Changing the Frame
Prefaces and Colophons in the Chinese Illustrated Book *Dijian tushuo* (The Emperor’s Mirror, Illustrated and Discussed)
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Issues of how authority is produced, asserted, co-opted, or resisted are deeply embedded in the history of woodblock-printed illustrated books in China. As a medium, woodblock printing (sometimes called xylography) initially developed in response to the need for replicas and multiple copies of Buddhist and Daoist icons and sacred texts.¹ The government adopted the technology as a means of circulating authorized versions of important writings and images. Besides proclaiming jurisdiction over crucial works, official printing insured a more accurate transmission, without the errors that manuscript copyists might introduce. Private individuals were forbidden to print materials whose content the state wished to control, such as the legal code, the calendar, and until 1064, the Confucian classics.² Members of the educated elite acting in a private capacity printed various kinds of literature, and commercial firms published books for public sale. As printing technology spread from the religious and official spheres into the private and mercantile realms, it provided socially disparate audiences with access to certain kinds of
shared culture, which might be appropriated and re-contextualized in various ways.

The technical characteristics of woodblock printing made the medium particularly adaptable to different contexts and purposes. In order to reproduce either written texts or pictorial images, a block carver created them in reverse on a wooden slab by cutting away the surrounding surfaces, leaving in relief the elements to be printed. Because the large number of Chinese characters made it simpler to carve an entire page of writing on a single block, rather than to set the text in reusable individual characters, moveable type never displaced block-printing. It was easy to juxtapose writing and pictures on the same page because the shapes were cut in the same manner. If the carved blocks were stored carefully, they could be used to print additional copies of the work at any time, until the surfaces became too worn to transmit a clear impression to paper. Moreover, a set of blocks could be loaned, rented, or sold; accordingly, persons unconnected to the original publisher could issue reprints long after the initial date of publication. If the blocks were not available, the prospective publisher could use a printed copy of the book as the model for carving new blocks, creating a re-cut edition (fankeben or chongkeben). Nonetheless, even the most faithfully reproduced editions invariably differ from the original in some way, whether subtle or obvious. The modular nature of woodblock printing also made it easy for a later publisher to insert new pages or delete old ones, simply by adding or removing blocks. Nor was it particularly difficult to modify an existing page by gouging out unwanted portions or inserting wooden plugs into which new material was then carved.

Such features created open-ended possibilities for circulating and perpetuating a book, both in its original edition as well as later reprints. Later editions of a book might well be produced for reasons different

---

1Bibliographical criteria developed to describe European publishing do not fit Chinese publication practices very well, and the terminology is insufficiently nuanced to distinguish some of the permutations observed. Here I will use the term “edition” to refer not only to a book printed from a new set of blocks, but more broadly to include reprints made by publishers who used the same blocks but made alterations in the paratext.
from the initial offering and for different kinds of readers (or potential readers). Unless otherwise specified, I include potential readers in referring to “readers,” or for variety’s sake, “audience.” Because pictures are important to the illustrated historical anecdotes discussed below, I also use the term “viewers” more or less interchangeably with “readers.” Social and historical developments in the intervening period might lead later readers to interpret the work in new ways and perceive it as relevant or significant in new contexts. The prefaces (xu) and colophons (ba) were instrumental in repositioning a book over the course of its lifetime, particularly as later editions preserved, deleted, or made substitutions in the texts that “framed” the core work. In some genres of writing, illustrations might also be part of these changing frames. Even the typography might be altered, a technical detail that could make a book enticing or accessible to a broader audience or, alternatively, enhance its appeal according to criteria valued in more exclusive circles.

The period from the last quarter of the sixteenth century through the mid-seventeenth century, corresponding to the late-Ming dynasty (1368–1644), is universally regarded as the “golden age” of Chinese woodblock-printed illustrated books. During these decades, there was an extraordinary increase in the number and variety of works printed, covering a broad spectrum of quality and expense. Through multiple channels of distribution and marketing, books were made available to diverse types of readers. Recent scholarship has focused particularly on the proliferation of plays and novels, some of which appeared in multiple editions during the late-Ming period, including both illustrated and unillustrated versions. Scholars have also examined the upsurge of didactic literature ostensibly addressed to women, such as Lienü zhuan (Biographies of Exemplary Women) and works inspired by or modeled on it, which similarly flourished in numerous versions that might or might not include pictures. A third area of recent interest covers the wide variety of useful publications that were marketed to people who wished to better themselves in some way, whether by acquiring prestigious kinds of cultural capital or more mundane practical information and skills. Social and cultural historians have studied the organization of book production and distribution and the distinctive forms of “book culture” that they fostered.
Building on insights drawn from this considerable body of scholarship, I focus here on the successive appropriations and repositionings of one particular book, *Dijian tushuo* (The Emperor’s Mirror, Illustrated and Discussed), a compendium of annotated pictures/illustrated stories about earlier rulers that was first published in 1573. The basic principle of this work, and others of similar ilk, is that the exposition relies equally on pictures and words, as signaled in the title. In other words, the illustrations are neither optional nor merely supplemental, but integral parts of a “picturebook.” By contrast, in the genres of drama and fiction, pictures are only sometimes used to embellish texts that are complete and self-sufficient without them.

The compilation and production of *The Emperor’s Mirror* were orchestrated by senior grand secretary Zhang Juzheng (1525–1582, *jinshi* 1547). Although created in Beijing for the Wanli emperor (r. 1572–1620), the work was subsequently published several times in the late-Ming and Qing (1644–1911) periods by government officials, private individuals, and commercial firms in various parts of China. Unlike most novels or plays, the stories are drawn from official historiography and presented as factually true, rather than as products of the imagination. Moreover, the compendium shares certain generic expectations with official histories, particularly the assumption that moral lessons should be drawn from the events recounted. With Confucius’s (551–479 BCE) *Chunqiu* (Spring and Autumn Annals) as their ultimate paradigm, Chinese historians evaluated past events and judged their participants, in order to create a “mirror” to guide future generations. Many of the anecdotes chosen for *The Emperor’s Mirror* come from *Zizhi tongjian* (Comprehensive Mirror for Aid in Government) by Sima Guang (1019–1086), who chronicled the long sweep of history in a more explicitly judgmental vein than had the individual dynastic histories. Zhang Juzheng intended his compilation to mold the moral character of the young emperor with Confucian values peculiarly relevant to a ruler’s situation. To render the historical human exemplars as vivid and efficacious as possible, Zhang had pictures made to illustrate the text. The publishers of subsequent editions of *The Emperor’s Mirror*, addressing readers who were not potential rulers, used the power of the visual medium to different ends.
My approach to *The Emperor’s Mirror* fits neatly into what Stanley Abe has characterized as “Sinology overlaid with critical theory,” combining a close reading of Chinese texts with an analytical framework drawn from European literary criticism. Although some might view such an inquiry as just an exercise in cultural hegemonism, revealing more of Western desire than of Chinese literary history, my intention is to explore a potentially illuminating framework for interpreting certain kinds of observable physical differences among books with the same title. In any event, I have found many useful practical insights in Gérard Genette’s concept of the “paratext,” a term he uses to encompass various kinds of devices that mediate between a book and its public and serve to introduce the text to readers.

As analyzed by Genette, many forms of paratext are physically part of the book, such as its prefaces and postfaces, which may be by the book’s author or by other writers. An important function of an authorial (or “autographic”) preface is to ensure that the text is read “properly,” so it is likely to contain the author’s own interpretation of its content or a statement of his intent. Since it would be awkward for the author to acclaim his own achievements, he may well attribute “high value” to the subject of the text and explain why it deserves the reader’s attention. Prefaces by others, which Genette terms “allographic,” may recommend the work to readers more directly and explain the book in relation to some larger context, such as its precedents and genre, or provide more concrete details concerning its creation and production. Frequently more eminent than the author, a person who writes an allographic preface for the original edition usually has been asked to do so (by the author or by the publisher), in order to advertise the merits of the new work. By their mere presence, these contributions flatter the author and endorse his or her efforts with often lavish praise. In contrast to a preface, a postface is addressed to people who have already finished reading the text, as are colophons. Paratext that follows the body of the book represents one final attempt, by the author or someone else, to impose the desired interpretation on readers before they escape.

