INTRODUCTION: THE TERMS JIATOU AND JIATOU ZAJU

Portraying the emperor on stage was not at all uncommon in the Yuan dynasty (1260-1368). This can be gathered from the fact that the emperor role, designated by the term jiatou, is one of the customary role types in Yuan drama. According to the Qinglouji (The Green Bower Collection), a valuable collection of short biographical notes on performers in the Yuan dynasty compiled around 1364, jiatou is one of the waijiao (extra roles) in zaju besides the female and male lead roles, dan (female) and mo (male):

[These extra role types] include the jiatou, the beauty pining in her boudoir, the bawd, the coquettish young girl, the high official, the poor, the brigand, the government servant, and those categories concerning immortals and Taoist deliverance, and family matters.

The term "jiatou" originally referred to the throne of the emperor which an old eunuch would carry in front of the emperor's carriage on an imperial tour of inspection. Since jiatou was an important insignia of an imperial tour, the modern Chinese scholar Sun Kaidi suggests that the term "jiatou zaju" must therefore involve at least a certain scene of the emperor going out in a carriage, as found in Act Three of both Hangong qiu (Autumn in the Palace of Han) and
Wutong yu (Rain on the Wutong tree). Sun's definition of jiatou zaju may represent the original meaning of this term, but the term “jiatou zaju” later acquired the more general meaning of all plays in which the role of an emperor is involved.

These jiatou zaju make up an important subgenre in the Yuan dramatic repertoire. From the Qinglouji, we learn that there were even a number of professional actresses who specialized in the performance of these jiatou zaju in the Yuan dynasty:

("Pearled Curtain Beauty") [Her performance of] zaju stands by itself today; [whether it is] the jiatou, the coquettish young girl, or the “soft” male lead, [she] always creates beauty out of the role.

("Timely Beauty") [Her performance of] zaju is most excellent in playing the beauty pining in her boudoir. [As for] the jiatou and the various dan roles, [her performance] is equally proper.

("The Southern Spring Joy") Excels in jiatou zaju; [she is] also a leading actress in the Capital.

("Natural Beauty") For zaju about a beauty pining in her boudoir, [she was] the best actress during her times. [Her impersonation of] a coquettish young girl or jiatou also reached the highest beauty.

Cross-dressing was very common in Yuan drama, and the majority of zaju performers were females who could play various kinds of male roles on stage. The above references suggest that the performance of jiatou zaju appears to have enjoyed considerable popularity in the Yuan dynasty.

However, in the Ming dynasty (1368-1644), jiatou zaju were outlawed and impersonations of the emperor on stage were prohibited for various reasons. I will discuss the prohibitions and some of the possible reasons why they were imposed in the Ming dynasty in the next section of this article. Previous studies have pointed out that the development of jiatou zaju therefore might have faced a different situation after these prohibitions. While we have records of two such prohibitions in the early Ming, we do not know how they were carried out or what their consequences were. In other words, we lack direct sources on the impact of these prohibitions, so how can we determine their effect on the jiatou zaju?
One way to do so is to compare different editions of the same jiatou zaju before and after the prohibitions to see if any changes were made. But which editions of the plays can we use for such a comparison? Of the seven hundred known titles from the Yuan dynasty, only some one hundred and sixty zaju have come down to us in one form or another, and only thirty of these plays have been preserved in a Yuan dynasty printing. In other words, the overwhelming majority of the Yuan plays that we have today only survive in late Ming dynasty editions, which scholars believe all originally derived from copies once kept in the imperial palace. Since there is a chance that these Ming editions may have undergone changes at the hands of censors or literati editors in the late Ming, they can only represent the state of the texts under the prohibitions.

For editions of the plays before the prohibitions, we have to turn to the thirty Yuan printings of zaju which survive today. In fourteen of these thirty Yuan printings, we can find the role type “jia,” a term commonly used to designate the emperor role on stage.

These fourteen Yuan editions of jiatou zaju can start to help us understand how emperor was represented on the stage before the Ming prohibitions. My approach in this study is to compare the Yuan and Ming editions of these fourteen jiatou zaju, which represent, respectively, the state of the texts before and after the prohibitions, in order to determine whether they reveal any changes or evidence of censorship related to the staging of the role of the emperor. Some of the key questions related to my inquiry are: Was the role of the emperor removed from these jiatou zaju after the prohibitions? Were all jiatou zaju censored as a result?

