

AN ANGEL BY THE WATER

ESSAYS IN HONOUR OF DENNIS REGINALD O'HOY

Mike Butcher
Editor



Holland House Publishing

Holland House Publishing
2 Holland Court
Kennington, Victoria 3550

First published 2015

Printed in Hong Kong
by Print Plus International

ISBN 978-0-9871627-3-1 (hard cover)

This book is copyright under the Berne Convention.
Reproduction rights to the essays and illustrations rest with the authors.

All rights reserved.

Cover illustrations

Front:

The restored interior of the Emu Point Joss House Temple, 2015.

Photo: Richard Gibbs

Back:

Dennis' Chinese name stamp: *Louey Sai Yuen*.

Conversions

Length

1 inch = 25.4 mm
1 foot = 0.304 metres
1 yard = 0.912 metres
1 mile = 1.61 kilometres

Capacity

1 pint = 0.567 litres
1 gallon = 4.54 litres

Weight (Avoirdupois)

1 ounce (oz) = 28.35 grams
1 pound (lb) = 0.454 kilograms
1 Katty (Kati) = 0.605 kilograms

Currency

12 pence (d) = 1 shilling (s)
20 shillings = 1 pound (£)

At the time of conversion to decimal currency in 1966, the Australian Dollar was equivalent to ten shillings. Conversions between nineteenth, twentieth and twenty-first century monetary values and their modern equivalents requires meaningful comparisons to be made based on commodity prices or average wages.

Chang Woo Gow: the man and the giant

Sophie Couchman

With his high cheek bones and impeccable dress-sense Chang Woo Gow was a striking man.¹ There was a dignity and earnestness about the way in which he held himself in studio portraits.² In the few photographs, where the photographer, or perhaps Chang's agent, has attempted to create a playful pose, Chang looks unengaged and stiff.³ He does, however, wear the expressionless look common to many studio portraits created during the nineteenth century that reveal so little of the emotional being that they represent that it is easy for the viewer to impose their own understandings of what he might be thinking.

It was through photographs that I first discovered Chang Woo Gow. I was researching the ways in which Chinese and their descendants had been photographed in Australia in the nineteenth and early twentieth century.⁴ Chang however, proved to be a problematic figure to incorporate into my work because the time he spent in Australia was not as a miner, market gardener or merchant but as an entertainer on tour as a 'giant', publicly exhibiting himself in a series of levées for the cost of shilling.

As a 'giant', much of Chang's life sat outside 'ordinary' experience. While his life story was repeated *ad nauseum* in newspaper accounts and advertisements, because of the hubris and humbug associated with performances such as his, it is often impossible to tell fact from fiction in these accounts. Quite straightforward information such as his age, height and many other personal details vary wildly in accounts about him. His life as a performer has overpowered and distracted from his life and achievements

as a Chinese man who left China and explored the world. Something similar also occurs with Quong Tart (梅光達, 1850-1903), the well-known nineteenth-century Sydney tea merchant and community leader. While undisputedly a significant figure in Australia's Chinese history, Quong Tart's celebrity which he shaped through the skilful use of photography and the printed media, distorted how he is seen today and overshadowed the contributions of other significant Chinese Australians.⁵

Chang's celebrity has similarly distorted our understanding of his life. A close reading of historical accounts about his life which identifies the tropes of the freak show can help us see beyond the façade of 'Chang, the Chinese giant' to Chang the man. The biographical case study presented in this essay focusses on Chang's tour of Australia in 1871, which is not well covered in his published 'autobiographies'. In doing so it contributes to our understanding of cross-cultural relations and the construction of nineteenth-century celebrities. Finally it highlights the agency of Chang, Kin Foo and Catherine Santley in shaping their lives and how their lives were presented to the public.⁶

Chang Woo Gow's levées, held in rented halls, were 'slightly more respectable' than earlier human displays of anomalous human bodies in taverns and on the street but predate what would later become consolidated into the more well-known institution of the sideshows in which 'freaks' displayed themselves.⁷ Nevertheless performances, such as Chang's, still differentiated, distanced and stigmatised individuals for the pleasure and entertainment of others.⁸ While

Chang's career shared many characteristics with those of the freak show performer, it largely predates the widespread use of the term 'freak', which was perhaps more commonly used in the United States than Australia at that time.⁹ According to Richard Broome, English fair culture arrived in Australia in the 1850s but it was not until around 1900 that Australia had a healthy sideshow circuit.¹⁰ Sideshows reached their most popular in Australia in 1930s.

Although a 'Chinese giant', Chang was not referred to as a 'freak' in Australia. In fact one newspaper even went as far as to comment:

Those who were under the expectation that they were to see a more vulgar exhibition of such a giant as would be exhibited at a Richardson's show, must have been agreeably disappointed, for, as we before hinted, Chang is evidently a gentleman of refinement and education.¹¹

The only time 'freak' was used in relation to Chang in Australian newspapers was on his death, when they described how he 'was undoubtedly what is commonly called by our American cousins a "freak"'. While some sideshow performers were happy to describe themselves as freaks, Chang did not.¹² This reminds us that being a 'freak' is not a quality that is intrinsically part of the person on display but is something which is socially constructed.¹³ It is a performance which has particular characteristics. It is 'not an inherent quality but an identity realised through gesture, costume and staging'.¹⁴ As such it tells us more about those who define people as freaks than it does about the freaks themselves.¹⁵ As Robert Bogdan observes 'Freak shows can teach us not to confuse the role a person plays with who that person really is'.¹⁶

Bogdan has further identified two primary modes in which freak performers were represented and promoted: exotic and

aggrandised. The exotic mode was one where the performer was presented as a 'strange creature from a little known part of the world' and the aggrandized mode was where the performer was given social status and their characteristics enhanced.¹⁷ These are, however, fluid classifications and freak performances could draw on a mix of both modes and for any given performer might change over the course of their career depending on what worked with their audiences.¹⁸ Chang's performance drew on both these modes. As a native of China, 'that country concerning which the greatest amount of popular curiosity has long prevailed', he could easily be promoted within the exotic mode.¹⁹ He was also promoted in aggrandised mode as 'a gentleman', 'an able scholar' and a man of intelligence and learning, particularly linguistic ability and who, even if his biography contained a degree of 'romance' and 'humbug', had 'learned the art of behaving with decorum'.²⁰

As Rosemarie Garland Thomson has observed different strategies were adopted to promote these modes: the oral spiel ('lecture') by showman or 'professor', fabricated or fantastic textual accounts ('biographies') for sale at the show, staging (how the performer was costumed, choreographed and staged), and finally the sale of drawings or photographs and, in the case of Chang, Chinese and Japanese curios (collectable visual souvenirs to take home).²¹ Again these were all strategies which were used in Chang's performances, described as *levées*, a term which was itself part of aggrandising Chang.²² Despite the performative nature of biographies, newspaper reports and photographic portraits these are still useful historical sources for understanding Chang the man.