In their various ways, prefaces and colophons play an important role in creating conditions for the viewer’s reception of the pictures and texts. The work of these “framing” texts seems particularly important in
original editions; the time when a book first appears is when it most needs to be introduced, explained, legitimized, contextualized, or promoted. Nonetheless, the audience or readership for subsequent editions inevitably differs from that of the original edition. Depending on the circumstances of the later publication, its publisher may reproduce some or all of the original prefaces and colophons, perhaps in different sequence, and/or include new ones written to introduce and promote his own effort. It is also possible, however, that the prefaces and colophons that did meaningful work in the original edition have come to seem irrelevant or inappropriate, and the later publisher may not perpetuate them if the anticipated readership is significantly unlike the original readership in time, place (whether in terms of region or social status), or personal characteristics (such as degree of literacy or career aspirations). Although statements about a book’s intended purposes or target audience cannot necessarily be accepted at face value, comparisons between the paratexts of various editions may help to illuminate differences in the values attributed to various readerships, as well as shared norms or ideals.

Perhaps it seems implausible to attribute so much importance or power to prefaces and colophons and naive to pay close attention to them. Certainly poststructuralist and cultural studies theory has made us acutely aware that readers could ignore or resist the author’s or publisher’s attempts to influence them. The highly allusive literary language typical of prefaces also makes them difficult, if not virtually unintelligible, to most readers, even relatively literate ones. Moreover, as the study of pictures has become an entirely separate discipline from the study of texts, the art historian writing about Chinese illustrated books may be tempted to skip past their prefaces and colophons to indulge the fantasy of engaging the core work without preconceptions. More defensibly, it can be argued that prefaces and colophons are unreliable as evidence of a book’s “actual” reception. Nonetheless, I am not concerned with actual reception (which is difficult to document, in any case) but rather with the uses that various kinds of publishers made of prefaces and colophons to address potential readers. Prefatorial discourse appeals to values that the imagined audience is presumed to share and creates an interpretive framework for the reader to accept or reject in experiencing the work. In some genres, particularly novels, a preface or “general
“guidelines” (fanli) may prescribe a regimen for reading that will supposedly lead to moral insight, which allows the reader to rationalize his or her enjoyment of a work of entertainment.24

Framing and Reframing: Premodern Editions of The Emperor’s Mirror

Genette’s approach is particularly helpful for analyzing the paratexts that framed successive editions of The Emperor’s Mirror and repositioned the compendium several times over the past four centuries. The earliest version of The Emperor’s Mirror seems not to have been a printed work at all, but rather a large-format album containing paintings and handwritten texts, which Zhang Juzheng presented to the newly enthroned Wanli emperor in 1573.25 Instead of writing a preface, Zhang introduced the work to his young ruler in an epitext, a physically separate memorial, which was dated 21 January 1573 and co-signed by grand secretary Lü Tiaoyang (1516–1580, jinshi 1550).26 In it, Zhang describes how the work came into being and expounds its instructional purpose. He explains the title, cites famous precedents of earlier ministers who taught important principles of governance to their sovereigns, rationalizes the inclusion of pictures to stimulate an emotional response and make the stories’ lessons more memorable, and urges the boy-emperor to study them very diligently in order to become a great ruler.

Although the original album is no longer extant, a woodblock-printed reproduction made by surveillance commissioner Pan Yunduan (1526–1601, jinshi 1562) later in 1573 preserves the general appearance of the manuscript original.27 (See figure 1.) The 117 stories are divided into two sections, each arranged in chronological order, covering emperors from antiquity through the early-twelfth century. The section titled “Honorable Patterns of the Sagely and Wise” (Shengzhe fanggui) includes eighty-one positive models, and “Destructive Tracks of the Uninhibited and Stupid” (Kuangyu fuche) has thirty-six cautionary examples.28 Each story begins with an illustration labeled with an evocative title and the names of key figures. At left is the historical account, transcribed with punctuation added to the original text, and followed by extensive explanatory discussions in simplified classical language. To both sections
of the compilation, Zhang Juzheng appended a moralizing general statement that serves as an epilogue. The court diary shows that he and the nine-year-old emperor discussed stories from the work several times over the next several months.29

Shortly after submitting the album to the throne, Zhang also published a woodblock-printed version of *The Emperor’s Mirror*.30 (See figure 2.) Intended for officials at the capital, many copies must have been printed, and several are still extant.31 The edition probably was prepared in the inner-court workshops under the direction of the eunuch Feng Bao (fl. 1530–1582), the head of the Directorate of Ceremonial (Silijian).32 It reproduces a set of preliminary drawings, rather than the final painted versions of the illustrations.33 As a result, the pictures are considerably more perfunctory and sketchy than those in the album given to the emperor, as represented by Pan Yunduan’s printed reproduction. (Compare figures 1 and 2A.)

Much smaller in size than the painted album (again, judging from Pan Yunduan’s reproduction), Zhang’s printed edition is a book whose dimensions make it convenient to hold and read.34 Moreover, it contains a separate table of contents for the positive models and for the cautionary models, which lists the stories by title and identifies the emperor-protagonist. This kind of tabular information about the order and contents of the book enables readers to get an overview and locate sections of interest more quickly, without leafing through the entire work.35 A common feature of books but not paintings, the tables of contents help to mediate *The Emperor’s Mirror’s* transition from painted album to printed book.

To impress his target audience of highly literate officials, Zhang solicited a preface (*xu*) and postface (*houxu*) from two eminent court officials, Lu Shusheng (1509–1605, *jinshi* 1541) and Wang Xilie (*jinshi* 1553), respectively.36 They obliged with praise for Zhang and details concerning the book’s creation and production, just the kind of information that Genette describes as characteristic of an original allographic preface.37 Besides comparing Zhang favorably with famous advisers of antiquity, such as Yi Yin (fl. eighteenth century BCE) and the Duke of Zhou (fl. eleventh century BCE), Lu and Wang also hailed the young Wanli emperor’s intelligence and potential for sagehood. The learned
allusions and florid diction with which they addressed their bureaucratic colleagues are generic conventions in preface-writing and contrast sharply with the didactic plainness of the stories intended for a juvenile reader.

To enhance his publication further, Zhang inserted the text of his submission memorial immediately after Lu Shusheng’s preface and appended the emperor’s favorable response. (See figures 3 and 4.) The reproduced memorial functions in the same way as what Genette calls a “dedication,” a text addressed simultaneously to the dedicatee (in this case, the Wanli emperor) as recipient and to the reader (the capital official) as witness. Associating the book with a prestigious recipient, the dedication—here a memorial—elevates the author by advertising his relationship with the eminent figure. Zhang’s text also visually re-enacts the intricate rituals of respectful allusion or direct address to the emperor, because it is printed with three levels of carefully calibrated indenting and superscripting. The annotation at the end of the memorial indicates that the Wanli emperor ordered the “picture album” (tuçe), as he called it, to be sent to the History Office (Shiguan) and shown to officials after he finished looking at it. (See figure 4.) All of these paratextual additions are meant to stimulate the reader’s admiration by representing Zhang Juzheng himself as a worthy minister, comparable to those in The Emperor’s Mirror. Capital officials who were impressed by Zhang may have been more cooperative with his ambitious political agenda.