THE PROHIBITIONS ON JIATOU ZAJU IN THE MING DYNASTY

There were two prohibitions against the impersonation of the emperor on stage in the early Ming. The first was during the Hongwu reign. As recorded in the Yuzhi Da Ming lü (Imperial Code of the Great Ming) of 1397:

In general, when actors are performing either zaju or xiwen, they shall be allowed to costume neither as any emperor, king, empress, nor concubine of any era, neither loyal min-
ister nor ardent man of valor, neither the divine image of the prior sage nor the prior worthy—those who violate this shall be caned one hundred times. The households of officials or good citizens who allow such costuming shall be guilty of the same. Those who costume as spirits or Taoist transcendants, or virtuous husbands and chaste wives, or filial sons and compliant grandsons, or otherwise exhort people to good action are not bound within this proscription.\textsuperscript{14}

Previous scholars suggested that one possible reason for making such a prohibition is that using lowly actors and courtesans to impersonate emperors and sages appeared unpleasing to the Ming emperors and was considered disrespectful to the imperial order.\textsuperscript{15} Indeed, in the Wanli (1573-1620) edition of the \textit{Da Ming lü}, the first prohibition is accompanied by further explanations for why the prohibition was necessary: \textquotedblleft The emperor, the king, the empress and the concubine of all eras, the loyal minister and the ardent man of valor, and the divine images of the ancient sages and the ancient worthies, are characters whom the officials and the common people should all look up to with reverence, and [therefore] to impersonate them in performing \textit{zaju} is the most contemptuous.\textquotedblright\textsuperscript{16} In this first proscription, the emphasis is on the \textit{performance} of roles associated with the emperor and the imperial court.

About fourteen years after the first prohibition, in 1411, we find a more specified and stricter proclamation:

\textit{First day of the seventh month of the ninth year of Yongle (July 21,1411), Chief Supervising Secretary of the Office of the Scrutiny of Justice, Cao Run, and others request that an imperial directive be sent to Justice Offices to wit, that henceforth all citizens and entertainers who costume for \textit{zaju}—excepting those who, in keeping with proper codicils, costume as spirits or Taoist transcendants, virtuous husbands and chaste wives, filial sons and compliant grandsons, and all those who exhort people to goodness and those who sing joyously of peace, and are not bound by this proscription—especially those who hide away, pass along through singing, or print for sale anything not allowed by law that has lyrics that blaspheme emperors, kings, sages, or worthies, or that perform \textit{zaju} involving the role of the emperor, should be immediately seized and sent to the offices of justice for examination and order-}
ing. By imperial decree, after the public notices [of this prohibition] are displayed, all such songs must all be sought out and sent to government offices for destruction by fire within five days. If any dare hide away such items, their entire family will be killed.\footnote{17}

It is noteworthy that in this second prohibition, not only were impersonations of the emperor on stage prohibited, but the texts of these \textit{jiatou zaju} were also not allowed to be kept, circulated, or printed for sale. As scholars have suggested, this second proscription might have been a by-product of the collection of scripts at court for the enormous compilation project of the \textit{Yongle dadian} (\textit{The Great Canon of the Yongle Era}) carried out in the first decade of the fifteenth century which revealed the existence of such irrevocent texts.\footnote{18}

In addition, the lowly origins of the Hongwu Emperor (Zhu Yuanzhang, 1328-1398), and the similarities between some of the situations staged in these plays and his doings and those of his son, the Yongle Emperor (Zhu Di, 1364-1424), might be other reasons for these two prohibitions.\footnote{19}

As we have seen, these prohibitions were sweeping in their aim to ban all impersonations of the emperor and other sagely figures on stage. However, should we assume that they were strictly carried out, and that most \textit{jiatou zaju} were banned or destroyed as a result? To determine the actual impact of the prohibitions on these \textit{jiatou zaju}, I will now take a closer look at what happened to the fourteen Yuan edition \textit{jiatou zaju} in the Ming dynasty.\footnote{20}

\section*{VARIOUS CHANGES OBSERVED IN THE FOURTEEN \textit{JIATOU ZAJU}}

The fourteen plays in the thirty Yuan edition \textit{zaju} which stage the emperor are as follows:

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|}
\hline
\textbf{Table 1: Titles of Yuan Edition zaju Featuring the jia (Emperor)}
\hline
1. Guan Hanqing, \textit{Guan daiwang dangao hui}; short title \textit{Dandao hui} (Lord Guan Goes to the Feast with a Single Sabre)
\hline
2. Gao Wenxiu, \textit{Haojiu Zhao Yuan yu Shanghuang}; short title \textit{Yu Shanghuang} (Wine-craving Zhao Yuan Meets the Prior Emperor)
\hline
3. Ma Zhiyuan, \textit{Taihua shan Chen Tuan gaowo}; short title \textit{Chen Tuan gaowo} (At Taihua Mountain, Chen Tuan Rests on High)
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}
4. Shang Zhongxian, *Yuchi Gong sanduo shuo*; short title *Sanduo shuo* (*Yuchi Gong Thrice Seizes the Lance*)

5. Shang Zhongxian, *Han Gaohuang zhuozu qi Ying Bu*; short title *Qi Ying Bu* (*Gaohuang of the Han Washes His Feet and Thereby Enrages Ying Bu*)