The sale of photographs at performances such as Chang's were a particularly important tool of the act and popular souvenirs for

patrons. As one Australian reporter noted 'we took care to have a souvenir of the great Chang in his photograph, his autograph, and biographic history'.²³ They were a source of income for performers, provided publicity for their shows and the act of selling them perhaps offered a diversion from performing.²⁴ The number of photographs sold was a marker of success and photographs of more popular acts could also be purchased direct from photographic studios or the performer's agents.²⁵ By the 1880s and 1890s, at the end of Chang's performing career, many cities had studios which specialised in photographing freaks.²⁶ Even accounting for hyperbole, extraordinary numbers of photographs were created. Lavinia Warren (the wife of Tom Thumb) reportedly ordered over 50,000 photographs of herself at one time.²⁷

It is not known how many photographs of Chang were distributed over his lifetime. According to newspaper reports his Australian levées attracted hundreds of guests.²⁸ While on tour he held two levées a day (afternoon and evening) and at the Egyptian Palace and Crystal Palace in London was reported to have held 'upwards of 600 levées'.²⁹ At Chang's levées held for charity purposes, he gave away in the order of 300 photographs at each event.

A search of the web today for photographs of 'Chang Woo Gow', or one of his other names 'Chang, the Chinese giant', 'Chang Yu-Sing', '詹五九' or '詹世釵' (*zhān shì chāi*³⁰), reveals tens, if not hundreds, of different historical photographs taken of him. Rather than a small selection of negatives being printed over again in different places, Chang had new sets of photographs taken in the different places that he toured. These photographs were taken by many different photographers in places such as China (Ye Chung 宜昌 in Shanghai), the United Kingdom (London Stereographic Company, Elliot & Fry in London, C.W. Wilson in

Scotland), Europe (Pierre Petit in Paris), the United States (Eadweard Muybridge in San Francisco and Abraham Bogardus in New York), New Zealand (Bartlett in Auckland and London Portrait Room in Dunedin), Australia (Alexander McDonald and Patterson Brothers in Melbourne and Bardwell's Royal Studio in Ballarat) and Hong Kong (Afong Lai 赖阿芳)³¹. Most of the photographic studios where he was photographed were substantial respected photographers.

Rachel Adams identifies three main types of freak photography: the freak in a familiar context, the juxtaposition of the freak with a 'normal' person and the pairing of freaks with opposing extremes.³² Subjects were generally posed so that their 'abnormality' was emphasised. Giants for example might be photographed next to scaled-down chairs or wear hats or lifts in their shoes to make them appear taller (in Chang's case traditional white-soled platform shoes).³³ Some studios just doctored the negatives. It was also common for managers or family members to appear in photographs and sometimes descriptions of their 'condition' and biographies were included on the back or in captions.³⁴

Photographs taken of Chang drew on all the tropes of 'giant' photography but they were also a performance of being 'Chinese'. His 'Chineseness' was performed during levées via a short speech in Chinese (which was translated by his agent), writing his name in Chinese characters (one popular entertainment was to write his name in pencil on the wall ten foot from the floor), the exhibition and sale of Chinese and Japanese 'curiosities' and also by wearing and being photographed in Chinese dress.³⁵ In most portraits he wears formal Chinese robes (a full length white[?] gown embroidered with floral design, dragon robe or mandarin robe with imperial rank badge). In many he holds a folding fan and on occasion there are Chinese

studio props near him such as a water pipe or cloth on a stool with Chinese characters on it. If he wears a hat, it is a black mandarin hat with turned-up brim but most do not seem to have (or to show) the blue finial (or 'button') that he was reputedly awarded by the Chinese Emperor and only wore on 'state occasions'.³⁶ When he wore western dress it was the frockcoat of the dress suit with waistcoat complete with watch and watch chain in one hand he holds a top hat. These photographs complemented his act. Descriptions of his performance in Sydney describing him appearing in three outfits: 'Mandarin costume', 'Chinese court dress' and 'full European dress' or the 'ordinary evening dress of a European gentleman'.³⁷ During his tour of the United States in 1880 with Barnum he is reported to have also worn a much wider range of costumes including 'a French military uniform', 'full armour', dress of the 'Mongolian warrior'.³⁸ No photographs have been found of these to date.

Most of the photographs produced were full length portraits taken in the studio. Given the *raison d'être* of his performance was that he was a 'giant' it is noteworthy that at least two head-and-shoulders portraits of him were created—one in a suit and jacket and waistcoat and one in a dragon robe.³⁹ A series of outdoor portraits that were also taken of him in the Woodward Gardens in San Francisco where Chang displayed himself as part of his tour in 1870.⁴⁰ It was a mixture of amusement park, museum, art gallery, zoo and aquarium. In many of the portraits he poses with Kin Foo (who was of average height) and also with a western man who in photographs from his 1870-1871 tour of the United States, New Zealand and Australia is believed to be his agent Edward Parlett. In some of his earlier portraits he poses with 'Chung Mow, the Tartar rebel dwarf'. Chung Mow toured with Chang as far as New Zealand but does not seem to have come to Australia with him. In Australia, 'the



Figure 1: Chang Woo Gow with his travelling agent, Edward Parlett. *Carte de visite*, William Bardwell, Ballarat, 1871. State Library of Victoria, Picture Collection, H32780.

Australian Tom Thumb' accompanied Chang's act for a while but the two do not seem to have been photographed together.

In addition to photographs, Chang's public persona and life were also described in thousands of newspaper reports and reviews of his levées in the places he travelled, both during his lifetime and after he died. A number of biographical accounts were also published and sold at his levées. Biographies were a key element of freak show performances and these accounts were often



Figure 2: From left to right: Kin Foo and Chang Woo Gow with their travelling agent, Edward Parlett. *Carte de visite*, A. McDonald, St George's Hall, Bourke Street East, Melbourne, 1871. D.R. O'Hoy Collection.

embellished in order to boost public interest and sales.⁴¹ Most newspaper accounts about Chang draw heavily from these published accounts. While these embellishments may have fooled some people, even at the time there was an awareness of the fabrication that seemed to be an inherent part of them.⁴²

Chang published at least five slightly different 'autobiographical' accounts which discussed his life and travels. The earliest was published in London (1866),⁴³ one in York (1869),⁴⁴ another in Auckland, New Zealand

(dated c1869 but which should rightly be 1870 the year he toured there),⁴⁵ another was published in Sydney (1871).⁴⁶ What appears to have been a final publication was published in Liverpool in the United Kingdom in 1882.⁴⁷ While some of these monographs might describe themselves as 'autobiography' with a section, for example, titled 'The Autobiography of Chang (translated from the Chinese)', it is impossible to know how much of the text was written by Chang (translated from Chinese or otherwise), and how much written by his agent of the time. His agent Edward Parlett is acknowledged as a joint author of one of the monographs, although elements of others are written in the third person rather than the first person suggesting a second author. Each biographical pamphlet, except the last one published in 1882, builds on the previous account with slight variations, which as we shall see can be quite revealing.