Once launched into the public realm, The Emperor’s Mirror was soon appropriated for other purposes, as commercial publishers, government officials, and private individuals issued new editions. The combination of pictures and annotated stories, which made The Emperor’s Mirror accessible to a boy-emperor, also held potential appeal for other readers of modest literacy. Such readers might find the book useful as a compendium of cultural knowledge because it presented a great sweep of Chinese history in manageable portions and explained it clearly. Not only was cultural literacy in itself potentially useful for improving people’s social status, it also made them participants in the great tradition of Chinese civilization. In addition, the book gave its readers a ringside view of the political intrigues and machinations that went on at the center of power. Stories about what happened behind the walls of the palace may well have been entertaining to people who did not serve there.
2A. Zhang Juzheng’s edition of *The Emperor’s Mirror*, 1573, story no. 4, “Jieqi qiuyan” (Setting up Instruments and Seeking Opinions), illustration pp. 9a–9b, folio frame height *ca.* 20 cm. Photograph of the exemplar in the collection of The East Asian Library and The Gest Collection, Princeton University, Rare book no. TB367/609.
In the winter of 1573, only a few months after Zhang published *The Emperor’s Mirror* in Beijing, the book-dealer Hu Xian (dates unknown) issued a re-cut edition of the work for sale in Nanjing, the Ming secondary capital and a center of book production and urban culture late in the sixteenth century. The first of several commercial reprints, Hu’s edition reproduced all the components of Zhang’s work and added only a publisher’s colophon. (See figure 5.) However, Hu renumbered the pages according to a more straightforward system than Zhang’s and placed the numbers where viewers could see them easily, and he moved Wang Xilie’s postface from the head of the “cautionary models” section to a more logical position at the end of the book. (Compare figure 6 with figure 2.) To keep costs down, fewer details were carved in the pictures, and page-folding guides were left at center top and bottom of the block. All these little changes made the book more accessible to Hu’s potential customers while preserving its identification with the court milieu, the source of its authority and appeal.

In 1575, Guo Tingwu (*jinshi* 1565), a censor assigned to Yunnan, sponsored a re-cut version based on his copy of Zhang’s edition, which he had brought to his distant post. In his preface, inserted after Zhang’s memorial, Guo claimed that local officials had begged him to republish the book for the benefit of the backward region’s inhabitants. Reciting the familiar litany of worthy ministers who had used stories of former rulers to educate young emperors, Guo suggested that Zhang’s compilation of illustrated models rivaled the accomplishment of the great Duke of Zhou himself. Under the pretext of extending the ancient cultural heritage to a peripheral population, Guo’s edition provided a means of currying favor with Zhang Juzheng, who was at the pinnacle of power. Significantly, Guo left out Wang Xilie’s rather fawning postface, presumably lest it dilute his own flattery.

Private editions of *The Emperor’s Mirror* that were neither for sale nor intended for general dissemination differ from the editions addressed to broader audiences, in physical features as well as stated purposes. Instead of being produced to meet the envisioned readers’ presumed need for edification of some kind, private editions indulge the personal tastes and desires of their sponsors. Moreover, where versions available to the public are closely based on Zhang Juzheng’s printed edition,
4. Zhang Juzheng’s edition of *The Emperor’s Mirror*, 1573, end of Zhang’s memorial and the beginning of the Wanli emperor’s response, *shu* pp. 3b–4a, folio frame height ca. 20 cm. Photocopy of
the exemplar in the collection of The East Asian Library and The Gest Collection, Princeton University, Rare book no. TB367/69.
5. Hu Xian’s edition of *The Emperor’s Mirror*, 1573, publisher’s colophon on last folio, folio frame height ca. 20.4 cm. The colophon reads, “An auspicious winter morning in the first year of the Wanli reign; Hu Xian of the Jinling [Nanjing] book quarter had the blocks carved” (*Wanli yuannian dongyue jidan Jinling shufang Hu Xian xiuzi*). Photocopy of the exemplar in the collection of the National Central Library, Taiwan, Rare book no. 05240.
private publications depart significantly from it. For example, at the same time that Hu Xian was publishing his commercial edition in Nanjing, Pan Yunduan was making a reproduction of the original painted album in Huaian, Jiangsu. The paratext to Pan’s printed version includes “Dijian tushuo song bing xu” (An Ode and Preface to The Emperor’s Mirror), a panegyric written by his father, Pan En (1496–1582; jinshi 1523), who had obtained the original album from the History Office and brought it south when he retired from office. Compared with other contemporary editions, Pan’s reproduction exhibits a much higher standard of workmanship and materials, being carved in fine detail on enormous blocks and carefully printed on high-quality paper. (See figure
The obvious expense of the large-format reproduction and the survival of only one example (in contrast to multiple examples of other editions) suggest that Pan Yunduan intended it for private enjoyment, rather than for wider distribution. Nonetheless, the preface that he solicited from a prominent local official, Wang Zongmu (1523–1591, jinshi 1544), commends Pan for having the work carved “for dissemination” (chuan). Wang’s comment reflects the traditional association between woodblock printing and the meritorious act of propagating efficacious images and texts.

After Zhang Juzheng’s death in 1582, his many enemies denounced him and succeeded in turning the Wanli emperor against his late mentor, leading him to rescind Zhang’s posthumous honors and to punish his family. A generation passed before another edition of The Emperor’s Mirror appeared in 1604, which was privately produced for limited circulation by Jin Lian (dates unknown), a minor official in Nanjing. With Zhang still officially in disgrace, the edition did not include his memorial or any of the prefaces to earlier editions, probably because they refer too directly and favorably to the censured minister and his failed project of nurturing a latter-day sage-ruler. Moreover, Jin had Zhang’s edition significantly redesigned to be more satisfying as an object of aesthetic contemplation. Two members of the celebrated Huang-family workshop created new illustrations (Figure 7) to replace the earlier formulaic and repetitive illustrations produced by anonymous artisans. (See, for example, figures 2 and 6.) Varied and imaginative, the new compositions are also less overtly didactic because the figures are not labeled and the scene titles are moved outside the picture frames. Moreover, both halves of the compositions in Jin Lian’s edition can be seen at once, unlike Zhang’s edition and others based on it, in which each illustration is divided by the page fold.

Despite these elements of heightened artistry, the illustrations still have moralistic content because Jin Lian retained their explanatory texts, as well as Zhang’s unsigned epilogues about good and bad role models. Furthermore, the The Emperor’s Mirror’s value as a guide to cultivating virtue, for emperor and common people alike, is practically the only topic that Jin Lian addresses in his preface. In the allographic preface by the renowned Li Weizhen (1547–1616, jinshi 1568), this theme is turned
into a protest against the factional politics and immorality of the day.\footnote{51} An eminent cultural figure who was much admired for his prose, Li had worked with Zhang Juzheng as a Hanlin official, but some thirty years of subsequent promotion and demotion in provincial posts had demoralized him into early retirement by the time he wrote his preface in 1604.\footnote{52} Powerless to do more than rail against the times, he begins by affirming the value of seeing exemplary and cautionary models, and then commends Jin Lian for rescuing \textit{The Emperor’s Mirror} from obscurity and transmitting it more broadly. Noting that Jin based his new edition on a version from the palace, Li bitterly observes that since Zhang Juzheng’s death, the Wanli emperor often imitated \textit{The Emperor’s Mirror}’s bad examples and avoided its good ones. Even though the emperor had repudiated Zhang, and officials still bore grudges against the late grand secretary, Jin Lian did not follow the crowd but recognized and promoted high moral standards, i.e., those embodied in \textit{The Emperor’s Mirror}. The dissident tone of Li’s remarks and the exquisite quality of Jin’s edition suggest that, despite the rhetoric of meritorious propagation of worthy images, the book may have been intended for a select group of cultivated individuals who were frustrated or repelled by contemporary politics. In the late-Ming period, such men were increasingly inclined to divert their energies into artistic pursuits, particularly those related to book culture.\footnote{53}

In 1622, a few months after the Tianqi emperor (r. 1620–1627) pardoned Zhang Juzheng and restored him posthumously to full honors, the palace published a new edition of \textit{The Emperor’s Mirror}, minus all the paratext that had given the 1573 edition its moralistic frame.\footnote{54} Despite Zhang’s rehabilitation, his name is nowhere mentioned in the new edition. Instead, the book’s contents and instructional purpose are briefly summarized in a single preface signed by eight eunuchs in the Directorate of Ceremonial, one of them the notorious Wei Zhongxian (1568–1627).\footnote{55} There is considerable irony in this eunuch appropriation of \textit{The Emperor’s Mirror}, because standard histories often blamed dynastic decline on the ascendancy of eunuchs, and they are the villains in many of the thirty-six cautionary stories. Although Zhang Juzheng himself had cooperated with eunuchs in order to govern, and they were probably involved in the original production of \textit{The Emperor’s Mirror}, his printed edition of
1573 bears no names of eunuchs. Wei Zhongxian’s prominent involvement with the 1622 edition doomed it to oblivion after he was repudiated and shorn of power by the Chongzhen emperor (r. 1627–1644), who reinstated many of the officials whom Wei had persecuted.

