *Jingisukan* was staged, a play named *Ezo no Yoshitsune* (『蝦夷の義経』, *Ezo no Yoshitsune*) by playwright Yamazaki Shikō (山崎紫紅),[15] starring the kabuki actor Ichikawa Sadanji III (三代目市川左団次),[16] was performed at the Shintomiza Theatre (新富座).[17] This play depicted Yoshitsune's experiences after fleeing to Hokkaidō and included a portrayal of the Ainu Bear Ceremony:

> The play *Ezo no Yoshitsune*, which premiered at Tokyo's Shintomiza Theatre in October 1920 (the 9th year of Taishō), was created by the Takashimaza troupe based on this legend (author's note: referring to the tale of Yoshitsune's escape to Hokkaidō). The production starred Sadanji Ichikawa as Yoshitsune, Jusaburō as the chieftain Omotai, Shōchō

[13.112.217.153] Project MUSE (2026-10-13 11:55 GMT) Login 'Li Tianran'

> as the chieftain's daughter Irabu, Sumizō as Tomari (the orphaned son of the previous chieftain), and Chūsha in the supporting role of Hitachibō Kaizon. The performance vividly portrayed Ainu customs including the traditional Bear Ceremony. (Shimazu 1935: 513)

Later, a similar Takarazuka Revue work by Hisamatsu Issei, also titled *Ezo no Yoshitsune*, was staged in January 1933. These facts strongly suggest that Hisamatsu was likely inspired by *Ezo no Yoshitsune* when incorporating the bear ceremony into *Jingisu Kan*. This clearly indicates that his depiction of Genghis Khan is explicitly linked to Yoshitsune. Moreover, the inclusion of the bear ceremony in the Revue also underscores a colonial order grounded in mimicry: the Mongols are depicted as adopting customs brought from Hokkaidō by Yoshitsune, thus relegating them to the lowest rung of this colonial hierarchy.

Once we recognize the connection between Genghis Khan and Yoshitsune in the play, it becomes clear that Genghis Khan is portrayed as the ideal leader aligned with Japan's geopolitical circumstances during the Taishō period. When *Jingisukan* was performed, Japan was engaged in the Siberian Intervention,[18] and public interest in territorial expansion in Manchuria and Mongolia was at its peak. In this context, Genghis Khan is depicted as a selfless patriot and a resolute conqueror.

In the scene where the two protagonists are executed, Genghis Khan is portrayed as a stern and impartial patriot unwilling to show any favoritism. After discovering that Karishin had released the sacrificial bear, Genghis Khan executes her himself, stating, "The love of parent and child is a personal matter, but national policy is unchanging for all eternity" (Hisamatsu 1922: 41). He then sings:

> Khan (solo) : Thirty-six peaks of snow, ice fields all around, my vast land stretches across thousands of miles. I embrace two hundred million citizens, holding the sword that defends the nation. The law of the nation is impartial. Those who defy it shall be punished—families wiped out, bodies cut down. My hands are for the people; my heart is solely for the nation. (Hisamatsu 1922: 41)

When Tobokukan hears that Genghis Khan has ordered him to be killed, he exclaims, "Ah, do not make a fuss. Truly, the Khan is a hero of the realm. Even if—even if I had obtained the poisoned arrow, I could not shoot him. A poisoned arrow aimed by someone like me—how could it ever strike its mark? I have no more sorrow, no more resentment. To die with the princess, as promised, is my deepest wish" (Hisamatsu 1922: 42-43). The deaths of the protagonists highlight Genghis Khan's fairness and impartiality, and the prioritization of national interest over personal feelings in this scene aligns with the values that emerged in Japan during the Showa era.

Another key characteristic of Genghis Khan's image in the play is that of a "conqueror." The theme song of the play includes the following lyrics:

> Ensemble (chorus): In the northern land at the end of the world, beneath the snow-capped mountains, a pure people are nurtured, and their king is Genghis Khan. Unparalleled bravery, boundless compassion, building a nation of equality where all voices are heard, protecting the people, sleeping with the horses, their king is Genghis Khan.
>
> Ah, great Khan, ah, mighty Khan.
>
> On the round earth, all lands belong to the Great Mongol Empire. (Hisamatsu 1922: 35)

The phrase "building a nation of equality where all voices are heard" (衆議平等) in the lyrics seems to reflect the Japanese public's heightened concern about democracy during the Taishō period. However, the line "On the round earth, all lands belong to the Great Mongol Empire" appears to project the public's expectations for territorial expansion. The shift in the lyrics reflects Japan's transition from democratic ideals to more populist ideologies during the Showa period, and the song sung by the soldiers at the sacrificial ceremony accordingly embodies Japan's militarist view of conquest.