The final account is quite startling as it offers a complete reinvention of Chang's family and early life in China. The account of Chang's career after leaving China, however, largely matches what is known from other sources. He also changes his name from 'Chang Woo Gow' to 'Chang Yu-sing'.⁴⁸ It is almost as if another giant may have toured as 'Chang the Chinese Giant' using some of Chang Woo Gow's backstory but under the name 'Chang Yu-Sing'. However, photographs taken by Abraham Bogardus in New York of Chang during his tour in the 1880s are clearly labelled as 'Chang Yu-sing' and show the same man as those of 'Chang Woo Gow'.⁴⁹

What follows is an attempt to pull together a coherent account of Chang Woo Gow's life by contrasting various published biographical accounts and comparing and supplementing them with other primary source material. The early accounts of Chang's life state that he was born in the city of 'Fychow' [Huizhou, 徽州] in 'Au-Hwy [Anhui, 安徽] province' in

Eastern China in the basins of the Yangtze and Huai River.⁵⁰ In contrast the 1882 account reports that he was born in 1847 in 'Waang-Hue, near Pekin [Beijing, 北京], and in the most hilly part of the country'.⁵¹ While the area around Huizhou is 'hilly' it is a long way from Beijing.

This part of Anhui province was well-known for its tea and the quality of its 'Indian' ink and printing.⁵² According to a Chinese language account, which also has an element of the fantastical about it, there were two Chinese brothers who were ink makers in Anhui who were giants. The account describes how a 'westerner' came and 'hired them away with a large sum of money' and that 'spectators fought to shower them with coins, whereby heavy profits were reaped'.⁵³

Three kinds of teas are associated with Anhui in the nineteenth-century: Moyune (婺源, Wuyuan) Tienkai (屯溪, Tunxi) and Fychow (徽州, Huizhou).⁵⁴ Fychow (Huizhou) and Moyune (Wuyuan) are not that far from each other. Modern day Huizhou is an area to the southwest of Huangshan city and Wuyuan is to the north of Huangshan city. 'Moyuen' was the name Chang gave the house in Bournemouth that he bought and lived in. It was apparently named after his birthplace.⁵⁵ An unattributed and unsourced Chinese language Wikipedia entry for Chang also states that he was born in 安徽 (Anhui) province, 婺源 (Wuyuan) county, 浙源 (Shangrao) district in 虹關 (Zheyuan) village (which is now in Jiangxi (江西) province).⁵⁶

According to his first four biographies Chang's parents were of average height. His father was a 'Confucian scholar' (but deceased), his grandfather a 'sage' and his brother (tall like him) a decorated soldier in the Chinese Imperial army. He had two sisters, a favourite who died and a surviving sister who was also very tall. His mother was described as still alive and over the age of ninety. In contrast the 1882 account describes

his parents as of average height, but as both still alive and 'independent, and large tea and silk growers'. Rather than three siblings he has five brothers and three sisters also of average height.⁵⁷ Earlier accounts state that after the death of his favourite sister and following the advice of his dying father he decided to begin a life of travel. The 1882 account provides no real reason for his move to London; it just mentions that the children and men where he lived would not associate with him and that he began travelling the world exhibiting himself at the age of eighteen.⁵⁸

Before his departure from Shanghai the earlier published biographies also describe him arriving in 'Soo Chow' [Suzhou] just in time to see 'the Imperial army, headed by an English general' free the city from 'rebels'.⁵⁹ This is a reference to Charles 'Chinese' Gordon and the Ever Victorious Army's defeat in 1863 of the Taiping army who had captured Suzhou as part of the Taiping rebellion. This account may have been invented to add some interest but it may also have had some basis in fact as in order to get from his birthplace in Anhui to Shanghai he would probably have passed through Suzhou.

According to his published accounts Chang is then persuaded to leave Shanghai in 1865 to tour London accompanied by 'Kin Foo, Lady Chang, Chang Moo [Chung Mow?], Alook, A'Yang, and an interpreter and agent [James Marquis Chisholm]'.⁶⁰ All his biographies basically tell a similar story of this time in London through to his arrival in Australia. Contemporary newspaper accounts at the time also support these accounts.

In London he held levées at the Egyptian Hall⁶¹ and went to Marlborough House, 'by command', to visit the Duke of Cambridge.⁶² Over the next six years he toured different cities in England, was on display at the Paris Exposition in 1867, went across to Dublin,

then back to northern England and Scotland, celebrating New Year's Eve in the city of Aberdeen in 1869. In June or July 1869 he arrived in New York where he spent twelve weeks at 'Barnum's American Museum' (which burnt down a few years later). He then toured the eastern states before taking a train to California where he spent time as an attraction at Woodward Gardens alongside other 'human curiosities' such as 'Japanese acrobats, tribes of American Indians, Sandwich Islanders and circus freaks'.⁶³ Chang left San Francisco in September 1870 for Honolulu where according to his biographies he was invited to attend a party at 'Queen Emma's' residence. After seeing the 'objects of interest on the Islands' Chang's party travelled on to Auckland.

Chang's published biographies do not provide much detail about the tour of New Zealand and Australia and so this part of Chang's life needs to be pieced together using newspaper and others sources. The composition of Chang's party over this period changed considerably. The one constant was Kin Foo. He left China with James Marquis Chisholm as his agent but arrived in Auckland, New Zealand in October 1870 with his agent Edward Parlett, 'the Tartar Dwarf Chung Mow', interpreters, Kin Foo and a child.⁶⁴ According to the *Hawke's Bay Herald*, the baby was called 'Fireworks' and was displayed such that 'knots of ladies speedily gathered'.⁶⁵ Although this was apparently done 'to the intense satisfaction of Kin Foo' there are no further reports of the baby being on public display.

Chang and his party then toured Dunedin, Nelson and Christchurch in November and December before sailing to Australia. Accompanied by Kin Foo and his agent, Edward Parlett, Chang arrived in Melbourne on 24 January 1871.⁶⁶ They had their first levée two days later at the Weston Opera House on 26 January.⁶⁷ While in Victoria he visited Bendigo, Echuca, Geelong, Ballarat before

taking the *Macedon* from Melbourne on 24 April to Sydney. He and Kin Foo performed at the School of Arts where they were visited by the Earl and Lady Belmore and Chang and his party were later guests of 'his Excellency' and dined with 'his lordship at Government House'.⁶⁸ After their shows in Sydney they then had performances in West Maitland, Singleton, Muswellbrook, Scone and Newcastle over June. By July they were in Goulburn, in August Wollongong then Brisbane and in September on to Warwick and Ipswich before returning to Bathurst in October. On 25 November 1871, Mr and Mrs Chang and Kin Foo left for Shanghai, on the *Novelty*, via Auckland.⁶⁹

Although most of his levées were conducted on a purely financial basis, Chang, Kin Foo and the other entertainers who accompanied them, also held a number of levées to raise money for hospitals and asylums. In February 1871 there was a 'Kin Foo Benefit' hosted at the Weston Opera House in Melbourne, although it is not clear what the money was raised for.⁷⁰ In March, Chang visited the Bendigo Benevolent Asylum and then held two levées in which half the receipts were to be donated to the Asylum.⁷¹ While in Sydney he announced that he intended to visit 'all the principal charitable institutions in the city and suburbs' in order to give inmates the opportunity of 'viewing' him. Then on 23 May a benefit was held in which three hundred photographs of 'various subjects' were given away.⁷² In Newcastle he again had a benefit where he promised to 'give two hundred pictures away' and while in Goonda (near Ipswich in Queensland) he visited the local lunatic asylum.⁷³