The tumultuous last decades of the Ming dynasty and the wrenching dislocations caused by the Manchu conquest made the early years of the Wanli reign seem orderly and stable in retrospect. As the dominant figure of the early-Wanli court, Zhang Juzheng got the credit for maintaining a relatively efficient government, and his posthumous reputation as a statesman gained luster. In the early- to middle-Qing period, reprints of his 1573 edition of *The Emperor’s Mirror* appeared, some of whose publishers indicate connections with Zhang Juzheng’s hometown of Jiangling, Hubei. Moreover, the compendium was translated into Manchu, suggesting that the conquerors sought Zhang’s insights on the art of ruling China. In 1770s, however, the imperial compilers responsible for selecting books to reprint in the Four Treasuries (Siku quanshu) of the Qianlong emperor (r. 1735–1796) declined to include *The Emperor’s Mirror*, because they felt that the work’s simplicity made it “vulgar” (*lisu*). Qing literati did not share their Ming predecessors’ appreciation of illustrated literature and rarely involved themselves in its production, a withdrawal reflected in the declining social prestige of the genre. Moreover, woodblock-printed pictures were tainted by their association with what Qing literati regarded as the hedonistic culture of the late Ming.

These developments help to explain why an unillustrated edition of *The Emperor’s Mirror* was privately published in 1819, despite the obvious conflict with its title, not to mention the principle behind its original compilation. Based on an incomplete manuscript copy owned by an obscure descendant of Zhang Juzheng, one Zhang Yijin (dates unknown) of Jiangling, the 1819 edition affirms the Ming statesman’s eminence. The first page bears the imprint Chunzhongtang (Hall of Extreme Loyalsm), the name conferred by the Wanli emperor on a building in Zhang Juzheng’s estate, which had become a “famous place” in Jiangling. The eminent Hanlin scholar Cheng Dekai (*jinshi* 1805) wrote an introductory preface, which is followed by a list of twenty-two collators and proofreaders. Framed by new paratext, the publication
includes a slightly modified version of Zhang’s memorial, which is subtly historicized by adding the word “Ming” (for the defunct Ming dynasty) at the beginning and by omitting the elaborate signatures and official titles of Zhang and his co-signatory Lü Tiaoyang at the end.63 (See figure 4, left.) After the section title “Honorable Patterns of the Sagely and Wise” and its table of contents is a fancily-worded page crediting Zhang Yijin with preparing the draft for carving. At the end of the book is a colophon by Zheng Ruohuang (dates unknown), a member of the local elite who coordinated the publication project.64 Both Cheng and Zheng reflect on Zhang Juzheng’s career and affirm the didactic value of The Emperor’s Mirror. As Zheng put it, “Although its words are shallow (qian), its meaning is profound and efficacious for molding [character].”65 Zheng Ruohuang also recounts his previous attempts to have the manuscript published for Zhang Yijin, which bore fruit only when Cheng arrived and took an interest in it.

Because seven of the 117 stories were missing, Cheng Dekai went to considerable effort to locate a Ming edition from which to transcribe them.66 However, neither Cheng nor Zheng Ruohuang expresses any regret that the manuscript lacked pictures, and neither suggests that illustrations should also have been copied from a Ming edition. Indeed, the absence of images is advertised by an otherwise blank page with the notation “illustration lost” (tu yi) preceding every story. Cheng and Zheng implicitly agree that the stories made the work efficacious for moral cultivation, and Zheng recommends the work to ordinary people (shuren) as well as emperors.67 Even in the late-Ming period, some writers had disparaged pictorial representations as superficial, unreliable, or generally inferior to written text for conveying profound or essential concepts.68 Taking this view a step further, the 1819 edition apparently rejects even the adage that pictures are useful for instructing “stupid men and women” (yufu yufu), unless Zheng’s reference to commoners was simply a rhetorical gesture.

**Modern Transformations of The Emperor’s Mirror**

All of the woodblock-printed editions described above represent appropriations of The Emperor’s Mirror that respect its integrity as a compen-
dium of annotated pictures or illustrated stories. Even the 1819 edition, which has no pictures, acknowledges their centrality to the work by repeatedly calling attention to their absence. Moreover, while the paratexts to new woodblock editions may redirect the work to a different kind of reader, they do not challenge, undercut, or ignore its didactic content. The reader is expected to engage directly with the stories, whether to learn the principles of sage rule, gain a firmer moral grounding, acquire some useful background in history, or simply be entertained. By contrast, when *The Emperor’s Mirror* is published in modern media, such as lithography late in the nineteenth century and photo-mechanical printing in the twentieth, it is presented as a relic of a departed past whose stories are not relevant to the reader’s world. In making *The Emperor’s Mirror* available to broader audiences than ever before, modern publishers have modified its core content in addition to framing it with new paratext.

In 1880, a small-sized lithographic edition of *The Emperor’s Mirror* was produced in Shanghai by the Dianshizhai, a subsidiary of the British-owned commercial newspaper *Shenbao* that published illustrated books and periodicals. As Genette notes of inexpensive “pocket editions” of important works in the West, publication in reduced size on inferior paper for the mass market is a sign of a book’s canonization, and the same is true in China. Indeed, despite the Western origins of lithography and its association with modernity in China, the new technology was often employed for reprinting affordable editions of traditional Chinese books, such as the Confucian classics, the dynastic histories, and renowned works of literature and philosophy. The 1880 lithographic edition of *The Emperor’s Mirror* was offered not as a didactic primer but as an embodiment of cultural refinement. The carefully executed pictures are miniature versions of those in the lineage of Zhang Juzheng’s printed edition, but the accompanying texts have been transcribed without punctuation in various styles of brush calligraphy, some of them fairly cursive (See figures 8 and 9). Printed characters that look like the actual physical traces of the writer’s hand movements evoke his presence and invite the viewer to fancy himself a connoisseur of calligraphy. On the other hand, the characters are more difficult to recognize and the sense of the text harder to grasp without punctuation. Compensating for the somewhat reduced intelligibility of the written accounts are several tables of
contents, one at the head of each fascicle, in addition to the comprehensive table at the beginning of the book. As He Yong’s (dates unknown) preface reassures the reader, “From a single inspection it can be fully understood.”