> Ensemble (chorus)：Look, across the world, there is no nation that does not fear the sword of our king.
>
> （Interlude）
>
> Together：Woah, woah; woah, woah.
>
> Ensemble (chorus)：Wherever there is land, wherever there is territory, the brave Khan moves forward, invincible and unstoppable. (Hisamatsu 1922: 38)

Thus, while the portrayal of *Jingisukan* may appear to present a tragic love story, it is heavily imbued with colonialist undertones. The play incorporates the well-known Ainu bear sacrifice ceremony, which became widely recognized following Japan's colonization of Hokkaidō, to subtly hinting at Genghis Khan's identity as Japanese. Furthermore, the depiction of a prewar sacrificial ceremony aligns with the growing public desire in Japan for territorial conquest. When Japan later supported the establishment of the puppet Mongolian government in Inner Mongolia during wartime, Genghis Khan was further utilized as a symbol to reinforce the bond between Japan and Mongolia, legitimizing Japan's expansionist actions. This is particularly evident in the 1941 Takarazuka Revue production *Mongōru*.

Mongōru—The Image of Genghis Khan in the Context of the Second Sino-Japanese War

After the outbreak of the Second Sino-Japanese War, the Takarazuka Revue became a propaganda tool for the Japanese government. At the authorities' request, the Revue produced a series of "current affairs plays" (時局物) reflecting the wartime situation and "national policy plays" (国策物) promoting Japan's military objectives. From October 1941 to March 1942, the Takarazuka Revue created the "Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere Series" (大東亜共栄圏三部曲), comprising *Mongōru*, *Pekin* (『北京』, *Beijing*), and *Higashi e kaeru* (『東へ帰る』, *Return Go East*). Unlike the usual fantastical Takarazuka productions, these three national policy plays—written after the authors visited the regions in question to study the local customs—were intended to promote Japan's "goodwill" (親善) policies by reflecting the customs of foreign lands. The first play in the trilogy, *Mongōru*, written by the famous playwright Utsu Hideo (宇津秀男),[19] premiered in the September–October 1941 performance by the Takarazuka Moon Troupe; its aim was to reflect Japan's "goodwill" relationship with the Mengjiang United Autonomous Government (蒙疆联合自治政府), a regime established in Inner Mongolia under Japanese control.

In late June 1941, before writing the script for *Mongōru*, playwright Utsu Hideo, at the invitation of the Mengjiang United Autonomous Government, visited Inner Mongolia and spent about six weeks studying local arts and culture ("Takarazuka shōshi" 1942: 60). The Japanese military and the Mengjiang United Autonomous Government placed great importance on Utsu's visit, and during a visit to the residence of De Wang—who served as chairman of the Japanese-backed Mengjiang United Autonomous Government in Inner Mongolia—Utsu's party received a banner inscribed with "The Art of Duty to the Country" (芸道報国) (Utsu 1941a: 16).[20] Subsequently, on 10 March 1942, De Wang visited the Takarazuka Grand Theatre to watch a performance. Over eighty members of the Snow Troupe presented Genghis Khan's March, a scene from Warera Tetsugun Nijūman (我等鉄軍二十万, "We, the Iron Army of Two Hundred Thousand"), vividly demonstrating the political function of the Genghis Khan.

Mongōru tells the story of a Beijing merchant, Zhou Da (周大), and his party, who travel to the Chahar League to purchase butter. During their visit, they receive a warm welcome from the League's leader and attend a lama festival. Although the plot is simple, Utsu's field research enables the play to showcase the rich cultural customs and ethnic arts of Mongolia. Regardless, as a national policy drama, *Mongolia*'s focus remains on promoting the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere.

[13.112.217.153] Project MUSE (2026-10-13 11:55 GMT) Login 'Li Tianran'

In contrast, the portrayal of Genghis Khan in the play is minimal, existing only in the songs and memories of the characters. Similar to *Jingisukan*, the portrayal of Genghis Khan in *Mongōru* is also connected to Japan. However, while the former implies Japanese ancestry, the latter explicitly depicts Japan as the legitimate successor to Genghis Khan and the Mongol Empire. To achieve this effect, the screenplay employs a juxtaposition technique in its depiction of Genghis Khan and the Japanese military. The theme song of the play, "March Forward, Mongolia," contains the following lyrics that reference Genghis Khan:

> Chorus: (omitted) Under the guidance of the Greater East Asia leader, we will build a peaceful Mongolia. Inherit Genghis Khan's legacy, awaken, rise, our Mongolia. (Utsu 1941b: 60)

The "Greater East Asia leader" clearly refers to Japan, and the juxtaposition of "under the guidance of the Greater East Asia leader" and "inheriting Genghis Khan's legacy" implies a connection between the Mongolia of Genghis Khan and contemporary Japan, presenting Japan as the spiritual heir of the Mongol Empire. This portrayal suggests that Japan's leadership in Mongolia is justified.

This contrastive approach is further reflected in the character portrayals. In the play, the governor of Chahar is portrayed as the descendant of a general who fought alongside Genghis Khan in his campaign to capture Zhongdu (the capital of the Jin dynasty). His lines explicitly state Japan's leadership: "Since Zhangjiakou became the capital of the Mengjiang United Autonomous Government, we have accepted Japan's leadership. Since then, peace has arrived in Mongolia, and we have truly gained a prosperous life. We were once just a nomadic people, but thanks to you, we are now beginning to develop industry" (Utsu 1941b: 65). Here, the narrative constructs a striking symbolic parallel between modern Japan and Genghis Khan's Mongol Empire through the character of the governor of Chahar. While his lineage traces back to generals who served under the Great Khan, his contemporary allegiance lies with Japanese authority. This calculated juxtaposition serves to reinforce Japan's dual claim: as the legitimate heir to the Mongol imperial legacy and as the destined leader of the East Asian order.