Two significant events occurred during Chang's time in Australia which are worth describing in more detail. Neither received the kind media attention that you might expect today. The first event is that sometime in March or April Chang parted ways with

his travelling agent, Edward Parlett. Parlett is first mentioned in advertisements as Chang's agent as early as February 1869 in England.⁷⁴ He is listed on the passenger list of the *Tararua* when it lands in Melbourne and is described as Chang's agent in newspaper advertisements and also as one of the performers at Chang's levées where it is reported that he would introduce Chang 'giving a sketch of his life and travels'.⁷⁵ There is, however, no further mention of him after 6 March 1871 and he is not listed on the passenger list for the *Macedon* which Chang, Kin Foo, a child and two servants took to Sydney on 28 April 1871.⁷⁶ The breakdown in the business relationship was sufficiently great that on 30 October Parlett took 'Kin Foo's husband', a Mr Howell, to the Bathurst Circuit Court for slander.⁷⁷ He sought £1,000 damages but got £30. The break with Parlett is revealing as Chang, Kin Foo and presumably her husband continued on with the tour without an agent. It demonstrates that he and Kin Foo's careers were not dependant on their agent and that they could now function without one and could presumably, if they wished, choose an agent.

The second significant event occurred in Sydney. According to the *Illustrated Sydney News* in 1893 (on Chang's death), while Chang was exhibiting in Sydney, he met, through the secretary to the Sydney School of Arts Hall Mr John Rogers, a 'Miss Kitty Santley'.⁷⁸ Miss Santley was described as 'an accomplished young lady', 'of respectable character and connections' who 'was companion to Mrs Rogers's family' and daughter of a well-known Geelong publisher.⁷⁹ Most newspaper accounts of the marriage state that she was born in Geelong or Australia but according to information provided on the 1881 and 1891 Census returns for the United Kingdom, she was born in Liverpool, Lancashire.⁸⁰

The couple presumably met sometime in April 1871 while Chang was performing in

Sydney. Newspaper reports indicate that they were married in early November before sailing to Brisbane on 7 November. They were married by the Rev John Graham 'according to the Congregational ritual' at Graham's residence in Sydney.⁸¹ Congregational churches were Protestant Christian churches in which each congregation independently and autonomously runs its own affairs. Chang was also buried according to Congregational church rites and involved in supporting Christian causes in later life so this association with the church continued. What is interesting about reports on the marriage is the general lack of interest they show in it. While the event was widely reported it was done so in both Australia and New Zealand, in very brief and neutral terms, simply noting that Chang had married 'a young lady from Geelong', a 'European lady', or 'native of Geelong'.⁸² Only the *Wagga Wagga Advertiser and Riverine Reporter*, chose to report in its 'Odds and Ends' section written by their 'Sydney correspondent' to use the event to make some snide remarks about cross-cultural relationships in the guise of a joke:

Chang the great has taken unto himself a wife. A lady resident of Sydney has had the hardihood to say "Yes" to the modest proposal of a Chinese suitor. There certainly is no accounting for tastes, but it is not generally looked upon as quite the thing for English people to intermarry with the Chinese. Indeed, some folks actually pronounce it the *height* of absurdity and a *great* mistake. Sydney ought to be very gratified though, for may we not ere long be blest with some little Changs, and will it not look well in history some century hence to read as a description of Sydney people, "there were giants among them in those days"!⁸³

Miss Santley does not seem to have been the only white woman to have shown an

interest in Chang. Newspaper accounts of Chang's levées occasionally specifically mention the significant number of women in the audience.⁸⁴ They also occasionally, and reluctantly, acknowledge that Chang was a handsome man. In 1865 the *Sydney Morning Herald* wrote that:

... judged by a Chinese standard of beauty, Chang may really be called handsome. His expression is singularly mild and gentle, almost to effeminacy. There is something very courteous and engaging, too, in his mien as he walks about from one spectator to another, shaking hands with all who desire that honour.⁸⁵

In 1870 the *Star* in New Zealand reported that 'For an Asiatic he is decidedly good-looking, and he converses freely in several tongues'.⁸⁶ According to the *Ballarat Star* one unnamed woman was even prepared to proposition Chang:

When visiting one of the Pleasant Creek institutions he [Chang] was presented with a handsome bouquet by a young woman, who asked in return to be permitted to kiss his celestial visage. Chang blushed, hesitated, and at length granted the request. The lady then gave a narrative of her worldly prospects—rich shares in North Cross Reef—which she would place at Chang's disposal, should he make her his bride.⁸⁷

The *Launceston Examiner* also reported on this woman's interest in Chang and described how she had 'offered him a share in her gold mine if he married her'.⁸⁸ She was 'stopping at the same hotel' as Chang but on the party's departure for Geelong, returned to her home in Pleasant Creek. There seems to have been no further developments between them after this. While both these articles are condescending and mocking in tone they do

not use this woman's infatuation to moralise about cross-cultural relationships.

What newspaper accounts of both these events fail to do is to comment on Kin Foo, who up until Chang's marriage to Catherine Santley, was described as 'Chang's wife'. Despite being prominently promoted as part of Chang's levées we know much less about her than Chang. Chang's levées often included other performers, although these acts were not as unusual as those normally associated with 'freak shows'.⁸⁹ The idea was to create an interesting and entertaining afternoon or evening out. Chang's levées included dwarfs like Chung Mow and the Australian Tom Thumb but also musicians and singers and at one point, a Mr Singleton, described himself as a 'kestronographist'. Kestronography appears to be a form of papertole.⁹⁰ While Chang usually received top billing, Kin Foo was commonly given second billing with one reviewer noting that she 'considerably enhances the pleasure derived from the interview'.⁹¹ Portraits of her were also posted in windows to promote the levées.⁹²

Kin Foo, or 'Golden Lily', was initially promoted as simply a 'Chinese lady'. As *The Argus* reported she 'attracted a good deal of attention' because she is a 'young and very pretty Chinese lady' like those that 'we see so often in Chinese pictures, but so seldom see in real life'.⁹³ Kin Foo, however, shaped her public persona over time so that her role in the act went beyond simply appealing to the exotic. An early report from her displays in London in 1865 describes her as 'modest, not to say shy, she will consent to exhibit her mite of a foot, which is the true "golden lily" in shape, size and uselessness' but by the time she is touring Bendigo in 1871 the *Bendigo Advertiser* is forced to ponder 'whether her feet are of diminutive size usually accredited to Chinese ladies, we are unable to say, as they were not exhibited'.⁹⁴ Instead she 'chats to the visitors in fair English and sells

photographs of the troupe, and other odds and ends'. Those 'odds and ends' were Chinese and Japanese 'curiosities' such as displays of fans and 'tasteful articles in ivory, scented wood' and other articles 'chiefly suitable for ladies, who formed a considerable portion of the audience'.⁹⁵ Some were simply on display as part of the *levée* but others were available for sale. Newspapers in Australia reported that she gained the 'good opinions of all who spoke to her' with her 'affability' and 'her comely features and conversational manner were the admiration of all present, especially the ladies, who were ever and anon engaged with her and hearing the many incidents of her travels'.⁹⁶