Solicited by the publisher, He Yong’s preface reframes The Emperor’s Mirror for its new audience, providing the background information and endorsements that Genette would predict. Noting that the reduced-size lithographic version was based on a copy of The Emperor’s Mirror purchased in Japan, He Yong explains that the publisher had invited “famous
people”—none identified by name—to rewrite the accompanying texts in “all styles of calligraphy.” Warming to his pitch, he enthuses, “Truly it is a classic and valuable work of art!” Unlike the preface to Guo Tingwu’s 1575 re-cut edition of The Emperor’s Mirror, which follows the paratexts reproduced from Zhang Juzheng’s original edition and highlights the historical and conceptual continuity between Zhang’s project and his own, He Yong’s 1880 preface appears at the very front of the book and underscores a decisive disjuncture from the original context. The inherited paratext is packaged visually as a unified configuration with the core work and set apart from the preface that touts the artistry of the production. Genette comments on similar instances in European literature in which a new preface pushes the old one(s) further into the
book, virtually collapsing them into the core text.\textsuperscript{75} Writings that once did the meaningful work of introducing \textit{The Emperor’s Mirror} and promoting Zhang’s enterprise had become integral parts of the symbol of traditional culture that the Dianshizhai offered to Shanghai’s modern urban consumers in 1880.

The appropriations and reconfigurations of \textit{The Emperor’s Mirror} do not end in 1911 with the collapse of the Qing dynasty and the demise of the imperial system in China, despite the presumptive irrelevance of a work whose title links it unambiguously with emperors. As a cultural and historical relic, \textit{The Emperor’s Mirror} remains useful for demonstrating the unmistakable otherness of the past, not least because the language reforms associated with China’s modernization have rendered the book’s once-accessible text archaic and difficult to understand. Surviving copies of most editions have become “rare books” to the libraries that house them, and some have been reproduced as photo-facsimiles or microfilms in scholarly reference series. More revealing, however, are the configurations of three recent photo-offset editions, two published in mainland China during the 1990s and one in Taiwan in 2002. In addition to their new paratexts, their radical modifications of the core work dictate new readings to contemporary audiences.

A 1993 edition issued by the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences reproduces a set of illustrations from an unidentified old edition in its library.\textsuperscript{76} However, the accompanying texts have been reworked to enable modern readers to understand them. The historical accounts are transcribed into the simplified characters now standard in mainland China, and their appended explanations have been translated into modern vernacular Chinese, with the occasional addition of “new material and new points of view.”\textsuperscript{77} Replacing the old prefaces is a new, unsigned introduction that authoritatively assigns the book to its proper place in Marxist historiography, so that readers will know how to approach it.\textsuperscript{78} Presumably written by the editor Feng Guangyu, the introduction begins by locating \textit{The Emperor’s Mirror} within a Ming-imperial tradition of “using history as a mirror,” and then describes the book’s contents, notes its utility to rulers, and acknowledges the broader appeal of its lively pictures and accessible text.\textsuperscript{79} It concludes by cautioning contemporary readers to be wary of the work’s “feudal” and biased viewpoint, and
ritualistically invites them to submit criticisms. The substitution of this impersonal yet definitive introduction for the old prefaces and the linguistic interventions into the core text both transform The Emperor’s Mirror into a picturebook of history and exoticize it as a curiosity, underscoring the superiority of the enlightened present over the “feudal” past.

A 1996 edition reworks The Emperor’s Mirror even more drastically, not only modifying the texts, but also substituting new and drolly theatrical pictures for the old ones. (See figure 10.) As in the scene reproduced here, the modern illustrations sometimes highlight a different part of the story than what had been emphasized previously. For example, story number seventy-four tells how an imperial tutor to the

young Song emperor Renzong (r. 1022–1063) presented *Wuyi tu* (Pictures of *No Pleasurable Ease*), illustrating the Duke of Zhou’s teachings to King Cheng of Zhou (fl. eleventh century BCE), and how Renzong had the paintings displayed in the lecture hall. Later, when two adjoining pavilions were added to the building, Renzong ordered Cai Xiang (1012–1067) to transcribe the text of *No Pleasurable Ease* onto a screen. Illustrations of this story in the lineage of Zhang Juzheng’s edition show Cai Xiang writing on a large screen, while contemporary editions show the emperor and his tutors with a screen that portrays an ancient ruler with attendants and officials. (See figure 8 and figure 10, respectively.) In general the redesigned compositions depict large forms at close range, rarely opening onto the panoramic settings typical of earlier versions. Even though the stories refer to some three thousand years of history, the illustrations represent a generic past that corresponds to no specific period. The material culture of the past is portrayed in stereotypical terms, deploying motifs for “ancient” architecture, furniture, clothing, and personal ornamentation common to a range of modern visual media, such as traditional-style painting (*guohua*), plays, operas, dances, and films. The ambiance of antiquity is also evoked by the clerical script used in the picture titles and name labels.

In addition to confirming contemporary viewers’ perceptions of the traditional past, this edition reshapes *The Emperor’s Mirror* into a curriculum for lessons on language and history, intended for students and general readers of middling literacy. For each accompanying story, the historical account and its explanation are fully transcribed into simplified characters, with romanized pronunciations inserted for rare characters and superscripts for names and terms that are explained in the following section of notes. The story is then retold in simpler modern language, and the section concludes with a detailed critical discussion of the significance of the events in larger historical and modern political contexts. Similar treatment is given to Zhang Juzheng’s concluding epilogues and memorial, the latter relegated to an appendix.

As in the 1993 edition, the original preface has been replaced by a modern introduction, but its preoccupations are scholarly rather than ideological. Signed by Jia Naiqian, one of the two editors, it traces the book’s history and discusses several of its later editions. A postface by Jia
and Chen Shengxi addresses additional topics and restates the signifi-
cance of the book. Lauding the importance of education in China ever
since antiquity, they describe *The Emperor’s Mirror* as a primer with
something to offer youths and adults alike. Proclaiming a desire to spread
Chinese culture, they dismiss their own work as mere “arranging” and
proceed to detail their interventions, identifying which of the critical
discussions they each contributed to provide a contemporary perspective
on the education of emperors. Like the introduction to the 1993 edition,
the 1996 postface ends by inviting the reader to point out the shortcom-
ings of the work, which are portrayed as inevitable because of the lack
of time and the complications of the project.

By contrast with the two recent mainland editions, both of which
reinforce the disjuncture of past and present, a 2002 Taiwan publication
uses *The Emperor’s Mirror*, without such distancing disclaimers, as an
accessible introduction to traditional Chinese history and culture. Re-
titled *Baidi tu* (Pictures of One Hundred Emperors), the work is the first
volume in a popular-level series called *Tuhua lishi renwu* (Pictorial Tales
of Historical Figures), whose premise is that lively stories about colorful
individuals are more appealing than standard historiography. Although
the cover, title page, and publication-data page identify Zhang Juzheng
as the “original author” (*yuanzhu*), there is no mention of the original
title, *The Emperor’s Mirror*, and there is no introduction or preface. The
main concern of the short “Chuban shuoming” (Publisher’s Explanation)
at the front of the book is to promote the whole set, whose titles are
linked by the common theme, “pictures of one hundred” (*Bai x tu*):
brave generals (*Baijiang tu*), beautiful women (*Baimei tu*), filial sons
(*Baixiao tu*), and emperors. Despite this numerical specificity, all 117
stories of *The Emperor’s Mirror* appear in *Pictures of One Hundred Emperors*
but are not given numbers, unlike in the mainland editions, so the
incongruity with the book’s title is obscured. The table of contents,
which is divided into separate sections for the good and bad models using
Zhang Juzheng’s subtitles, lists the episode titles, emperor-protagonists,
and starting page numbers. The stories themselves have been adapted
with essential background information and are presented in accessible
modern prose, which is written in traditional-style characters that a high-
school student would recognize.
Although the accompanying illustrations are more dignified and serious-looking than those in the 1996 mainland edition, they nonetheless have a somewhat cartoonish and theatrical quality, which confirms the assertion by the “Publisher’s Explanation” that history is a play and its protagonists actors on stage. (Compare figures 10 and 11.) The compositions often are based on traditional ones, but the panoramic settings and minor subplots are pared away to focus on the most important narrative elements. (Compare figures 2A and 11.) The absence of name-labels on the figures may indicate the publisher’s expectation that the intended reader needs no help in identifying them or, more likely, a belief that such a didactic visual aid would make the work seem too pedantic to be appealing.
Although developed in European literary criticism, Gérard Genette’s concept of the paratext offers a useful analytical model for interpreting the acts of appropriation and repositioning that the various editions of *The Emperor’s Mirror* represent. Compared to most European books, however, the recontextualizations of *The Emperor’s Mirror* are more numerous and diverse. Although the absence of legal protections for intellectual property in China made it normal for books to be reissued by different publishers to new audiences, the redeployments of *The Emperor’s Mirror* seem unusually abundant even by Chinese standards. Perhaps its combination of accessible content and palace origins helps to explain the number and diversity of its later editions. Associated with imperial prestige, *The Emperor’s Mirror* may have held appeal for members of other levels of society. As it moved into different social contexts, through, the sources of its authority also changed. For Zhang Juzheng, its value came from history, so he cited the historical texts from which each account was taken. For Guo Tingwu, Zhang Yijin, and various commercial publishers, the involvement of Zhang Juzheng himself made the book compelling, though in different ways, which are reflected in the framing of diverse editions for their respective audiences. For Pan Yunduan and Jin Lian, the supreme value was a moral system that transcended specific historical contexts or individual associations, which they honored by engaging high-quality craftsmen to illustrate events that displayed its workings.