6. Zhang Guobin, *Xue Rengui yijin huanxiang*; short title *Yijin huanxiang* (*Xue Rengui, Clad in Brocade, Returns to His Home Village*)

7. Wang Bocheng, *Li Taibai bian Yelang*; short title *Bian Yelang* (*Li Taibai is Banished to Yelang*)


10. Yang Zi, *Chengming dian Huo Guang guijian*; short title *Huo Guang guijian* (*Huo Guang Remonstrates as a Ghost at the Chengming Hall*)

11. Gong Tianting, *Sisheng jiao Fan Zhang ji shu*; short title *Fan Zhang ji shu* (*Friends in Life and Death: Fan Shi and Zhang Shao, Chicken and Millet*)

12. Zheng Guangzu, *Fu Chengwang Zhougong shezheng*; short title *Zhougong shezheng* (*In Aid of King Cheng, the Duke of Zhou Acts as Regent*)

13. Jin Renjie, *Xiao He yueye zhui Han Xin*; short title *Zhui Han Xin* (*Xiao He Pursues Han Xin During a Moonlit Night*)


For the purposes of the following discussion, I have divided these fourteen *jiatou zaju* into four different groups. Only eight of the fourteen plays survive in both Yuan and Ming editions. These eight can be divided into three different groups, A, B and C, according to the changes made to the “jia” (emperor) role in their Ming editions. Case A includes plays in which the jia has been removed, while Case B consists of works in which the jia role has been renamed. In Case C, the jia role remained unchanged. The other six *jiatou zaju*, Case D, survive only in Yuan editions.
Case A: "Jia" Removed through Various Means in Dandao hui,
Fan Zhang ji shu, Sanduo shuo, and Yijin huanxiang

In four of the jiatou zaju, the emperor was removed from their Ming editions in different ways. Previous studies on individual plays have pointed out that because of the prohibitions, changes needed to be made to these jiatou zaju so that they could still be performed. In some cases, the jia did not play a major part in the play and could be easily written out of the Ming editions. After the jia was removed, the information that the jia was supposed to deliver in the Yuan edition of the play was instead provided by a minister or a eunuch. For example, the Yuan edition of Dandao hui begins with the following stage direction:

[Jia, accompanied by his entourage, opens the play and stops.]
[Waimo (Lu Su) enters, presents a memorial, stops and speaks.]
[jia speaks.] [Waimo speaks and stops.] [Zhengmo plays the role of Senior Minister Qiao, enters and stops.] [Waimo speaks.] [Qiao ponders and speaks] The tripartition [of the empire between the kingdoms of Wei, Shu and Wu] has now been settled. I fear that further warfare would bring suffering to the people. You ministers should give the king your advice. [Qiao moves over and pays obeisance] [Jia speaks] [Qiao speaks] May your Majesty live a myriad years! In my humble opinion, we must not take back Jingzhou. [Jia speaks again.] [Qiao speaks] We must not! We must not!

The jia, here impersonating Sun Quan, only appears in the opening scene, when Lu Su, Minister of the Kingdom of Wu, presents to him a memorial, which demands that Guan Yu return Jingzhou. The dialogue of the jia is not included in the Yuan edition, a common practice for the dialogues of minor characters. Sun appears to have agreed to Lu's suggestion, only for Senior Minister Qiao to enter and try to stop this plan.

As the jia only appears in this opening scene, it was not difficult for the editors to write him out of the Ming edition. In this later edition, the play commences with the entrance of Lu Su, who is now impersonated by the role of chongmo (secondary male role).

[Chongmo Lu Su enters and speaks]......I now wish to take back Jingzhou, but I suppose with Lord Guan as the governor there, he would not return it to us. Now, I send Gener-
al Huang Wen to present to our king a memorial proposing three plans......

Lu simply explains that he has sent a memorial to his master Sun Quan and reported to him about his scheme. This change allows the role of the jia (Sun Quan) to be removed from the play.

Another related adjustment can also be observed in the timu (title) of the two editions of this play:

**Yuan edition:** Senior Minister Qiao remonstrates with the Emperor of Wu
Sima Hui resigns from his official post

**Ming edition:** Sun Zhong plans to monopolize the Jiangdong region
[Lu Su] invites Mr. Qiao to discuss the three schemes

As Sun Quan no longer makes an appearance in the Ming edition, Senior Minister Qiao cannot remonstrate with him directly as in the Yuan edition. Therefore, a change is made to the timu: we are now informed of Sun's plan to monopolize the Jiangdong region (announced by Lu Su in the play) and Lu discusses with Qiao his three schemes to force Guan Yu to return Jingzhou.

Similarly, we find that the jia featured in the opening scenes of the Yuan editions of two other plays, Fan Zhang ji shu and Sanduo shuo, was later removed from their Ming editions. For example, similar to the case of Dandao hui, in the Yuan edition of Sanduo shuo, the jia, Emperor Gaozu of the Tang Dynasty (r.618-627), was actually receiving the remonstration of an official, Liu Wenjing, in Act One, but the jia was then removed from the Yuanqu xuan edition in the Ming dynasty.