Soon after arriving in London in 1865 it was reported that Chang had refused to leave China without a wife to accompany him and so his manager had to find him a wife, Kin Foo, before they left.⁹⁷ There is also mention of a female maid who accompanied her but the maid very quickly disappears from reports. Promotional material published in English newspapers during his tour of England between 1866 and 1868 also clearly describes Kin Foo as Chang's wife.⁹⁸ Chang's 1869 biography offers a more 'romantic' description of their courtship and marriage. In it Chang and Kin Foo met at a temple in Shanghai while both grieving for family members—Chang his sister and father and Kin Foo her parents—and that they bonded over this grief and married soon after—Kin Foo having no one to look after her and Chang not wanting to travel to London alone.⁹⁹ Kin Foo is still being described in newspapers as Chang's wife up until the party arrived in Sydney at the end of April 1871.¹⁰⁰

After this point, however, she is simply referred to as a 'Chinese lady'.¹⁰¹ This is mirrored in Chang's autobiographical accounts. She is still described as Chang's wife in his 1870 account published in New Zealand but in his 1871 biography published

in Sydney, although she is mentioned, she is not part of his biography and all references to her as his wife have been removed.¹⁰² There is no mention of her at all in his 1882 biography.¹⁰³ While it is difficult to be certain it seems from this that Chang did originally 'marry' Kin Foo in Shanghai prior to leaving for London and that he subsequently married Catherine Santley in Sydney. It was acceptable within Chinese society at the time, provided you could afford it, to have multiple wives and concubines. What the 'marriage' in China might have involved is difficult to know as marriage records were not kept in China at this time. The nature of any marriage would also have been further complicated if Kin Foo was indeed an orphan and if they had married in Shanghai away from Chang's family and village.¹⁰⁴

Kin Foo's life history is confused even further by the mention in an obituary for Chang published in 1893 that although it was 'generally thought' that Chang was married to Kin Foo that in fact she been married to a 'Mr Phahlert, who piloted the giant to this country'. This is presumably a reference to Mr Parlett (Chang's agent), but in the slander case, described above, Mr Howell is described as Kin Foo's husband. It is also possible that there was another man in Kin Foo's life, as a 'Mr Parfhlet' (perhaps an alternate spelling of 'Phahlert') is listed as travelling from Dunedin to Melbourne on the same ship as Chang, Kin Foo and Mr Parlett in January 1871.¹⁰⁵ The historical record beyond newspaper reports and Chang's biographies is also not much more revealing. In shipping records, for example, she is listed as 'Mrs Kin Foo', perhaps following the Chinese custom of women keeping their names after marriage. Some information about her is also just wrong; such as one report that described her as 'a lady from Japan'.¹⁰⁶ It is also possible, that as a Chinese woman travelling outside China, that Kin Foo was able to operate outside the social norms of both China and Australia have



Kin Foo holding baby 'Fireworks'. Note the rings on her left ring finger. *Carte de visite*, Bardwell's Royal Studio, Ballarat, 1871. D.R. O'Hoy Collection.

relationships with both these men.

This essay has focussed its attention on Chang's tour of New Zealand and Australia in 1870-1871 based primarily on digitised newspaper records in Australia, New Zealand and to a lesser extent the United Kingdom; biographical accounts published around the time; and also historical photographs of Chang available online. In order to get a better understanding of what happened to Chang, Catherine, Kin Foo and Kin Foo's baby, significant additional research is required into undigitised material

and also other historical sources in other parts of the world. As noted at the start of this essay, the 1882 published account about Chang Yu-Sing (which according to photographs was Chang Woo Gow) contains such substantially different biographical information that it might almost relate to a different person. According to this account on leaving Australia Chang went to: Java, the Philippines, Japan, India (1873), Rangoon, Burma, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, Thailand, Macao, Hong Kong, China, the Paris International Exhibition (1878), Austria, Germany, Russia, then returned to London in May 1880 to exhibit at the Royal Aquarium for a season,¹⁰⁷ before being lured back to New York by P.T. Barnum in December 1880, which is where the account finishes.¹⁰⁸ It is a sufficiently grandiose travel itinerary that it cannot be taken at face value, particularly given it may have been co-written by Barnum.

What can be substantiated about Chang's life from newspaper reports after Australia is that Mr and Mrs Chang and Kin Foo left Australia for Shanghai, via Auckland in November 1871.¹⁰⁹ Kin Foo's baby is listed as arriving in Sydney on April 1871 but there is no mention of him/her after this or in shipping notes when the group left Australia.¹¹⁰ The baby appears to have been born during their tour of the United States but its father is unknown and it would have turned one year at around the time Kin Foo left in November.¹¹¹

After retiring from exhibiting, Chang began a business importing Chinese goods into England.¹¹² It seems he and Catherine settled for a time on the Isle of Wight but after Chang contracted suspected TB in 1890, they moved to Bournemouth, and eventually ended up living at 'Moyuen' at 288 Southcote Road, hoping for a cure.¹¹³ In 1891 Chang was reported to have become a 'naturalized British subject' with the curious addition that he was also an 'earnest Christian worker'.¹¹⁴

Chang died on 5 November 1893 only a few months after his wife Catherine (who died in June).¹¹⁵ His private funeral was attended by about one hundred mourners and friends. He was buried with his wife in the nonconfirmist section of the cemetery according to Congregational rites.¹¹⁶

The Chang family furniture and household effects as well as Chang's 'collection of curiosities, ivories, [and] enamels' were auctioned in 958 lots after his death.¹¹⁷ This included the 'silver lever watch (3½ inches in diameter and weighing about two pounds)' given to him by Queen Victoria and also a crystal goblet presented to him by the King of Siam [Thailand]. The will he wrote on the day he died left his estate of £1509 to his two teenage sons—Edwin Santley and Ernest Alfred—who were brought up by a friend and photographer, William J. Day, after their parents' deaths.¹¹⁸ Information in the census records states that Edwin was born in Shanghai (c1877) and Ernest in Paris (c1879).¹¹⁹ In 1901 they were still living in Bournemouth, in Lansdowne Road and were using the surname 'Gow'.¹²⁰

Writing a biographical account of Chang Woo Gow's life is an almost impossible task due to the distortions created by his fame as a performing giant. It does however make some important contributions to our understanding of Australia's Chinese history. Chang and Kin Foo's careers spanned across many countries, through which they appeared to be able to travel freely. In Australia and New Zealand this was not because he was granted any special exceptions because he was a 'giant' or an 'entertainer' but because he was travelling during a period where restrictions on Chinese arrivals did not exist. In the colonies of Victoria and New South Wales, earlier legislation that limited Chinese arrivals had been repealed and in New Zealand, Queensland and California they were yet to be introduced. Chinese-Australian histories

have a tendency to focus on the restrictions placed on would-be Chinese arrivals and the ramifications of these. Chang and Kin Foo's experience is a reminder that during certain periods these restrictions did not apply.