In contemporary China, reissues of *The Emperor’s Mirror* have entailed radical interventions into its core elements, in addition to paratextual reframing. Beyond merely adapting the work to make it intelligible to present-day readers, these mediations have removed the sources of its traditional authority and redefined the work. In Taiwan, its value lies in its presentation of history through colorful stories, which entertain the readers while also educating him or her. This engaging way of promoting acculturation is reminiscent of the original function of *The Emperor’s Mirror* for the young Wanli emperor. To serve a similar function now, the work’s historical identity and original format need not be preserved. In fact, its transformation into a very accessible *Pictures of One
Hundred Emperors makes it more effective as a low-key means of inculcating the Chinese heritage in a time of increasing “Taiwanization.” Mainland editions, however, present The Emperor’s Mirror as a historical and cultural relic, circumscribing it as part of China’s past. Its account of history delegitimized, its didactic value is limited to the data it offers for study of the past, whether from a Marxist or a scientific standpoint. The fundamental difference in approach is emblematic of Beijing and Taipei’s official views of contemporary China’s relationship to the cultural heritage of the imperial era.

Notes

Many colleagues and staff members at libraries in China, Taiwan, Japan, and the United States helped me gain access to extant versions of The Emperor’s Mirror. I am particularly grateful to Professor Ôki Yasushi of Tokyo University for organizing my visits to several important Tokyo collections; to Professor Chen Pao-chen of National Taiwan University for arranging access to rare books at the National Central Library; and to Martin Heidjra of Princeton’s The East Asian Library and The Gest Collection and Thomas Hahn of Cornell University for obtaining photocopies of rare materials.

1. There is a profusion of scholarship on the history of Chinese woodblock printing. For particularly accessible introductory accounts, see Denis Twitchett, Printing and Publishing in Medieval China (New York, Frederic Beil, 1983); and Frances Wood, Chinese Illustration (London: The British Library, 1985).

2. The prohibition on private publication of the Confucian classics and commentaries was lifted in 1064. See Twitchett, Printing and Publishing in Medieval China, p. 32. Other restrictions remained in force, but by the late-Ming period, commercial publishers ignored them in responding to perceived demands of the market, such as for almanacs. See Timothy Brook, The Confusions of Pleasure: Commerce and Culture in Ming China (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), pp. 167–171.


4. This is not to say that moveable type was never used, but it was extremely cumbersome to organize the huge quantities of type so that the needed characters could be found. An illuminating discussion of the complex system developed at the Qing court for this purpose is given by Lothar Ledderose,

5. Chinese, Japanese, and Western scholars all agree that the late Ming was the “golden age” of woodblock-printed illustrated books. Nonetheless, the genre became the subject of serious discussion and scholarly inquiry only about a century ago, as part of a larger reaction against late-imperial disdain for what was presumed (by advocates and opponents alike) to be a “popular” form. Recent studies amply demonstrate that late-Ming printing was by no means a “folk” art, and some of the works most admired in recent times were made in and for exclusive circles of highly literate individuals. For representative recent scholarship, see Craig Clunas, Pictures and Visuality in Early Modern China (London: Reaktion Books, 1997); Robert E. Hegel, “Distinguishing Levels of Audiences for Ming-Ch’ing Vernacular Literature,” in Popular Culture in Late Imperial China, ed. David Johnson, Andrew Nathan, and Evelyn Rawski (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), pp. 112–142; Hegel, Reading Illustrated Fiction in Late Imperial China (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998); Kobayashi Hiromitsu, Chūgoku no hanga: Tōdai kara Shindai made (Chinese Woodblock Illustration: From the Tang Through the Qing Dynasty) (Tokyo: Tōshindō, 1995); Zhou Wu, Zhongguo banhua shi tulu (Illustrated Catalogue of the History of Chinese Printing) (Shanghai: Shanghai renmin meishu chubanshe, 1988); and the Japanese exhibition catalogues Chūgoku kodai hanga ten (Exhibition of Traditional Chinese Woodblock Prints), compiled by Machida Shiritsu Kokusai Hanga Bijutsukan (Tokyo: Machida Shiritsu Kokusai Hanga Bijutsukan, 1988) and Osaka Shiritsu Bijutsukan, Chūgoku Min Shin no ehon (Chinese Illustrated Books of the Ming and Qing Periods) (Osaka: Osaka Shiritsu Bijutsukan, 1987).


8. For example, Craig Clunas, Superfluous Things: Material Culture and Social Status in Early Modern China (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991); Clunas, Pictures and Visuality in Early Modern China, chap. 5; Timothy Brook, The Confusions of Pleasure, pp. 167–171; Brook, Geographical Sources of Ming-Qing History (Ann Arbor: Center for Chinese Studies, University of Michigan, 1988); and Kai-wing Chow, “Writing for Success: Printing, Examinations, and Intellectual Change in Late Ming China,” Late Imperial China 17.1 (June 1996), pp. 120–157.


10. The present article also draws on my own previous research on The Emperor’s Mirror, which comes to conclusions significantly different from those of other scholars, and to which I refer readers who want additional information. I provide detailed discussion and references on the origins and evolution of The Emperor’s Mirror, based on extensive first-hand research and visual comparisons, in my “From Textbook to Testimonial: The Emperor’s Mirror, An Illustrated Discussion (Dijian tu shuo / Teikan zusetsu) in China and Japan,” Ars Orientalis 31 (2001), pp. 65–101. I discuss the relationships among various pictorial media (painting, printing, and carved stone) and the changes in meaning that arise from a change of medium for the same illustrated subject (three case studies of which The Emperor’s Mirror is one), in my “Didactic Illustrations in Printed Books,” in Printing and Book Culture in Late Imperial China, ed. Brokaw and Chow, pp. 417–450.

11. Other extant works in the genre of picture-and-explanations made to educate a (future) ruler include Yangzheng tujie (Cultivating Rectitude, an Illustrated

12. This term is widely used in scholarship on children’s literature; for its range, see Maria Nikolajeva and Carole Scott, How Picturebooks Work (New York: Garland Publishing, 2001), Introduction. Some scholars use the term “iconotexts” for pictures closely related to texts, e.g. Peter Wagner, Reading Iconotexts: From Swift to the French Revolution (London: Reaktion Books, 1995). That term seems inappropriate here, because the pictures for The Emperor’s Mirror were made as illustrations in a straightforward sense, rather than being “constructs that rely on the interpenetration of words and images” (Wagner, p. 25).

13. Among extant versions of many plays and novels, text-only editions outnumber the illustrated ones. However, it is possible that the distinctly textual turn taken in the Qing period caused disproportionate numbers of illustrated editions to be lost, compared with unillustrated ones. Sometimes illustrations for novels and plays provide a different viewpoint or even flatly contradict their written texts. Nikolajeva and Scott use the term “counterpoint” to refer to such situations. See their How Picturebooks Work, p. 17.