If the jia only makes brief appearances in the opening scene, then the task of removing the emperor is relatively easy. In cases where the jia is more involved in the entire plot, however, more effort would be needed to remove the emperor's role. A good example is Yijin huanxiang, which was rewritten in the Ming dynasty under the title of Xue Rengui ronggui guli (Xue Rengui Returns in Glory to his Native Village) and included in the Yuanqu xuan.

This play tells an interesting story about the discovery of the merits of Xue Rengui as the real hero on the battlefield, his rise to
the higher ranks, and his subsequent return to his native village. In the Yuan edition, Emperor Taizong of the Tang Dynasty was featured throughout the wedge (xiezi) and the first three acts. In Act One, he personally supervises a shooting match between the soldier Xue Rengui and his commanding officer Zhang Shigui, an imposter who has falsely claimed most of Xue's military merits. Xue Rengui wins the shooting match and proves himself to be the real hero. He is appointed to higher rank, and is later featured as the son-in-law of the emperor in Act Four.

However, in the Ming edition of the play, we find that the task of supervising the shooting match was passed on to the army supervisor Xu Maogong. In addition, Xue Rengui now marries the daughter of Xu instead of the daughter of the emperor. In other words, Xu Maogong is used to perform some of the tasks originally carried out by the emperor. This is perhaps most clearly summarized in the changes in the timu and zhengming (name) of the two editions. While the zhengming of the Yuan edition stresses how Emperor Taizong welcomed the virtuous and took in scholars, the timu of the Yuanqu xuan edition has shifted the focus to Xu Maogong supervising the shooting match at the main gate.

In the four jiatou zaju discussed in this section, the emperor role has been removed from the Ming editions of the plays. If we believe that the prohibitions were strict and effective, then we may expect that all jiatou zaju probably shared a similar fate and underwent rewriting or heavy editing to make them more acceptable to the Ming court. However, we will see that this is not the case and the whole situation is far more complicated.

The next two cases, B & C, demonstrate how the role of the emperor continues to find its way into the Ming editions of some other jiatou zaju.

Case B: “Jia” Renamed as Another Role Type in Bowang shaotun and Qi Ying Bu

In the two plays comprising Case B, the jia in the Yuan editions was renamed as another role type in the later Ming editions. One is a play about the story of the Three Kingdoms, titled Zhuge Liang Bowang shaotun (Zhuge Liang Burns the Encampment at Bowang). In many ways, Bowang shaotun is a unique case. It is the only play of the fourteen Yuan jiatou zaju that has a Ming edition that came di-
rectly from the imperial archives (neifu) and contains a detailed costume list (chuanguan). While previous scholars have showed that the great majority of the late Ming editions of Yuan drama originate from the copies held at the imperial palace, it is very important that we have a clear example like Bowang shaotun which provides us with a Ming text that was once performed or at least prepared to be performed at the Ming court. Such an example can give us important information about what was acceptable at the Ming court, and we shall soon see that the censors might not have been that strict after all. There might have been rules of prohibitions, but there were also ways to get around these rules quite easily. This text is an interesting case because it suggests that the emperor may still remain in a play after the Ming prohibitions, as long as he is designated by a role type other than jia.

In this play, the main character is Zhuge Liang, who is played by the mo and zhengmo (main male lead) respectively in the Yuan and Ming editions. Zhuge Liang is the wise statesman and advisor of Liu Bei. In Yuan and Ming plays, the zaju writers followed the lead of Zhu Xi (1130-1200) in considering Liu Bei the legitimate heir to the Han throne. Liu Bei is only a secondary character in this play, and from the stage directions in the Yuan edition, we are not sure of the role type of this character. In the Yuan edition, he is interchangeably designated as “Liu Bei”, “Liu” and “huangshu” (Emperor’s uncle) throughout the whole play. Only in the final stage directions of the play is he designated as jia: “Emperor makes a judgment.”

We can see that considerable changes have been made in the Ming edition of this play. It is clearly stated in the stage directions that Liu is now played by the chongmo, and all the various designations of Liu as presented in the Yuan edition have been standardized as “Liumo” (male role Liu) in this later edition. This applies to the concluding stage direction as well, which simply reads “male role Liu makes a judgment.” The jia in the Yuan edition is now only designated as a mo in the Ming edition, a term that simply means the male role type in Chinese drama.

Censors at the Ming court insisted on inspecting a complete text of each play before its performance. These censors might have found it difficult to remove the character Liu Bei completely from
this play, but such a play could still be considered “acceptable” as long as all the designations that might be related to the emperor, such as jia or huangshu, were replaced by some other neutral designations such as Liumo. We can see from this example how some jiatou zaju might have been able to get around the rules of prohibition quite easily, simply by renaming the “jia” as another role type.