Chang's courtship and marriage to Catherine contributes to our understanding of the significant number of relationships which were formed between Chinese men and white women in Australia.¹²¹ Their relationship appeared to have been a successful one which lasted until their deaths, just over twenty years after they married and produced two sons who grew to adulthood. While their relationship might have been privately frowned upon as inappropriate for a range of reasons, it was not, on the whole, used by politicians or the press as a vehicle to attack the presence of Chinese in Australia or to moralise about mixed-race relationships. Probing edge cases, such as Chang and Catherine's relationship, helps us to appreciate how other mixed-race relationships might have developed and been tolerated and even accepted by the communities in which such couples lived.

The increasing availability of digital copies of the world's newspapers has in some cases resulted in an almost overwhelming amount of information. The lacunae that still exist are therefore revealing for what they say about the social mores of the day. Not only was there very little detail published about Chang and Catherine's relationship and marriage, there was also no comment about the fact that Kin Foo had, prior to their relationship, been described as Chang's wife and the mother of his baby. Kin Foo also appears to have formed at least one relationship with a white man but again the newspapers showed no interest in reporting this. There is so little coverage of Kin Foo's baby that it disappears from the historical record without even being identified as a boy or a girl. Similarly, no newspaper reported the fact that Chang and Kin Foo had separated from their agent who

had travelled with them for several years. This only came up when the dispute reached the courts and even then there was only limited interest in it.

Finally, the reading of Chang and Kin Foo's lives that has been explored in this essay also offers us a glimpse of how they exercised agency in the management of their careers and actively shaped their public representation. While we do not know the details of the breakdown in the business relationship between Chang, Kin Foo (her husband) and Edward Parlett, his departure did not halt their tour which continued on for several more months. Kin Foo also changed her on-stage persona from one where she was a beautiful passive object, there to be viewed only, into one in which she conversed with the public who had come to view her and, through her partnership with Chang, had stories of her own to tell about their travels. She also seems to have made choices about the involvement of her baby in performances.

As a Chinese giant it was going to be difficult for Chang to avoid being viewed as exotic. He nevertheless shaped this public image into one that was also of an educated, Chinese man of standing who was culturally refined and a philanthropist. And despite the public construction of Kin Foo as his wife chose to marry another woman and rework his stage persona. On his death he was remembered as a Chinese giant but he was also remembered as a husband, father, friend, businessman, philanthropist and a part of everyday life in Bournemouth. As the *Hampshire Advertiser* reported after his death: 'People always found him friendly and affable, and after the first novelty wore off, Chang in his appearances among the residents was always well received and attracted no special attention'.¹²²

Endnotes

1. 'Chang Woo Gow' was the English name Chang most commonly used during his lifetime

and was written in Chinese as '詹五九'. It was occasionally misspelt as 'Chang Woo Goo'. Chang was also known as 'Chang Yu-Sing' and 'Chang, the Chinese giant'. The Chinese entry in Wikipedia calls him '詹世钗' (pronounced *zhān shì chāi* in Mandarin but Chang would have said his name in either Hui, Wu or Gan, the dialects spoken in the region where he was born).

2. His impeccable dress sense and dignified demeanour has also been noted by Geoffrey Batchen. Geoffrey Batchen, 'A Perfect Likeness', in *Mirror with a Memory: Photographic Portraiture in Australia* (Canberra: National Portrait Gallery, 2000), 30–31.

3. In one, a white man poses cowering or being threatened by Chang. In another two white women turn away from the camera and appear to be weeping. One kneels with her head bowed against Chang and the other stands on a ladder with one arm and her head resting on his shoulder.

4. Sophie Couchman, 'In and out of Focus: Chinese and Photography in Australia, 1870s–1940s' (PhD Thesis, La Trobe University, 2009).

5. Sophie Couchman, "'Then in the Distance Quong Tart Did We See": Quong Tart, Celebrity and Photography', *Journal of Australian Colonial History* 8 (2006): 59–182.

6. 'Kin Foo' was sometimes referred to as 'King Foo and 'Kin Foo'. 'Catherine' was also referred to as 'Kitty'.

7. Robert Bogdan, *Freak Show: Presenting Human Oddities for Amusement and Profit*, Reprint edition (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), 10; Rosemarie Garland Thomson, ed., 'Introduction: From Wonder to Error – A Genealogy of Freak Discourse in Modernity', in *Freakery: Cultural Spectacles of the Extraordinary Body* (New York: NYU Press, 1996), 2.

8. Thomson, 'Introduction: From Wonder to Error – A Genealogy of Freak Discourse in Modernity', 10.

9. Using Tim Sherratt's QueryPic tool it is possible to map the number and proportion of newspaper articles in Trove and DigitalNZ that

- use the term 'freak'. A scan of the results suggests that 'freak' as a term started to be commonly applied to performers from about the 1880s onwards. Sherratt, Tim, 'QueryPic: Exploring digitised newspapers from Australia and New Zealand', <http://dhistory.org/querypic/create/> (accessed 1 February 2015).
10. Richard Broome, 'Windows on Other Worlds: The Rise and Fall of Sideshow Alley', *Australian Historical Studies* 112 (1999): 7.
11. *Empire*, 1 May 1871, 2.
12. *Illustrated Sydney News*, 18 November 1893, 14.
13. Bogdan, *Freak Show*, xi.
14. Rachel Adams, *Sideshow U.S.A.: Freaks and the American Cultural Imagination* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), 6.
15. Broome, 'Windows on Other Worlds', 11.
16. Bogdan, *Freak Show*, 10.
17. *Ibid.*, 97.
18. *Ibid.*, 115.
19. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 25 December 1865, 6.
20. *Ibid.*; *Southland Times*, 15 October 1870, 2.
21. Thomson, 'Introduction: From Wonder to Error – A Genealogy of Freak Discourse in Modernity', 7, 10.
22. The word 'levée' has three meanings:
 1. A reception held by a person of distinction on rising from bed,
 2. An afternoon assembly at which a British sovereign or representative receives only men or
 3. A reception held usually in honour of a particular person. Chang's levées are used in the third meaning of the word.
23. *The Newcastle Chronicle*, 30 May 1871, 3.
24. Bogdan, *Freak Show*, 15.
25. *Ibid.*
26. *Ibid.*, 13.
27. *Ibid.*, 15.
28. For example in his first appearance in Sydney he was reported to have appeared before 'about 300 persons'. *Empire*, 1 May 1871, 2.
29. *Durham County Advertiser*, 15 January 1866, 5.
30. This is the mandarin pronunciation of his name which is the name used on his Wikipedia page. 'Zhan Shichai', Wikipedia (accessed 30 January 2015).
31. Photographs identified from public collections: Auckland Museum, Gold Museum Ballarat, Museum Victoria, National Portrait Gallery (Australia), National Portrait Gallery (Australia), Smithsonian, Syracuse University Digital Library, State Library of New South Wales Library, State Library of Victoria, University of California Berkeley Bancroft Library, University of Nevada Rene Library, University of Otago Library). From private collections: Dennis O'Hoy and Terry Bennett now owned by the Moonchu Foundation and known as Moonchu Collection of Early Photography of China. From various websites (www.worthpoint.com, www.oldchinaphotography.com, www.delcamp.net, www.flickr.com).
32. Adams, *Sideshow U.S.A.*, 114.
33. Bogdan, *Freak Show*, 13, 97.
34. *Ibid.*, 13; Adams, *Sideshow U.S.A.*, 114.
35. *Hawke's Bay Herald*, 15 November 1870, 3; *The Australasian*, 16 December 1865, 15; *The Argus*, 25 January 1871, 1.
36. *Australian Town and Country Journal*, 18 November 1893, 20; *Illustrated Sydney News*, 18 November 1893, 4; Note that by the second half of the nineteenth century it was possible for overseas Chinese to purchase imperial rank rather than earn it through the imperial examination process. Yen Ching-Hwang, 'Ch'ing's Sale of Honours and the Chinese Leadership in Singapore and Malaya (1877-1912)', *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 1, no. 2 (1 September 1970): 20-22; Paul Macgregor, 'Chinese Political Values in Colonial Victoria: Lowe Kong Meng and the Legacy of the July 1880 Election', in *Chinese Australians: Politics, Engagement and Resistance*, ed. Sophie Couchman and Kate Bagnall (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2015), 79-80.