It is particularly noteworthy that this juxtaposition operates bidirectionally throughout the narrative: while modern Japan is consistently portrayed in alignment with Genghis Khan's legacy, the depiction of the Mongol conqueror himself simultaneously incorporates subtle yet deliberate allusions to contemporary Japanese military realities. In the play, Zhou Da and his party hear a Mongolian artist sing about Genghis Khan's attack on the Naiman tribe:

> The morin khuur player：The Naiman troops split into two flanks, causing the core of their forces to be attacked, resulting in great chaos. Many people lost their footing and fell into the valleys. By noon that day, almost all of the Tayang Khan's people were brought before Genghis Khan. When they learned that Genghis Khan's army did not plunder treasure or livestock, the residents hiding in the deep mountains all surrendered to Genghis Khan. (Utsu 1941b: 68)

In conjunction with the idea that Japan's militarist ideology and Genghis Khan share a legacy, the political intent of this description is clear—it subtly praises the disciplined Japanese military through the depiction of Genghis Khan's army as being morally upstanding and victorious.

After the performance, the The morin khuur player says, "Today, the story ends here. What should Genghis Khan do when he is caught between attacks from the front and the rear? Let's wait until tomorrow's performance to find out" (Utsu 1941b: 68). In the context of wartime Japan's rhetoric, the phrase "attacked from both the front and rear" would immediately remind audiences of the Japanese army's situation as it fought on two fronts, in China and the Pacific. The playwright's use of this phrase seems deliberate, intending to draw a parallel between the Mongol army's situation under Genghis Khan and that of the Japanese army, thus evoking an implicit connection between the two. In addition, Zhou Da's companion, Wang Wu, dreams about the ancient Mongol army, at which point the song "The Blue Flag," which mentions Genghis Khan, is performed.

> Chorus: Raising the blue flag high, our army is brave and resolute, inheriting Genghis Khan's legacy to protect Mongolia.
>
> Chorus: Raising the blue flag high, we will eliminate all enemies and build a peaceful utopia. (Utsu 1941b: 74)

Here, the term "utopia" would likely evoke associations with the Japanese army's propaganda slogan of "Hakko Ichiu" (八紘一宇, the unity of the eight corners of the world under one roof) and the concept of the "Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere." In this way, the ideal of "peace" in the lyrics echoes the Japanese concept of a "co-prosperous world" under Japanese leadership.

Although *Mongōru* does not explicitly employ the G=Y theory, this doctrine in fact provides the essential cultural context connecting the Japanese military with Genghis Khan in the narrative. Indeed, if examined solely through the work's internal depictions, Japan's claim as Genghis Khan's successor appears groundless. However, the latent association between Genghis Khan and Yoshitsune operates on a meta level to substantiate this assertion within the work.

Simultaneously, this theory resolves a critical dilemma Japan faced when asserting its leadership over East Asia through the Genghis Khan legacy: why shouldn't the rightful successors be the actual descendants of Genghis Khan—the Mongols? This posed a potentially fatal logical flaw for Japan's pan-Asian leadership claims. The G=Y theory conveniently circumvented this by fundamentally redefining Genghis Khan's identity: he was, according to the doctrine, actually the Japanese hero Yoshitsune in disguise.

Significantly, while *Mongōru* itself never explicitly mentions this theory, its 1942 Takarazuka performance was strategically staged as a double feature with *Yoshino Tadanobu* (吉野忠信)—an episode from the classic Yoshitsune-themed drama *Yoshitsune Senbon Zakura* (義経千本桜), which centers on Yoshitsune's flight after being pursued by his elder brother. This programming decision by the Takarazuka Revue likely served as an intertextual nod to contemporary audiences, subtly reinforcing the Yoshitsune–Genghis Khan connection through performative context rather than direct textual reference.

However, it is noteworthy that *Jingisukan* and *Mongōru* both deliberately avoid directly stating the connection between Genghis Khan and Yoshitsune. When we try to approach the G=Y theory through the lens of Homi Bhabha and view it as a form of mimicry, we may begin to understand why the author exhibits such ambivalence toward this theory. In Bhabha's view, mimicry is fundamentally the behavior of the colonized. Although Japan attempted to legitimize its leadership in East Asia through the G=Y theory, the inherent ambiguity in mimicking Genghis Khan and the Mongol Empire actually threatened the stability of colonial power itself. As Bhabha puts it, "The menace of mimicry is its double vision which in disclosing the ambivalence of colonial discourse also disrupts its authority" (Bhabha 1994: 88). Clearly, in the narrative of the G=Y theory, the insistence on Yoshitsune's "pure" Japanese lineage clashed with the reality that his legendary transformation into a foreign ruler inherently undermined racial and cultural purity—a cornerstone of imperial propaganda. This paradox explains why pre-1945 works such as *jingisukan* and *Mongōru* only hinted at the connection through subtle staging (such as Heian-style armor) and Ainu bear rituals (linking Yoshitsune's exile to Hokkaidō), rather than stating it outright. The colonial fantasy of seamless assimilation was always haunted by the hybridity it denied. As Bhabha writes, hybridity is itself an inescapable part of colonial power: "Hybridity is the sign of the productivity of colonial power, its shifting forces and fixities; it is the name for the strategic reversal of the process of domination through disavowal (that is, the production of discriminatory identities that secure the 'pure' and original