Another jiatou zaju that continues to portray the emperor but under a different role name in its Ming edition is Qi Ying Bu.\(^48\) Qi Ying Bu is part of a larger group of around thirty Yuan plays that dealt with the founding of the Han dynasty which was once a very popular theme in dramatic literature. Because of their extremely negative characterization of the imperial protagonists, most of these plays were not passed down in later times, and Qi Ying Bu is the only play on this subject matter that has been preserved in the Yuanqu xuan.\(^49\) It is interesting to note that Liu Bang, the founder of the Han dynasty who is designated as a “jia” in the Yuan edition of the play, is later consistently referred to only as the King of Han (Hanwang) in the Yuanqu xuan edition and no longer as the emperor (jia). Similarly, previous scholars have also pointed out that some characters such as Li Shimin and Zhao Kuangyin can only appear in plays that portray them before they became emperor but not after.\(^50\) While it may appear that the portrayal of the emperor could be avoided this way, I suspect that such changes to the designation of jia were perhaps chiefly targeted towards any censor who would review the text rather than the performance of the play. This is because while on paper, Liu Bang is changed from the “jia” to “the King of Han,” the difference it makes in performance might indeed be quite minimal.

We have seen from the two examples of Case B that “jia” was replaced by other role types. However, this can hardly be regarded as a strong supporting evidence for the effectiveness of the prohibitions since one could easily get around these prohibitions simply by renaming the jia as other role types. The following case raises even more questions as to whether the prohibitions were effective.
Case C: “Jia” Remains Unchanged in Yu Shanghuang and Chen Tuan gaowo

We have seen how the prohibitions might have brought about some changes in the Ming editions of the Yuan jiatou zaju, but we must be aware that there are also cases in which the texts seem not to be affected by the prohibitions. In two of the jiatou zaju, the role jia actually still remains in their Ming editions.

One is a play titled Haojiu Zhao Yuan yu Shanghuang, which is about how the Wine-craving Zhao Yuan Meets the Prior Emperor at a tavern. In its Yuan edition, the jia, Emperor Huizong of the Song Dynasty (r. 1101-1126), makes his first entrance in Act Two. In this play, Emperor Huizong leaves the palace with two of his followers to drink at a tavern, but forgets to bring money with him, and therefore is unable to pay for his wine. Eventually, the Emperor and his followers get into a fight with the tavern bouncers, before Zhao Yuan comes to their rescue and settles the bill for them. The Emperor then even suggests that they become sworn brothers. Later, when Zhao Yuan, set up by the governor who had an illicit relationship with Zhao’s wife, is to be punished for his late delivery of an official letter, it is now the Emperor’s turn to rescue Zhao. The Emperor not only gives an order to pardon Zhao Yuan, but also makes sure that justice is done by punishing both the governor and Zhao’s wife.

The main plot of the story remains unchanged in the Ming edition of the play, but while the jia is also kept in this edition, the emperor who is portrayed is now changed to Taizu (r.960-976). The entrance of the Emperor onto the stage is prominent in the Ming edition, which includes full prose dialogues. Emperor Taizu first recites a four-line entrance verse (shangchang shi), then gives a self-introduction, announcing that he is the first emperor of the Song dynasty:

I am Emperor Taizu of the Song Dynasty. Ever since I have ascended the throne, the four seas are quiet, and all quarters are at peace. Today, I lead my courtiers Chu Zhaofu and Shi Shouxin, the three of us, dressed up as simple students, making a private trip incognito to the rural areas.

If the staging of the emperor was already prohibited, staging an emperor fighting with bouncers and becoming sworn brothers
with someone at a tavern must have been totally unimaginable. Here is the utter confusion that Emperor Taizu gets into after he fails to pay up:

[The tavern bouncer grasps the jia firmly and speaks] Pay up fast! If you don’t pay up, don’t think that I will let you off lightly.

......

[The main male lead (Zhao Yuan) sings] [To the tune of “Caicha ge”]

One grasps his clothes,
And the other is dead drunk.
Don’t say that you have fallen into these shadows of flowers waiting for others to help you up.
My three Confucian scholars, don’t be scared,
I will take out some copper cash to help pay your wine debt.\(^{54}\)

The Emperor is held tight by the bouncer, who threatens that he will definitely not let him off easily should he still fail to pay up. From the aria then sung by Zhao Yuan, we get a vivid picture of how the Emperor and his followers later get into a chaotic fight. Comparing the arias in the two editions, the scholar Zheng Qian noticed a minor alteration in the aria quoted above, from a "bloody confusion" (xue mohu) in the Yuan edition to a "drunken confusion" (zui mohu) in the Ming edition.\(^{55}\) While this may tone down the degree of commotion involved, it is difficult to deny that these scenes would have still remained very unpleasing to the eyes of the royal audience in the Ming court.

