Thoughts about Chinese Folk Theatre performances

by W. Eberhard
(Berkeley)

A few words in an introduction. This study is based on the one side on actual field observations in Taiwan. Professor Ch'en Ch'i-lu (Academia Sinica, Taiwan) and myself as “Principal Investigators” studied the so-called Ko-tsi hsi with the help of five research assistants. The assistants did the field work, often in my presence. I have seen the articles written by the assistants in the first draft, and I hope they will soon be published. These articles did not discuss the topic of this essay. Fieldwork was done in 1976, but the texts used here were collected after my return in 1977. On the other side, I used data from early texts and recent excavations. This method is used on the assumption that even a socio-historian would get a better insight into problems of the past if he knows how the present is. He, then, can ask: “Is it possible that the situation in the past is the same or almost the same as in the present time?” The answer can be in the positive, or in the negative, but in both cases, our chance to find an understanding of the past is higher if we know how the present is.

Secondly, we start with the assumption that each cultural trait in a society is not an isolated thing, but a part of a network of connected traits – even in the case where the cultural trait was introduced from the outside, from a different society.

The study of Chinese theatre (or “opera”) has a long history and has brought forth an enormous literature. We think we know the development of the theatre, at least from Sung time on; we have texts of numerous plays and several studies of the language of these plays have been made. Yet, it is my belief that these studies are not complete as long as the folk theatre has not been taken into consideration. In the late 1920’s Chinese folklorists began to be interested in these plays, but the first systematic attempt to collect folk plays was made in the 1950’s when the traditional theatre was regarded as expressing the values of the upper class and when the government by collecting folk plays tried to bring together a representative body of plays which would represent the values of the folk and of the new regime. The collections contain genuine “folk” plays as well as plays, recently created by ??oups of people – plays which clearly express the new values. But even the plays which are clearly “traditional” were changed so that they would fit better the purpose for which they were collected, namely, to replace the old opera by a new body of plays with proletarian values. This attempt to influence the theatre and to change it, is not new; a study of plays performed in Taipei by the armed forces troupes reveals that plays with a specific tendency were preferred. In much earlier times we find discussions about the “educational” value of plays and hear of changes of some plays to make them agree with the confucian values of the government. What I want to state here is only that the texts, published in the 1950’s should not be regarded as scientifically genuine texts, but as texts which should be performed because they suited or were made to suit the ideological aims of the government. The attempt to replace the traditional “opera” by folk plays was soon abandoned because even the folk plays contained an ideology which was not what the government wanted to have – just as before this, attempts to make traditional operas suitable for the new time had failed.

To get an insight into the folk theatre, a research project was initiated in Taiwan, the results of which, I hope, will soon be published. Without anticipating the results of this project, I want to discuss today one problem which has bothered me for as long as I had
an interest in the folk theatre. Performances in Taiwan usually start around 3:00 P.M. with one play, and are continued in the evening around 7:00 P.M. with a second play. Often I asked an actor, sometimes only ten minutes before the play began, which play would be performed today. The answer was: "We do not know." I was astonished and could not believe this. Our team confirmed my observation: the "director" of the troupe decides, often only minutes before the start of the performance which play would be played. He surveyed the audience and guessed what type of play his audience would like. For instance, the audience in the afternoon consisted, as I observed, mainly of old men and some old women with their grandchildren, and the plays performed for this audience were more serious and sedate than the evening performances which were attended largely by younger persons, the working fathers and mothers. Their children had been put to bed or were cared for by the grandparents. These plays had more often romantic themes of love and intrigue. Our team members witnessed that after this "survey" of the audience, the director told the actors which play they would perform and distributed the roles. If an actor did not know the play, the director would tell him/her the basic content of the play, though usually the actors knew the play already. Our team even witnessed a case when the director assigned a role to an actor and the actor objected that he could not perform because of a cold. The director then asked another actor to play that role.