[13.112.217.153] Project MUSE (2026-10-13 11:55 GMT) Login 'Li Tianran'

identity of authority)" (Bhabha 1994: 112). The Takarazuka stage thus became a site where colonial power, even at its most triumphalist, was perpetually undermined by the specter of its own contradictions. This also explains why it was not until 28 years after the war, in 1973, that the G=Y theory was explicitly referenced in the Revue *Kono koi wa kumo no hate made*.

Anti-War Tendencies and the Manifestation of Personal Emotions in *Kono koi wa kumo no hate made*

As previously mentioned, although the dissemination of the G=Y theory was closely tied to Japan's modern expansionist trajectory, its propagation did not cease with Japan's defeat in the war. Rather, it continued to exert influence in both academic circles and artistic creation during the postwar period. In July 1973, the Takarazuka Revue's Flower Troupe premiered *Kono koi wa kumo no hate made* at the Takarazuka Grand Theatre. This production demonstrates how playwright Ueda Shinji (植田伸爾)—who would later serve as the Revue's chairman (1996–2004)—engaged with the G=Y theory in the postwar context, reinterpreting it through theatrical expression to construct new layers of ideological and cultural significance.

When examining this production, it is crucial to first acknowledge its complex historical context. The work was created in the immediate aftermath of the 1972 normalization of Sino-Japanese diplomatic relations and was subsequently revived in 1992, the twentieth anniversary year of this historic event, rendering its production and reception intrinsically tied to the bilateral relations of these periods. Simultaneously, while the shadows of Japan's wartime defeat still lingered, the nation had entered a phase of rapid economic growth. As noted by Japanese scholar Kazutoshi Hando (半藤一利) in his periodization of postwar thought, this particular moment (1973) marked a transitional phase in Japanese society—from the national pride fueled by economic miracles (1966–1972) toward a new era of introspection and a reconsideration of values (1973–1982) (Mostafa 2007: 110). This unique historical confluence profoundly shaped the dramatic portrayal of Genghis Khan in the production.

Kono koi wa kumo no hate made consists of thirty-five scenes, divided into two main parts: "The Lily of Ezo" (蝦夷の鈴蘭) and "The Iris of the Desert" (砂塵のイリス). "The Lily of Ezo" tells the story of Yoshitsune (who changed his name to Kurō (克羅) and his companions, who, after fleeing to Ezo (Hokkaidō), are pursued by the leader of the Usappu (ウサップ) tribe, who hates Japanese people. They eventually escape to Mongolia with the help of a Hokkaidō girl, Charenka (チャレンカ), and a man from the Song dynasty named Qian Wangling (乾王陵). During

their journey across the sea, Yoshitsune's lover, Shizuka Gozen (静御前), sacrifices herself by throwing herself into the sea to calm a storm. "The Iris of the Desert" recounts how, after arriving in Mongolia, Yoshitsune (known as Kurō)'s group is joined by 800 Mongol warriors. They travel south, intending to cross the Jin dynasty's territory to reach the Song dynasty, where they reunite with Shizuka Gozen, who had been enslaved and—feeling that she had been defiled—quietly commits suicide. After the death of his beloved, Yoshitsune abandons his journey to the Song dynasty and resolves to lead the 800 Mongol warriors to establish the Mongol Empire, renaming himself Genghis Khan.

It is clear that this work differs considerably from the earlier productions of *Jingisukan* and *Mongōru*. The first two works focus on the portrayal of Genghis Khan as a conqueror, with only subtle hints at his connection to Yoshitsune. In contrast, *Kono koi wa kumo no hate made*, while based on the G=Y theory, centers on the process of Yoshitsune becoming Genghis Khan. Furthermore, the author, Ueda Shinji, chooses to emphasize personal emotions in this process, filling the gap left in the portrayal of Genghis Khan by the collapse of wartime ideology. This transformation also led to a fundamental reexamination of the G=Y theory, marking a shift from its wartime ideological interpretations toward more existential and psychological dimensions.

This perspective is partially reflected in Ueda Shinji's own remarks on the G=Y theory. As Ueda himself stated, he was inspired to adapt this legend for theatrical creation after reading Takagi Akimitsu's novel *Jingisukan no himitsu*. However, his interpretation of the theory differed markedly from prewar writers: "The Japanese did not want the tragic warrior (Yoshitsune) to die without a connection to the distant figure of Genghis Khan. I feel there is a vast romanticism in this" (Ueda 1973a: 19). Compared with the works before and during the war, which focused on Genghis Khan's identity as a "Yellow Race Hero" when applying this theory, Uemada Shinji emphasizes that the root of the G=Y theory is the fantasy born from Japanese sympathy for Yoshitsune, and its value lies in the "romance" inherent in this fantasy. In the play, this romanticism is expressed through the transcendence of collective ideological nationalism in personal emotion. For example, Charenka, the daughter of the Ezo tribe's chief, who helps Yoshitsune enter her tribe and later assists in his escape, and Qian Wangling, who risks the ship's sinking to ensure Yoshitsune and his companions reach the Song dynasty, both illustrate how personal feelings can transcend ethnic or national boundaries. This tendency is likewise reflected in the characterization of Yoshitsune.