37. *Freeman's Journal*, 29 April 1871, 7; *Empire*, 1 May 1871, 2.
38. Philip B. Kunhardt, Philip B. Kunhardt III, and Peter W. Kunhardt, *P.T. Barnum: America's Greatest Showman* (New York: Knopf, 1995), 274.
39. The one in western dress is reproduced in Lebovic and the other is held in the State Library of Victoria in their Victorian Patents Office copyright Collection, H96.160/1639. Josef Lebovic, Joanne Cahill, and Susette Cooke, *Masterpieces of Australian Photography* (Sydney: Josef Lebovic Gallery, 1989), 40.
40. University of California Berkeley Bancroft Library, Vol. 5 Helios Album. University of Nevada Rene Library, Special collections, Alfred Doten Collection; Edward Ball, *The Inventor and the Tycoon: A Gilded Age Murder and the Birth of Moving Pictures* (Doubleday, 2013), illustration credit 6.9.
41. Bogdan, *Freak Show*, 17; Thomson, 'Introduction: From Wonder to Error – A Genealogy of Freak Discourse in Modernity', 7.
42. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 25 December 1865, 6.
43. Woo Gow Chang, *The Autobiography of Chang, the Tall Man of Fychow, the Great Chinese Giant, Including His Celebrated Ode on the Crystal Palace, &c., &c., &c.* (London, 1866). Unfortunately I have not been able to access or read a copy of this rare volume.
44. Woo Gow Chang and Edward Parlett, *The Life and Travels of Chang, the Great Chinese Giant* (New York: Metropolitan Job Printing and Engraving Establishment, 1869).
45. Woo Gow Chang, *Chang Woo Gow: The Tall Man of Fychow : His Life and History of His Travels: Dedicated to the People of Australasia*. (Auckland, New Zealand: Jones, Printers, 1869).
46. Woo Gow Chang, *The Autobiography of Chang: His Travels & Notes by the Wayside through England, Ireland, Scotland, China, France, America, and the Colonies* (Sydney: J.A. Engel, 1871).
47. *The Life of Chang, the Celebrated Chinese Giant* (Liverpool: Printed by Mathews Brothers, 1882).
48. In fact there was a second Chinese giant who toured Australia in 1867, only six years after Chang. Three photographic portraits were taken of him by Arthur W. Burman (Bourke Street, Melbourne). Copies are held by the National Portrait Gallery, the State Library of Victoria and the Art Gallery of New South Wales. He toured as 'Chonkwicsee' or 'Choukwicsee' and was said to be born in 'North China'. *Bendigo Advertiser*, 14 September 1876, 2.
49. See for example: 'Chang Woo Gow (Chang Yu Sing)' by Abraham Bogardus in the National Portrait Gallery, NPG x128291.
50. Chang, *The Autobiography of Chang, the Tall Man of Fychow, the Great Chinese Giant, Including His Celebrated Ode on the Crystal Palace, &c., &c., &c.*; Chang and Parlett, *The Life and Travels of Chang, the Great Chinese Giant*, 5; Chang, *Chang Woo Gow*, 2; Chang, *The Autobiography of Chang: His Travels & Notes*, 3.
51. *The Life of Chang, the Celebrated Chinese Giant*, 16.
52. Archibald John Little, *The Far East* (Cambridge University Press, 2010), 102.
53. 《夜雨秋燈錄》卷四《長人》[A lamplit Account from a Rainy Autumn Night or An Account called an Autumn Night, Rain, and Lamplight, Chapter 4, 'Giants']. Thanks to Ely Finch for his translation of this. The account also describes a woman 'who remained pregnant for three years' and grew 'ever taller and belly ever more distended'. It was suggested that she should have been paired with one of the giants as a wife.
54. Augustus F. Lindley, *Ti-Ping Tien-Kwoh: The History of the Ti-Ping Revolution* (Day & Son Ltd, 1866), 839.
55. 'The Gentle Giant', <http://www.ashleighhotel.co.uk/chang.html> (accessed 6 January 2015).
56. '詹世釵', Wikipedia, <http://zh.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E8%A9%B9%E4%B8%96%E9%92%97> (accessed 21 January 2015).
57. *The Life of Chang, the Celebrated Chinese Giant*, 16.
58. *Ibid.*, 17.
59. Chang, *The Autobiography of Chang: His Travels & Notes*, 6; Chang, *Chang Woo Gow*, 4.