While we have seen in earlier examples how even seemingly "harmless" appearances of the emperor were removed from several plays, here in the case of \textit{Yu Shanghuang} we find to our surprise \textit{that such scenes were still kept in its Ming edition}. If we assume that the staging of the role of the emperor was already banned under the prohibitions, then it is hard for us to imagine how this \textit{drama could continue to stage an emperor fighting with bouncers} and becoming sworn brothers with some drunkard at a tavern. This makes us reconsider the effects of the prohibitions: were all portrayals of the emperor banned, or were some of them perhaps more "acceptable"?
It may be worthwhile to note one change in the two versions of this play as mentioned earlier: Emperor Huizong in its Yuan edition was changed to Emperor Taizu in the Ming edition, possibly because the latter enjoys a more positive image in history. In addition, this alteration of the identity of the emperor from the last to the first emperor of the Northern Song Dynasty might have also aligned the play more closely with the rhetoric of brotherhood found in plays on the Three Kingdoms, which enjoyed considerable popularity at the Ming court.  

Similarly, Zhao Kuangyin also continues to feature as jia in the Ming editions of another play, Chen Tuan gaowo. The appearances of the jia are largely concentrated in Act Three, where the Song emperor tries to persuade Chen Tuan to become an official. While scholars have speculated that the Ming editions of this play may have been edited and rewritten by some literati in the Ming court to make it more suitable to be performed before the emperors, it is interesting to note that portraying the emperor on stage was again allowed in this case, which shows that not all portrayals of the emperor were banned.

To summarize, the eight jiatou zaju passed down in Ming editions, cases A, B, and C, underwent different degrees of change. On the one hand, there are examples in which the jia was clearly removed in the Ming editions, which seems to suggest that the prohibitions were effective. However, on the other hand, there are also other dramas which appear to be unaffected by the prohibitions. The jia continued to appear in some Ming editions. This cast serious doubts on whether the prohibitions were strictly and consistently practiced. With this in mind, how should we deal with the final group of jiatou zaju that I classify under Case D?

Case D: Six Plays Which Were Not Passed down in Ming Editions

As we have seen, not all fourteen jiatou zaju survive in later Ming editions. In Case D, we have six jiatou zaju that only survive in their Yuan printings: Bian Yelang, Jie Zitui, Dongchuang shi fan, Huo Guang guijian, Zhougong shezheng and Zhui Han Xin.

Previous scholars, believing that the prohibitions had been effective, have suggested that the negative portrayal of the emperor may be one reason why these jiatou zaju were not passed down, and that some of them might have been censored. One example is
Huo Guang Guijian.\textsuperscript{59} In the first act of this play, the powerful Han minister Huo Guang explicitly denounces the undesirable behavior of the Prince of Changyi (then the Emperor) whom Huo Guang had originally set on the throne only a month earlier. Huo Guang then deposes the Prince of Changyi and has him replaced by Liu Xun, known posthumously as Han Xuandi (r. 73-49 B.C.).\textsuperscript{60} There are conjectures that such plays might have been censored during the process of making collections of plays in the early Ming dynasty.\textsuperscript{61}

But given that certain dramas still managed to continue portraying the emperor after the prohibitions, I question whether we can assume that these jiatou zaju were effectively outlawed and even destroyed as a result of the prohibitions. Furthermore, other Ming dynasty sources reveal that the texts of these plays might not have been “lost” during the Ming dynasty after all.

First, we may turn to the Yongle dadian which was compiled around 1403 to 1408 with the aim of including all existing literature at that time, including plays. Although the various juan in the Yongle dadian on zaju drama are now lost, we are able to know from its catalog what plays were once included in this massive compilation. In this catalog, we actually find several “prohibited” plays such as Huo Guang guijian (in juan 20738), Dongchuang shi fan (in juan 20744), and Bian Yelang (in juan 20746).\textsuperscript{62}

Second, the Baowentang shumu, a catalog of the books kept in the private library of a mid-Ming literatus Chao Li (jinshi 1541), also listed two of these jiatou zaju, Zhougong shezheng and Zhui Han Xin, which shows that the texts of these plays were still being circulated during the Jiajing period (1522-1566).\textsuperscript{63} From these sources, it appears that copies of these jiatou zaju might still have been around during the Ming dynasty. If that were the case, then one could not say that these jiatou zaju disappeared because of the prohibitions. As shown above, the texts of some of these plays might have survived in the private collections of the Ming literati, some of whom were great collectors of Yuan drama.\textsuperscript{64}

Suppose the texts of those zaju in the Yongle dadian and the Baowentang catalog had survived to the present day. How would that change our understanding of the effect of the prohibitions? That is to say, is it possible that the lack of extant versions of cer-
tained plays might have led us to overestimate the effectiveness of the prohibitions? We must not forget that out of the over seven hundred known titles of Yuan dynasty zaju, only about a hundred and sixty have been passed down to the present day. Therefore, it is possible that these jiatou zaju might simply have been lost in the process of transmission, just like many other Yuan plays, and not as a result of the prohibitions.