In the performance, Yoshitsune's journey to becoming Genghis Khan involves personal emotions gradually transcending ethnic identity.

Yoshitsune faces multiple choices regarding his identity: in Ezo, pressured by the chief, he insists that he must die a Japanese person. After leading 800 Mongol warriors across the mainland, he still refuses to relinquish his Japanese identity, insisting on reaching the Song dynasty. However, after his lover dies in the capital of the Jin dynasty, he decides to stay in Mongolia and renounce his national identity—declaring, "From today, I am Genghis Khan, a Mongol"—and tells his subordinates:

> Yoshitsune: Mongolian wolves, I will become the dust of Mongolia on this land, where my love ended. On this Mongolian plain, until the end of the clouds, I will engrave the tombstones of my love, making them the foundation of this young Mongol nation. Long live Mongolia, long live Mongolia! (Ueda 1973b: 45)

Thus, Yoshitsune abandons his Japanese identity when he becomes Genghis Khan, and his identification with Mongolia is rooted in his lost love—this is the "romance" to which Ueda Shinji refers. After the breakdown of militarist ideology, personal emotions take over the human aspects of the prewar portrayal of Genghis Khan.

As previously discussed, the creation of this Revue clearly correlates with the normalization of Sino-Japanese diplomatic relations, while its portrayal of Yoshitsune carries distinct anti-war connotations. Unlike *Jingisukan* and *Mongōru*—which place Genghis Khan's character within a war context—in *Kono koi wa kumo no hate made*, we see the author's avoidance of war-related depictions. During the journey from Ezo to the mainland, Yoshitsune and his companions never actively engage in battle; even when drawn into conflict, their primary goal is to escape. At the end of the story, Yoshitsune, now determined to become Genghis Khan, confronts a Jin general to save the Mongol warriors. However, when the general sees Yoshitsune arrive, he orders his troops to retreat. This general aversion to war in the play seems to reflect a shift in Japan's postwar ideological stance, and Yoshitsune's journey—from Hokkaidō to Mongolia, ultimately forgoing the advance south toward Song China—seems to mirror Japan's modern expansionist trajectory while subtly questioning its underlying rationale.

Moreover, the anti-war sentiment is vividly articulated through Yoshitsune's dialogues and soliloquies throughout the narrative. At the beginning, when Yoshitsune and his group learn that Emperor Shirakawa has issued an edict to capture him, Fujiwara no Tadamune says, "The imperial edict must have been instigated by the Kamakura shogunate. The emperor could never have ordered the pursuit of our lord (Yoshitsune)" (Ueda 1973b: 20). This statement evokes the idea of the independence of the military establishment's actions during the Second Sino-Japanese War. When Tadamune suggests using the power

[13.112.217.153] Project MUSE (2026-10-13 11:55 GMT) Login 'Li Tianran'

of the Fujiwara clan to resist the pursuit of the imperial army, Yoshitsune replies, "No, this Hiraizumi is the sacred ground founded by the three generations of the Kiyohira, Motohira, and Hidehira. We must not allow the flames of war to defile it. Just as I quietly left Kyoto before, I will not let this Buddhist city turn into streets of warfare" (Ueda 1973b: 20). Here, Yoshitsune's refusal to let the flames of war defile Kyoto and Hiraizumi evokes the situation of Japan's ancient capitals, such as Kyoto, Nara, and Nagoya, at the end of World War II.

This anti-war sentiment is pronounced in Yoshitsune's soliloquy as—stranded in Hokkaidō—he reminisces about Shizuka Gozen:

> Yoshitsune: This Ezo is ultimately not a place where I can settle. Where should I go? At the end of this long journey, where is my place of rest? I have never felt such pain in living. Although it was not my intention, until now, my hands have been stained with too much blood. Since the Battle of the Kisegawa, I have fought against my own people, including Kiso Yoshinaka, and battled the Taira clan at Ichi-no-Tani, Yashima, and Dan-no-ura. But what have I, Yoshitsune, truly gained? I have never once felt happiness. What have I achieved with my life? Has what I have done really helped the world? I increasingly feel that washing blood with blood will never bring true happiness. (Ueda 1973b: 29)

These anti-war sentiments expressed in Yoshitsune's words reflect the postwar pacifist mood in Japanese society, also tied to the historical context of the normalization of Sino-Japanese relations at the time. Moreover, after traveling through Hokkaidō and Manchuria-Mongolia, Yoshitsune ultimately refuses to enter the Song dynasty—a plot development that not only reflects his personal transcendence of national identity but also seems to represent, at least in part, a rejection of Japan's continental expansionist trajectory since the Meiji era.