15. Although stories of exemplary women also trace back to historical sources and were accepted as fact, many such women were recorded only to describe some particular conduct, suggesting the possibility that some were made up to personify desirable behaviors. See Wu Hung, The Wu Liang Shrine: The Ideology of Early Chinese Pictorial Art (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1989), p. 169 ff. By contrast, rulers were recorded even if little of note occurred during their reigns.
16. Similar claims to moral efficacy and hence legitimacy often are asserted in the prefaces to novels and collections of fictional stories, which frequently mimicked the rhetorical features of factual records, besides containing plotlines in which virtue was acclaimed and evil condemned. For illuminating discussions, see Eugene Eoyang, “A Taste for Apricots: Approaches to Chinese Fiction,” in Chinese Narrative: Critical and Theoretical Essays, ed. Andrew Plaks (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977), pp. 53–69; and Sheldon Hsiao-p’eng Lu, From Historicity to Fictionality: The Chinese Poetics of Narrative (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1994).


19. This is the subject of Gérard Genette’s 1987 book Seuils (Thresholds), which has a lucid and engaging English translation by Jane E. Lewin, under the title Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1997). Most relevant for my purposes here are his discussions of paratexts that are part of the book, such as its format, typeface, paper, cover, title, author name, title page, preface, table of contents, chapter headings, running heads, and postface. Although Genette recognizes illustration as another important kind of paratext, he declines to treat it, for lack of appropriate expertise; see Lewin’s translation, Paratexts, p. 406.

20. Genette discusses prefaces in Paratexts, chap. 8–10. In analyzing various paratextual components, he sensibly distinguishes “readers” who (at least) look inside the book, from a larger “public” who (at most) may only see it on a bookstore shelf or in advertisements. Prefaces and colophons, which appear inside the book, are addressed only to the smaller group.

21. Genette states that an allographic preface to an original edition is always written in response to a request and that its writer’s prestige permits him to use the occasion to write about other issues that may be important to him. If the request makes him uncomfortable, he may make a point of stating that his preface was solicited, thus absolving himself of responsibility for contributing it. See his Paratexts, chap. 10.

22. Genette does not discuss colophons in exactly the sense that the term is used in the Chinese context, which is similar to what he calls an “allographic postface.” See his Paratexts, pp. 237–239. In the European context, a colophon is either an ending inscription that gives the facts of publication, or a publisher’s emblem that appears on the cover or title page.

23. As Jacques Derrida suggests, even in the best of circumstances, prefaces “fall away” after the reader gets to the main text, leading him to assert that they are “written in view of their own self-effacement.” See his Disseminations, trans. Barbara Johnson (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1981), p. 9.

25. For a vivid account of Zhang’s presentation and the Wanli emperor’s enthusiastic reaction to *The Emperor’s Mirror*, see *Shenzong shilu* (Veritable Records of Shenzong) in *Ming shilu* (Veritable Records of the Ming) (1630; Taipei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan lishi yuyan yanjiusuo, 1961–1966), vol. 96, *juan* 8, pp. 7b–8a (pp. 290–291).

26. For epitext, meaning paratext that is physically separate from the work but that also serves to present the work to the reader, see Genette, *Paratexts*, chap. 13–14. Epitext is sometimes brought into later editions of a book and thus transformed into peritext. (i.e., paratext that is physically part of the work) Indeed, as noted below, later editions of *The Emperor’s Mirror* reproduce Zhang’s memorial, under the title “Jin tu shu” (Memorial on Submitting the Pictures), as part of the prefatory section. The memorial also appears in Zhang Juzheng’s collected writings, compiled by his sons; for a photographic reproduction of the memorial as it appears in the 1612 edition of Zhang’s writings, see *Zhang Taiyue ji* (Collected Writings of Zhang [Juzheng] Taiyue) (Shanghai: Guji chubanshe, 1984), *juan* 7, pp. 3b–6a. A punctuated and annotated transcription is given in Zhang Shunhui, ed., *Zhang Juzheng ji* (Zhang Juzheng’s Collected Writings), *juan* 3, pp. 103–107, first cited in note 14 above.

27. For Pan Yunduan’s biography, see Guoli zhongyang tushuguan, comp., *Mingren zhuangzi ziliao suoyin* (Index to Biographical Materials for Ming Personages) (Taipei: Guoli zhongyang tushuguan, 1965), p. 775; and *Mingshi* (Official History of the Ming), *juan* 202, p. 5342. The sole surviving example of Pan’s printed reproduction of the painted album, now only two-thirds complete, belongs to the Japanese Imperial Household Agency. The extant pictures are reproduced in Machida Shiritsu Kokusai Hanga Bijutsukan, comp., *Kinsei Nihon kaiga to gafu: E tehon ten* (Painting and Painting Manuals of Early Modern Japan: Exhibition of Hand-Painted Books) (Tokyo: Machida Shiritsu Kokusai Hanga Bijutsukan, 1990), vol. 2, catalogue no. 21. Each pair of illustration and text was carved on a single enormous block, with a column at the center of the block to display the title and page number. The work is mounted with the printed sheets pasted together along the edges. Pan Yunduan’s reproduction appears to have been an evolutionary dead-end, in the sense that it did not become the basis for any other edition. For further discussions, see my “From Textbook to Testimonial,” pp. 71–74.

28. As Zhang’s memorial (cited in note 26 above) explains, the number eighty-one (nine times nine) embodied extreme *yang* and the number thirty-six (six times six) extreme *yin*, thus making them respectively the correlates of the auspicious and inauspicious. Zhang Shunhui, ed., *Zhang Juzheng ji* (Zhang Juzheng’s Collected Writings), *juan* 3, p. 104.

I have personally examined examples of the edition in the National Central Library, Taipei (Rare book no. 05239); the National Library of China, Beijing (Rare book no. 17486); and Princeton University’s East Asian Library and Gest Collection (Rare book no. TB 367/609). Another that I have studied only in microfilm was formerly catalogued in the “Beiping” Library and is now in the National Palace Museum Library, Taipei (Rare book no. 05238). For other purported examples in collections in mainland China, see Zhongguo guji shanben shumu bianji weiyuanhui, comp., Zhongguo guji shanben shumu (Bibliography of Rare Books in China), (Shanghai: Guji chubanshe, 1985), vol. 2, juan 8, p. 407.

The intended audience for Zhang’s edition is explicitly identified in a postface dated 1 May 1573 by Wang Xilie (jinshi 1553), “Dijian tushuo houxu” (Preface Written After [or, to the Latter Part of] The Emperor’s Mirror), houxu pp. 4a–4b; also transcribed with punctuation in Guoli zhongyang tushuguan, comp., Guoli zhongyang tushuguan shanben xuba jilu, shibu (Prefaces and Colophons in Rare Books in the National Central Library, History Section) (Taibei: Guoli zhongyang tushuguan, 1993), pp. 399–400. For discussion of what “houxu” means here, see note 36 below.

During his tenure as senior grand secretary, Zhang developed a useful working relationship with this powerful and cultured eunuch. See Huang, 1587, A Year of No Significance, chap. 1. Although Zhang’s printed edition of The Emperor’s Mirror is not explicitly identified as a palace publication, its visual appearance is consistent with a “Jingchangben,” that is, a “Depot edition,” a book carved and printed in the inner court under the supervision of the Directorate of Ceremonial. A eunuch, Liu Ruoyu (1584–ca. 1642), later explicitly claims that Feng Bao published The Emperor’s Mirror for Zhang. See Liu’s Zhuozhong zhi (Treatise in the Middle of Pouring) (Beijing: Beijing guji chubanshe, 1994), juan 5, p. 27.