CONCLUSION

By showing how the fourteen Yuan dynasty jiatou zaju experienced very different fates in the Ming dynasty, I would like to suggest that it is difficult to draw a general conclusion about the impact of the prohibitions on jiatou zaju.

To further illustrate the complexity of the issue, we might consider two other plays, Hangong qiu (Autumn in the Palace of Han) and Wutong yu (Rain on the Wutong tree), which are often taken as “model” examples of jiatou zaju. Hangong qiu and Wutong yu are included in the Yuanqu xuan, and Hangong qiu is even placed as the very first play in that collection. If there was any censorship around the time Yuanqu xuan was published (1615-1616), it would have been obvious to the censors that this play featured the emperor prominently. How can we explain this apparent violation of the previous proscriptions?

One explanation for this seeming contradiction has been mentioned above, namely that the prohibitions were relaxed in the late Ming. Believing that the prohibitions did have their effects in their initial stage, some scholars conclude that the laws might have lapsed in the late Ming, which would explain the inclusion of these plays in Yuanqu xuan. Their conclusion is based on the assumption that these jiatou zaju were once prohibited and were only allowed to be published or performed later. However, both Wutong yu and Hangong qiu were included in the Yongle dadian, which was edited during the period in between the two prohibitions. This fact then calls into question the assumption that a unilateral suppression of jiatou zaju took place as a result of the two prohibitions.

Another explanation for the existence of such jiatou zaju despite the proscriptions is that these prohibitions did not refer to all plays portraying the emperor, but only targeted those that contain criti-
cisms and undesirable portrayals of the emperor. However, this explanation is also unsatisfactory because it is not always clear what might be considered undesirable or irreverent. We have also seen cases such as *Yijin huanxiang* in which the emperor was still removed from its Ming edition even though there was nothing irreverent in his portrayal. If we look at the prohibitions more carefully, we notice that they also banned the portrayal of loyal ministers on stage. However, the irony is that in many cases where the emperor is removed from a play, his role is often passed on to a minister. This reminds us that the prohibitions perhaps should not be taken at face value.

As I have demonstrated above, there is very little evidence that shows that these dramas were actually censored. Nor do we have any records indicating that the staging of any *jiatou zaju* was prevented because of its portrayal of the emperor. All of these uncertainties therefore caution us against making any sweeping conclusions that the prohibitions could account for all the disappearances and rewritings of *jiatou zaju* in the Ming dynasty. The wide range of fates of the fourteen *jiatou zaju* discussed in this study suggests that the scope and reach of the Ming prohibitions was not monolithic and that further investigation into the complex issue of drama censorship during this period is needed.
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In the case of Wang Can Denglou, the jia enters in Act Two of the Yuan edition. See Zheng Qian, ed. and coll. Jiaoding Yuankan zaju sanzhizhong, p.445. The emperor is easily removed in the Ming edition in a similar way as in Dandao hui or Fan Zhang xishu. In the Yuanqu xuan edition, we are only informed in Cai Yong's dialogue that there is a discussion of Wang Can's matter in court earlier, which most probably refers to the scene that is at the very beginning of Act One of the Yuan edition. See Zang Jinshu, ed. Yuanqu xuan jiaozhu, p. 2083.

67 Some scholars have previously suggested that a need for a second prohibition in 1411 might suggest that the initial prohibition had not been very effective, and that jiatou zaju might still remain very common and popular even after the first prohibition. See Iwaki Hideo, "Min no kyutei to engeki," p. 607; Zhao Jingshen, Li Ping and Jiang Jurong, "Mingdai yanju zhuangkuang de kaocha", p. 177. However, no one has challenged the notion that the prohibitions were effective.

68 As mentioned earlier, these two plays are cited as models of jiatou zaju

69 Iwaki Hideo, “Min no kyûtei to engeki,” p. 608; Zeng Yongyi, “Mingdai diwang yu xiqu,” p.16. 60 Yongle dadian, juan 20744 and 20754 respectively, quoted in Wang Liqi’s preface to Yuan Ming Qing sandai jinhui xiaoshuo xiqu shiliao, pp. 6-7. 61 The Huang Ming tiaofa shilei zuan, for example, did not record any statute or regulation that was used in the actual implementation of the earlier cited prohibition of jiatou zaju in the Great Ming Code. See Dai Jin comp., Huang Ming tiaofa shilei zuan (Tokyo: Koten Kenkyûkai, 1966).
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GLOSSARY