However, although the play is devoid of implications of war and invasion in the portrayal of Yoshitsune, there remains a hidden colonial perspective—rooted in imperialist thinking—in the depiction of the relationship between Yoshitsune and the Mongolian natives. Yoshitsune, under the alias Kurō, "rescues" the Mongols oppressed by the Khitan people upon reaching the mainland and is followed by 800 Mongol warriors. The contrast between Yoshitsune's exceptional qualities as a foreign leader and those of the Mongol natives who follow him is frequently highlighted, with the latter depicted as "savages" awaiting rescue by a superior leader.

> Yoshitsune: "Exactly. My group has longed for the Great Song, crossing the Heilongjiang, Songhua River, and Nen River, and finally arriving on the land of the Jin Dynasty. We are so close to the Great Song. But along the way, through Wuse, Qingcang, and Weining, we have been repeatedly dragged into senseless struggles."
>
> Kichiji: "No, these are not senseless struggles."

> Tadamune: "Indeed. The young Mongols have struggled under the tyranny of the Khitan, and His Highness has rescued them."
>
> Kichiji: "Since then, Mongol men who admired His Highness have become his subordinates, and now there are more than 800 of them."
>
> Tadamune: "Since then, everyone has sworn loyalty to His Highness's noble character." (Ueda 1973b: 37–38)

In this dialogue, we clearly observe a colonial-style, dependent relationship between Yoshitsune and the Mongol warriors. The play also frequently emphasizes Yoshitsune's superiority as a leader over the Mongol warriors he leads. After Yoshitsune and his party enter the palace of the Jin dynasty, the palace concubines offer completely different evaluations of Yoshitsune and the Mongol warriors.

> Kōkan: "It is true. The barbarian is a barbarian. Those Mongols are the northern barbarians who crossed the Heilongjiang to reach the Jin Dynasty. Compared to our men of the Jin, they are not even human."
>
> Kōki: "How coarse they look, how frightening."
>
> Shūki: "But then again, don't you think the man named Kurō is quite lovable?"
>
> Gyokukan: "How could any of you like that kind of man? How repulsive! Stop it!"
>
> Reiki: "But when you say that, his eyes really are charming."
>
> Shūki: "Yes, yes. When his phoenix eyes looked this way, my heart truly fluttered." (Ueda 1973b: 36)

These descriptions of appearance implicitly suggest Yoshitsune's unique status within the group. This fantasy indicates a deep, colonialist-rooted belief in the superiority of the Japanese people. Through the Mongol warriors' expressions of admiration for their leader, Yoshitsune, the play elevates Japan and portrays Mongolia in a derogatory light.

> Jamuka: "Kereito, you are so obsessed with Kurō."
>
> Kereito: "That's because I like him. I see in him the grandeur that Mongols do not have. Brother, can't Kurō become a Mongol like us?"
>
> Jamuka: "I don't know about that. Kurō longs for the Great Song. Once he gets there, will he still treat us the same way?"
>
> Kereito: "Kurō is not a cold-hearted man. Isn't it always said that the Japanese are a nation of courtesy? Brother, don't you think Mongolia needs men like Kurō to prosper?"
>
> Jamuka: "Of course I do. I deeply hope for that. Mongolia needs men like Kurō now." (Ueda 1973b: 41)

Clearly, the relationship between Yoshitsune and the Mongols follows the colonial "Robinson Crusoe and Friday" model, with

Yoshitsune in a dominant position—responsible for leadership and enlightenment—while the Mongols are portrayed as primitive, ignorant, and awaiting a savior's guidance. The Mongol warriors' admiration for Yoshitsune and their desire to emulate his qualities can be seen as an enactment of colonial mimicry. Kereito's longing for Yoshitsune to "become a Mongol like us" and the praise for his supposed Japanese courtesy exemplify the tension Bhabha describes: the colonized subject internalizes the colonizer's virtues, yet always remains marked by an irreducible difference—a difference that both fascinates and unsettles the colonial order. This relationship is also haunted by hybridity. While the Mongol characters seek to incorporate Yoshitsune into their group, their reverence ultimately reinforces Japanese exceptionalism. The play creates a fantasy space in which the Japanese protagonist is both the object of Mongol desire and the standard of civilization, yet the impossibility of true assimilation reveals the inherent instability of the colonial hierarchy.

Conclusion

The Takarazuka Revue's Genghis Khan productions functioned as cultural palimpsests, each era reinscribing the conqueror's image to suit contemporary ideological needs. From the Taishō period's coded heroism to wartime propaganda and postwar introspection, these performances demonstrate how historical figures are instrumentalized to navigate national anxieties. The G=Y theory's endurance—despite academic debunking—reveals its utility in reconciling Japan's paradoxical self-perception: as both victim (through Yoshitsune's exile) and victor (via Genghis Khan's conquests). While postwar narratives ostensibly rejected militarism by foregrounding emotion, they inadvertently perpetuated colonial hierarchies through depictions of Mongol "savagery" and Japanese exceptionalism, illustrating Bhabha's argument that hybridity "reverses the process of domination through disavowal" (Bhabha 1994: 112) without fully dismantling its structures.