This information is given in a preface entitled “Dijian tushuo xu” (Preface to the Emperor’s Mirror), dated 4 March 1573 and written by Lu Shusheng (1509–1605), qianxu p. 4a; transcribed with punctuation in Guoli zhongyang tushuguan shanben xuba jilu, Shibu, pp. 398–399. This preface is further discussed below. Wang Xilie’s postface (see note 31 above) confirms that Zhang Juzheng had a duplicate set of pictures that was used to prepare the printed edition; see “Dijian tushuo houxu,” (Preface Written After [or, to the Latter Part of] The Emperor’s Mirror), houxu p. 1a (punctuated transcription, p. 399).

The size of the original album can be gauged from the printed reproduction (see note 27 above), in which the illustration and its text appear side by side within a block-frame that measures at least 40 x 77 cm. The sheets printed from these giant blocks are mounted accordion-style, so that the entire picture and text are seen together. Such a large object must be laid on a table for viewing. In Zhang’s edition, by contrast, the pictures and texts were carved on separate blocks, whose frames measure only about 20 x 28.6 cm. A single printed sheet, folded in half for binding, produced recto and verso pages in...
the final book. Therefore, the pictures are divided in half by the fold, and the page must be turned to see an entire composition. Likewise, the text extends over at least two pages, and longer texts extend to three or four pages. Not only are the pages much smaller, the book is divided into either six or twelve ce (fascicles), which the reader can easily hold in one hand. For a well-illustrated discussion of relationships between the block-printed sheet and a book's binding, see David Helliwell, “The Repair and Binding of Old Chinese Books,” East Asian Library Journal 8.1 (Spring 1998), pp. 27–150.

35. What little Genette has to say about tables of contents appears in his Paratexts, pp. 316–318.

36. Lu Shusheng was the minister of rites and a Hanlin academician. For his biography, see Mingshi (Official History of the Ming), juan 216, pp. 5694–5696; for reference to his preface, see note 33 above. Wang Xilie, who was temporarily in charge of the affairs of the Household Administration of the Heir Apparent, was a Hanlin academician as well as a vice-minister of personnel; see Mingren zhuanji ziliao suoyin (Index to Biographical Materials for Ming Personages), p. 34. In his postface (see note 31 above), Wang states that Zhang had shown him the work in progress and had prevailed upon him to “xu zhu hou,” which could mean either “to write a preface for the latter part” or “to write a preface to place afterward;” see Wang Xilie, “Dijian tushuo houxu,” houxu p. 1a (punctuated transcription, p. 399). Because his meaning is somewhat ambiguous, the placement of Wang Xilie’s text varies among editions. In Zhang Juzheng’s, it appears before the table of contents to the cautionary models, which are paginated as the “latter” (hou) section; in other editions, such as Hu Xian’s (dates unknown), discussed below, Wang’s text appears as a postface at the very end of the book.

37. See note 21 above.

38. For the memorial, see note 26 above.


40. I have seen the two examples of Hu’s edition in the National Central Library, Taiwan (Rare book nos. 05240 and 05241, both in six ce), which are catalogued in Guoli Zhongyang tushuguan, comp., Guoli zhongyang tushuguan shanben shumu, zengding ben (Taipei: Guoli zhongyang tushuguan, 1967), p. 404. For the sparse information that can be deduced about Hu Xian, see Lucille Chia, “Of Three Mountains Street: The Commercial Publishers of Ming Nanjing,” in Printing and Book Culture in Late Imperial China, ed. Brokaw and Chow, pp. 107–151.

41. There were at least two other early, commercially re-cut editions, which I discuss in my “From Textbook to Testimonial,” p. 75.

42. The page numbers in Zhang Juzheng’s edition were outside the upper left edge of the block frames in “the ear of the text” (shuer), and Hu Xian moved them into the pictorial space. Hu, also revised the numbering of pages in the first section from simply yi er san (“one, “two,” “three”) etc. to “qian yi,” “qian er” (“former 1,” “former 2”) and so forth, to match Zhang’s numbering
in the second section, which started over as “hou yi,” “hou er” (“latter 1,” “latter 2”), etc. For more on Wang Xilie’s postface, see notes 31 and 36 above.

43. I have seen one example in the National Central Library (Rare book no. 05242), in twelve ce; the library incorrectly identifies Rare book no. 05243 as another. Except for omitting Wang Xilie’s postface, Guo’s edition includes all the same parts as Zhang Juzheng’s edition. Guo’s “Dijian tushuo chongke xu” (Preface for Recutting The Emperor’s Mirror) is transcribed and punctuated in Guoli zhongyang tushuguan shanben xuba jilu, Shibu (Prefaces and Colophons in Rare Books in the National Central Library, History Section), pp. 400–401.

44. Guo’s flattery seems to have paid off, because his next official posting was in Beijing, and he served in or near one of the two capitals well into the 1580s.

45. For Pan’s reproduction, see references in notes 27 and 34 above.
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ba 跗
Baidi tu 百帝圖
Baijiang tu 百將圖
Baimei tu 百美圖
Baixiao tu 百孝圖
Cai Xiang 蔡襄
ce 冊
Cheng 成
Cheng Dekai 程德楷
Chenghua shilüe 承華事略
Chongke Dijian tushuo xiaodong xingshi 重刊帝鑑圖說校定姓氏
chongkeben 重刻本
Chongke Dijian tushuo xu 重刻帝鑑圖說序
chuan 傳
chunshe 傳世
Chuban shuoming 出版說明
Chunqiu 春秋
Chunzhongtang 純忠堂
Cui Longjian 崔龍見
Cunmu 存目
Dabishanfang ji 大泌山房
Deng 鄧
Dianshizhai 點石齋
Dijian tushuo 帝鑑圖說
Dijian tushuo chongke xu 帝鑑圖說重刻序
Dijian tushuo houxi 帝鑑圖說後序
Dijian tushuo song bing xu 帝鑑圖說頌佇序
Duchayuan zuodu yushi jinjie zhishi 都察院左都御史進階致士
Dijian tushuo 帝鑑圖說
Dijian tushuo xu 帝鑑圖說序
Duchayuan zuodu yushi jinjie zhishi 都察院左都御史進階致士
fankeben 翻刻本
fanli 凡例
Feng Bao 馮保
Feng Guangyu 馮廣裕
Feng Ruzong 馮汝宗
Guifan tushuo 闡範圖說
guohua 國畫
Guo Tingwu 郭庭梧
He Yong 何鏞
hong 弘
hou 後
hou er 後二
houxi 後序
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Huai 淮
Huaian 淮安
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Huang 黃
Huang Jun 黃銓
Huang Yingxiao 黃應孝
Huang Yizun 黃義尊
Hu Xian 胡賢
Jiangling 江陵
Jiangling xianzhi 江陵縣誌
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Jiaoding shixi 都察院左都御史進階致士
Jieqi qiuyan 謄器求言
Jingchangben 經廠本
Wei Zhongxian 魏忠賢
Wenyuan 文苑
Wuyi pían 無逸篇
Wuyi tu 無逸圖
Xiuye 秀野
xu 序
xuan 玄
xu zhu hou 序諸後
yang 陽
Yangzheng tujie 養正圖解
yi er san 一二三
yin 陰
Yi Yin 伊尹
yuanben 原本
yuanzhu 原著
yufu yufu 愚夫愚婦

Zhang Jingxiu 張敬修
Zhang Juzheng 張居正
Zhang Juzheng ji 張居正集
Zhang Sheguo 張社國
Zhang Taiyue ji 張太岳集
Zhang Tingyu 張廷玉
Zhang Yijin 張亦縈
zhengli 整理
Zheng Ruohuang 鄭若璜
Zheng Ruohuang Futing shì jìng ba 鄭若璜飬廷氏敬跋
Zhongchun 仲純
Zhou 周
Zhuozhong zhi 酌中志
Zitizhi tongjian 自治通鑑