Baowentang shumu 寶文堂書目
Caicha ge 採茶歌
Cao Run 曹淵
Changyi 昌邑
Chao Li 晁瓚
Chengming dian Huo Guang guijian 承明殿霍光詛譚
Chongmo 沖末
Chu Zhaofu楚昭輔
Chu Zhaowang shuzhe xiachuan 楚昭王疏者下船
Chuanguan 穿關
dan 旦
Di Junhou 狄君厚
Dizangwang zheng dongchuang shi fan 地藏王證東窗事犯
Fu Chengwang Zhougong sheng zheng 輔成王周公攝政
Gaiding Yuanxian chuanqi 改定元賢傳奇
Gao Wenxiu 高文秀
Gaozu 高祖
Gong Tianting 宮天挺
Gu Qiyuan 顧起元
Guan daiwang dandao hui 關大王單刀會
Guan daiwang dufu gandao hui 關大王獨赴單刀會
Guan Hanqing 關漢卿
Guan Yu 關羽
Gujin xiaoshuo 古今小說
Guminjia zaju 古名家雜劇
Guo 郭
Han Gaohuang zhuozu qi Ying Bu 漢高皇灌足氣英布
Han Xuandi 漢宣帝
Hangong qiu 漢宮秋
Hanwang 漢王
Haojiu Zhao Yuan yu Shanghuang 好酒趙元遇上皇
He Huang 何煌
huaben 話本
Huang Ming tiaofa shilei zuan 皇明條法事類纂
huangshu 皇叔
Huizong 徽宗
Huo Guang 霍光
jia 駕
Jiangdong 江東
jiatou 駕頭
jiatou zaju 駕頭雜劇
Jin Renjie 金仁傑
Jin Wengong huoshao Jie Zitui 晉文公火燒介子推
Jingde xiang Tang 敬德降唐
Jingzhou 荊州
Jinshi tongyan 警世通言
Kanqiannu 看錢奴
Kezuo zhuiyu 客座贊語
Kong Xueshi 孔學詩
Li Jiancheng 李建成
Li Kaixian 李開先
Li Shimin 李世民
Li Taibai bian Yelang 李太白貶夜郎
Li Yuanji 李元吉
Liu 劉
Liu Bang 劉邦
Liu Bei 劉備
Liu Wenjing 劉文靜
Liu Xun 劉詢
Liumo 劉末
Liyan 例言
Lu Su 魯肅
Ma Zhiyuan 马致远
Mengxi bitan 夢溪筆談
mo 未
Molizhi feidao duijian 摩利支飛刀對箭
neifu 內府
neifuben 內府本
Qilitan 七里灘
Qin 秦
Qin taishi dongchuang shi fan 秦太師東窗事犯
Qinglou ji zhi 青樓集誌
Qinglouji 青樓集
Shang Zhongxian 尚仲賢
shangchang shi 上場詩
Shen Kuo 沈括
Shi Shouxin 石守信
Shunshi xiu 順時秀
Sima Hui 司馬徽
Sisheng jiao Fan Zhang ji shu 死生交范張離娄
Sun Quan 孫權
Sun Zhong 孫仲
Taihua shan Chen Tuan gaowo 泰華山陳鎬高臥
Taizong 太宗
Taizong 太宗
Taizu 太祖
timu 題目
tiyao 提要
waijiao 外腳
Wang Bocheng 王伯成
Wutong yu 梧桐雨
Xiao He yueye zhiu Han Xin 蕭何月夜追韓信
xiezi 楔子
Xijizi 息機子
Xishumeng 西蜀夢
xiwen 戲文
Xu Maogong 徐茂功
xue mohu 血模糊
Xue Rengui ronggui guli 薛仁貴榮歸故里
Xue Rengui yijin huanxiang 薛仁貴衣錦還鄉
Yang Zi 楊梓
Yongle 永樂
Yongle dadian 永樂大典
Yu Zhongju tishi yu Shanghuang 俞仲舉題詩遇上皇
Yuankan zaju sanshizhong 元刊雜劇三十種
Yuanqu xinkao 元曲新考
Yuchi Gong 尉遲恭
Yuchi Gong danbian duoshuo 尉遲恭單鞭奪槊
Yuchi Gong sanduo shuo 尉遲恭三奪槊
Yuzhi Da Ming lü 御制大明律
zaju 雜劇
Zang Jinshu 臧晉叔
Zhang Guobin 張國賓
Zhang Shigui 張士貴
Zhao Bosheng chasi yu Renzong 趙伯昇茶肆遇仁宗
Zhao Kuangyin 趙匡胤
Zhao Qimei 趙琦美
Zhao Yuan 趙元
Zhaoshi guer 趙氏孤兒
Zheng Guangzu 鄭光祖
Zheng Qian 鄭齋
zhengming 正名
zhengmo 正末
zhengya fazuo 正衙法座
Zhu 朱
Zhu Di 朱棣
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Zhu Yuanzhang 朱元璋  
Zhuge Liang 諸葛亮  
Zhuge Liang Bowang shaotun 諸葛亮博望燒屯  
Zhulian xiu 珠麗秀  
zui mohu 醉模糊  
Zui sixiang Wang Can Denglou 醉思鄉王粲登樓  
zunzi 尊子
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