This trajectory suggests that Genghis Khan's symbolic malleability will persist, adapting to future discourses on Japan's role in global memory and identity. Ultimately, the Revue's stagings underscore theatre's complicity in mythmaking—where history is less reconstructed than repurposed for the present. The study further reveals how postwar narratives, despite their anti-war themes, failed to fully escape the colonial mindset embedded in the G=Y theory, leaving its ideological contradictions unresolved. As Bhabha contends, colonial discourse is haunted by its own ambivalence, and the Takarazuka productions exemplify this tension: even as they sought to redefine Genghis Khan

[13.112.217.153] Project MUSE (2026-10-13 11:55 GMT) Login 'Li Tianran'

for new eras, they could not fully erase the traces of imperial desire that first shaped his theatrical incarnation. The result is a performative legacy that continues to oscillate between remembrance and erasure, between the fantasy of Japanese exceptionalism and the unresolved specter of its colonial past.

NOTES

1. Philipp Franz von Siebold (1796–1866) was a German physician and naturalist who worked in Japan during the early nineteenth century.

2. Yoshio Chūjirō (吉雄忠次郎, 1787–1833) was a Nagasaki interpreter and early English scholar in late Edo Japan. He compiled one of the first Japanese studies on English language and customs, and assisted Takahashi Kageyasu and Philipp Franz von Siebold as interpreter and intermediary.

3. Kenchō Suematsu (末松謙澄, 1855–1920) was a Meiji-era politician, journalist, and historian. Educated in Britain, he served in several high government posts and is known for his role in Japan's modernization, as well as for publishing the first English translation of *The Tale of Genji*.

4. Yahachi Uchida (内田弥八, dates unknown) was a well-known translator and editor in mid-Meiji Japan. Uchida was a graduate of Keio University and played an important role in introducing Western ideas and scholarship to Japanese readers during the Meiji period.

5. Zenichirō Oyabe (小谷部全一郎, 1868–1941) was a Japanese pastor, educator, and writer known for his work in Ainu education and for vigorously promoting the theory that Genghis Khan was Minamoto no Yoshitsune.

6. Katsumi Iwasaki (岩崎克己, 1905–1993) was a Japanese linguist and historian known for his research on Mongol history and as a leading prewar critic of the theory linking Minamoto no Yoshitsune to Genghis Khan.

7. Takagi Akimitsu (高木彬光, 1920–1995), a pioneering figure in Japanese postwar mystery fiction, was renowned for blending rigorous logical deduction with historical themes. His 1958 novel *The Secret of Genghis Khan* (成吉思汗の秘密) represents a significant literary engagement with the G=Y theory during Japan's postwar cultural reckoning.

8. The performers of the Takarazuka Revue are divided into five troupes: Flower Troupe (花組), Moon Troupe (月組), Snow Troupe (雪組), Star Troupe (星組), and Cosmos Troupe (宙組).

9. Issei Hisamatsu (久松一声, 1880–1965) was a Japanese playwright and novelist active during the Taisho and early Showa periods and contributed numerous scripts to the Takarazuka Revue.

10. The male and female protagonists in this play are fictional figures. Since no audio recordings of the production have been preserved, and the readings (kana pronunciations) of the protagonists' names are not indicated

in any extant documents including scripts and playbills, the pronunciations of the protagonists' names in this text are annotated by the author in accordance with Japanese kanji reading rules.

11. The play features several historical figures associated with Genghis Khan, such as Jebe, but the male and female protagonists are fictional characters. Furthermore, the plot in which the two attempt to poison Genghis Khan during a ritual may have been inspired by the historical rumor that Genghis Khan was poisoned by a Western Xia princess.

12. The images discussed in this section can be found in Takarazuka Shōjo Kageki Kyakuhon-shū (Vol. 27).

13. The Kaitakushi (開拓使) was the Hokkaido Development Commission established by the Japanese government in 1869 to oversee the colonization, economic development, and administration of Hokkaido.

14. During the early colonization of Hokkaidō, official records noted that Ainu were being lured to other prefectures to perform bear ceremonies, reflecting its transformation into a cultural spectacle. For details, see *Sapporo-ken Furei Zensho, Meiji 17-nen* (札幌県布令全書 明治 17 年, Complete Sapporo Prefectural Ordinances, 1887): 1014.

15. Yamazaki Shikō (山崎紫紅, 1875–1939), born Yamazaki Shōzō (山崎小三), was a Japanese playwright and poet. He established himself as a leading "new historical drama" (shin shigeki) playwright through works like *Kabuki Monogatari* (1908), known for blending romantic lyricism with gradualist reforms influenced by his mentor Tsubouchi Shōyō. Later served as chairman of the Kanagawa Prefectural Assembly.

16. Ichikawa Sadanji II (二代目市川左團次, 1880–1940) was a renowned Japanese kabuki actor, known for his understated and versatile performances.

17. Shintomiza was a major kabuki theatre in Tokyo, originally founded as Morita-za in the Edo period and renamed in 1875. Under Morita Kanya XII (守田勘彌), it became a center of modernization in kabuki, introducing Western-style seating, gas lighting, and evening performances before being destroyed in the Great Kantō Earthquake of 1923.