60. Chang, *Chang Woo Gow*, 5. 'Kin Foo' was also called 'Lady Chang'. 'Chang Moo' is probably 'Chung Mow, the Chinese dwarf' also known as 'Chung Mow, the Tartar Dwarf'. It was reported in 1865 that Chang was encouraged to leave Shanghai for London by James Marquis Chisholm who became his agent. *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 25 December 1865, 6.
61. *Queensland Times, Ipswich Herald and General Advertiser*, 16 January 1866, 4.
62. *The Australasian*, 16 December 1865, 15.
63. Marta Braun, *Eadweard Muybridge* (Reaktion Books, 2010), 60–61.
64. *Southland Times*, 25 October 1870, 2.
65. *Hawke's Bay Herald*, 15 November 1870, 3.
66. Victorian shipping lists mention the arrival of Mr Chang (40 years old), Mrs King Foo (29 years old) and Mr E. Parlett (31 years old) as arriving in Melbourne on the *Tararua*. There is no mention of Kin Foo's child or the two servants who appear to be with the group when they travelled to Sydney later. 'Index to Unassisted Inward Passenger Lists to Victoria 1852-1923', Public Records Office of Victoria website, http://prov.vic.gov.au/index_search?searchid=23 (accessed 26 January 2015).
67. <http://nla.gov.au/nla.news-article5841621>, 25 January 1871, 1.
68. *Goulburn Herald and Chronicle*, 13 May 1871, 3.
69. *Australian Town and Country Journal*, 25 November 1871, 27; *Sydney Mail and New South Wales Advertiser*, 25 November 1871, 1237.
70. *The Argus*, 18 February 1871, 8.
71. *Bendigo Advertiser*, 6 March 1871, 1.
72. *Evening News* (Sydney), 17 May 1871, 2. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 15 May 1871, 8.
73. *Australian Town and Country Journal*, 10 June 1871, 7; *Queensland Times, Ipswich Herald & General Advertiser*, 23 September 1871, 3.
74. *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 20 February 1869, 1.
75. Public Records Office of Victoria, Index to Unassisted Inward Passenger Lists to Victoria 1852-1923. Thanks to Pauline Rule for sharing a copy of the original shipping list with me. *Bendigo Advertiser*, 6 March 1871, 1; *Argus*, 18 February 1871, 1; 25 January 1871, 1.
76. *Bendigo Advertiser*, 6 March 1871, 1. State Records Authority of New South Wales, Shipping Master's Office, CGS 13278, Passengers Arriving 1855-1922, X123-124, SR Reel 424, 1871. Thanks to Pauline Rule for sharing this with me. The newspaper report listing arrivals off the *Macedon* also list a 'child' with the group. *Evening News*, 28 April 1871, 2. *Sydney Mail and New South Wales Advertiser*, 6 May 1871, 309.
77. *Evening News* (Sydney), 30 October 1871, 2.
78. *Illustrated Sydney News*, 18 November 1893, 14.
79. *Ibid.*; *The Goulburn Herald & Chronicle*, 15 November 1871, 2.
80. Public Records Office (UK), Census records, RG11/4024, Manchester, Herbert Street [1881]; RG12/903, Bournemouth, Southcote Road [1891]. Thanks to Marcel Safier for sharing copies of these with me.
81. *The Mercury*, 12 December 1871, 3. One newspaper account puts Rev. Graham's residence in Darlinghurst and the other in Ashfield.
82. For example: *Goulburn Herald & Chronicle*, 15 November 1871, 2; *Northern Argus*, 24 November 1871, 3; *Brisbane Courier*, 8 November 1871, 2; *Maitland Mercury & Hunter River Advertiser*, 9 November 1871, 3; *Geelong Advertiser*, 10 November 1871, 2; *Otago Witness*, 18 November 1871, 14; *Wanganui Herald*, 22 November 1871, 2.
83. *Wagga Wagga Advertiser and Riverine Reporter*, 18 November 1871, 2.
84. *Empire*, 1 May 1871, 2.
85. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 25 December 1865, 6.
86. *Star*, 5 December 1870, 2.
87. *Bendigo Advertiser*, 12 April 1871, 3.
88. *Launceston Examiner*, 25 April 1871, 3.
89. Thomson lists: ventriloquists, mesmerists, performing animals, beauty contests, sword swallowing, sharp shooters as common ancillary acts. Thomson, 'Introduction: From Wonder to

Error— A Genealogy of Freak Discourse in Modernity', 5.

90. *Geelong Advertiser*, 15 April 1871; 2. *The Argus*, 18 February 1871, 8.

91. *Star*, 5 December 1870, 2.

92. *Geelong Advertiser*, 15 April 1871, 2.

93. *Brisbane Courier*, 19 August 1871, 4.

94. *Louth and North Lincolnshire Advertiser*, 16 September 1865, 3; *Bendigo Advertiser*, 28 February 1871, 2.

95. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 6 May 1871, 7.

96. *Evening News*, 17 May 1871, 2; *Empire*, 1 May 1871, 2.

97. *Wellington Independent*, 26 December 1865, 6. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 25 December 1865, 6.

98. *Louth and North Lincolnshire Advertiser*, 16 September 1865, 3; *Durham County Advertiser*, 15 January 1866, 5; *Kentish Chronicle*, 21 July 1866, 1; *Newcastle Guardian*, 15 February 1868, 6.

99. Chang and Parlett, *The Life and Travels of Chang, the Great Chinese Giant*, 7.

100. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 29 April 1871, 7.

101. Except in one account, just before they leave Australia, when she is described as Chang's sister. *The Mercury*, 12 December 1871, 3.

102. Chang, *The Autobiography of Chang: His Travels & Notes*, 1, 32.

103. *The Life of Chang, the Celebrated Chinese Giant*.

104. Arthur P. Wolf and Chieh-shan Huang, *Marriage and Adoption in China, 1845-1945* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1980), 70-72.

105. *Illustrated Sydney News*, 18 November 1893, 14.

106. *Darling Downs Gazette and General Advertiser*, 16 August 1871, 2.

107. *South Australian Chronicle*, 31 July 1880, 24. Levées were held with the Australian Tom Thumb and Commodore Knott with whom Chang Woo Gow had performed in the past.

108. Barnum reportedly signed Chang for a one year contract at £120 per week plus board, lodging, transportation and profits from sales. *The Argus*, 6 January 1881, 7; *Clutha Leader* (NZ), 14 January 1881, 3. Also purported to be US\$500 per month. Kunhardt, Kunhardt III, and Kunhardt, P.T. Barnum, 274.

109. *Sydney Mail & New South Wales Advertiser*, 6 May 1871, 309.

110. *Ibid.*; *The Mercury*, 12 December 1871, 3; *Sydney Mail and New South Wales Advertiser*, 25 November 1871, 1237.

111. According to a report in *The Era* the baby was six months old in April 1871. *The Era*, 2 April 1871, 10.

112. *Hampshire Advertiser*, 8 November 1893, 4.

113. Ray Bright and Julie Bright, 'The Gentle Giant', accessed 6 January 2015, <http://www.ashleighhotel.co.uk/chang.html>; *Western Gazette*, 10 November 1893, 6.

114. *Ann Arbor Argus*, 16 January 1891, 3.

115. *Western Gazette*, 10 November 1893, 6.

116. *Ibid.*

117. *Western Gazette*, 4 May 1894, 6.

118. *Aberdeen Evening Express*, 6 April 1894, 2; Bright and Bright, 'The Gentle Giant'.

119. Public Records Office (UK), Census records, RG11/4024, Manchester, Herbert Street [1881]; RG12/903, Bournemouth, Southcote Road [1891]; RG13/1043, Bournemouth, Landsdowne Road [1901].

120. Public Records Office (UK), Census records, RG13/1043, Bournemouth, Landsdowne Road [1901].

121. For further examples see: Kate Bagnall, 'Golden Shadows on a White Land: An Exploration of the Lives of White Women Who Partnered Chinese Men and Their Children in Southern Australia, 1855-1915' (PhD thesis, University of Sydney, 2006).

122. *Hampshire Advertiser*, 8 November 1893, 4.