18. From 1918 to 1922, Japan deployed approximately 70,000 troops to Siberia as part of the Allied intervention in the Russian Civil War. Although the initial aim was to help evacuate the Czechoslovak Legion in Vladivostok, Japan remained long after other Allied forces withdrew, maintaining control over key areas east of Lake Baikal. This intervention stirred intense domestic criticism over its strategic value and cost, and ultimately served as a significant yet costly expansion of Japanese influence into Siberia—with little lasting gain.

19. A Takarazuka playwright, he created numerous propaganda plays during Japan's invasion of China.

20. The images discussed in this section can be found in Hideo Utsu, "Travel Notes in Mengjiang: A Journey through the Region," in Takarazuka Shōjo Kageki Kyakuhon-shū (1941a).

REFERENCES

Bhabha, Homi K. 1994.
The Location of Culture. London: Routledge.

Hisamatsu, Issei. 1922.
"Jingisukan" (Genghis Khan). *Takarazuka Shōjo Kageki Kyakuhon-shū* (*Collected Scripts of the Takarazuka Girls' Revue*) 27: 35–43.

Hokkaidō-chō, ed. 1887.
Sapporo-ken Furei Zensho Meiji Jūshichi-nen (*Complete Sapporo Prefectural Ordinances, 1884*). Sapporo: Hokkaidō-chō.

Iwasaki, Katsumi. 1938.
"Shīboruto no Chingisu Khan soku Minamoto no Yoshitsune setsu to sono kōsei e no eikyō" (Siebold's Theory of Genghis Khan as Minamoto no Yoshitsune and Its Later Influence). *Chūgai Iji Shinpō* (*Chūgai Medical Journal*) 1252: 1–8.

Maki, Itsuma. 1934.
"Wakaki hi no Jingisukan-Honnen rokugatsu Tōkyō Takarazuka gekijō hatsuen ni saishite-" (Youthful Genghis Khan-On the occasion of the first performance at the Tokyo Takarazuka Theatre this June-). *Takarazuka Chūgekijō Kyakuhon Kaisetsushū* (*Collection of Script Commentaries for Takarazuka Middle Theatre*) 2: 28–29.

Miyawaki-Okada, Junko. 2006.
"The Japanese Origin of the Chinggis Khan Legends." *Inner Asia* 8(1): 123–134.

Mostafa, Fathy. 2007.
"Nihon sengo bungaku ni okeru 'sengo' wa hatashite owatta no ka" (Has the "Postwar" in Japanese Postwar Literature Really Ended?). *Cairo Conference on Japanese Studies*, Cairo University, 5–6 November 2006, 103–122.

Oyabe, Zenichirō. 1924.
Chingisu Khan wa Minamoto no Yoshitsune nari (*Genghis Khan Is Minamoto no Yoshitsune*). Tokyo: Fuzambō.

Shimazu, Hisamoto. 1935.
Yoshitsune Densetsu to Bungaku (*The Yoshitsune Legend and Literature*). Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.

"Takarazuka shōshi" ("A Brief History of Takarazuka"). 1942.
In *Takarazuka Nenkan (Shōwa Jūshichi-nen Ban)* (*Takarazuka Yearbook [1942 Edition]*): 50–60.

Uchida, Yahachi, trans. 1885.
Yoshitsune Saikōki (*The Revival Record of Yoshitsune*). Tokyo: Uedaya.

Wang Yukun. 2013.
"Chingisu Khan yu beiju yingxiong Yuan Yijing — Jian lun Riben de lingtu kuozhang yu minjian chuanshuo" (Genghis Khan and the Tragic Hero Minamoto no Yoshitsune: On Japan's Territorial Expansion and Folklore). *Beifang Minzu Daxue Xuebao (Zhexue Shehui*

Kexue Ban) (*Journal of Northern Nationalities University [Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition]*) 110: 41–48.

Ueda, Shinji. 1973a.
"*Jūgonenrai no yume no jitsugen*" (*A Dream Realized After 15 Years). Takarazuka Kageki Hachigatsu Hanagumi Kōen Puroguramu (Takarazuka Revue August Hanagumi Performance Program*).

———. 1973b.
Kono koi wa kumo no hate made (*This Love Will Last Until the End of the Clouds*). Takarazuka Kageki Hachigatsu Hanagumi Kōen Puroguramu (Takarazuka Revue August Hanagumi Performance Program): 11–45.

Utsu, Hideo. 1941a.
"Mōkyō Kenbunki: Mōkyō o yuku" (Travel Notes in Mengjiang: A Journey through the Region). *Takarazuka Shōjo Kageki Kyakuhon-shū* (*Collected Scripts of the Takarazuka Girls' Revue*) 24(10): 15–20.

———. 1941b.
"Mongoru" (Mongolia). *Takarazuka Shōjo Kageki Kyakuhon-shū* (*Collected Scripts of the Takarazuka Girls' Revue*) 24(10): 60–77.

Yamada, Bimyō, ed. 1892.
Nihon Daijisho Dai-go-kan: Ka, Ki, Ku (*Great Japanese Dictionary, Vol. 5: Ka, Ki, Ku*). Tokyo: Nihon Daijisho Hakkōsho.