This raised the question whether the actors had memorized a fairly great number of plays – even memorized the texts of different roles in a play, and whether there were written or printed texts available. All the troupes studied asserted that no texts existed and that the performances were spontaneous, i.e. creations of the moment, influenced by the ability of the specific actor and by the public. If this were so, each performance represented a creative act.

Our team tested this. As many plays as possible were recorded during the performance by a member of the team, while another team member was behind the curtain, in the rear of the stage, observing the actors and listening to their conversations. For the purpose of testing a play was selected which was performed by the Hsin ch'ü sheng troupe first on Febr. 2, 1977 (Text 2) and then again on Febr. 3, 1977 (Text 1), both times in a different place in Taipei city. The same play had been played by the Hsin ch'in-sheng troupe on Oct. 23, 1976 (Text 3) and recorded in order to see whether both troupes used a written text, as we knew that both troupes had close contacts and some actors had studied with the same teachers.

The result of an analysis of the recordings is surprising (see attached transcripts): there is a great difference between the two performances by the same troupe on two consecutive days. And the performance of the other troupe is not only much shorter but also deviates strongly. Let me give some sections of the content of the play:

Kan who supposedly lived in the 18th century and who had an older brother, played in his early youth often with his two girl cousins, Lien-lien and Hsüeh-ch'iao; his brother's wife was Hsiu-hsiu. After Kan failed the state examinations and had lost his money by gambling, he went to Taiwan. Here, the captain of the ship takes him into his services, because Kan had saved him, when the ship because of the captain's incompetence, had to return to Fu-chou in a storm. Kan settled with the captain in Feng-shan in Southern Taiwan. He fights the natives, but has to return to Fu-chou because of a denunciation. He is believed to have died in prison, but he is later rehabilitated through a connection with the court.

The sections selected are (1) Kan's cousin Lien-lien refuses to help Kan financially, when he asked her. After he left, she denounces Kan – and later marries a rich man. (2)
Kan's other cousin gives him upon his departure a hairpin, (3) his sister-in-law bevels the death of Kan (who in reality was not dead), and her mother consoles her. In two of the selections, the _Hsin ch'in-sheng_ text is much shorter and in the third one, this scene does not appear. At the moment when Kan says goodbye to his family, in the _Hsin chü-sheng_ versions, his cousin Hsüeh-ch'iao is present, but in the _Hsin ch'in-sheng_ version, also Kan's maternal uncle and his grandmother are present.

The two _Hsin chü-sheng_ versions differ so strongly from one another that it is impossible to assume that the actors had relied on a written or printed text; we have to assume that they knew the play and improvised. This is confirmed by our team members who, while sitting in a corner of the stage, observed that in moments when it seemed that an actor did not know what to say, either the director who was also in a corner of the stage said a few words to him, or another actor advised him (or her) by signs or words what he should do at this moment. This is, of course only possible when the actors have much experience and feel themselves members of a team. In fact, most actors started their career very early and often are children of actors who are literally raised behind the stage, so that they know from earliest days what acting is.

Let me now go a few steps further and make some hypotheses. (a) It is known that some written texts of folk plays exist; I myself have a few. We can now assume that these texts were either created by some _hsi-mi_ (theatre enthusiasts) to be played by troupes which they knew, or written down from memory by persons who had liked the plays and wanted to have their texts. But — at least in Taiwan's _Ko-tsai-hsi_ — the companies did not use them. Words and performances are not identical. I would, thereupon, hypothesize that the high-class plays (which I may here call "operas" to avoid confusion with folk plays) which we have in manuscripts, also do not represent what actually was spoken or sung on the stage. I experienced in Peking (1934–5) that the comical plays did not seem to have a standardized text because the performance contained allusions to social and political events of the day. The opera texts which we have could either be plays written for the stage, but then we cannot assume that the performance was identical with the text; or, again, the text was written down by an interested scholar who translated the folk language into an acceptable, more educated language. As we know that many plays were performed at the court, I think, we can assume that the actors were given a "clean" text, in order not to offend the eminent audience. This means that ribald passages were eliminated, dialect words and phrases translated and the language in general adjusted to conform with a desired style. This then would mean that a study of plays of Yuan and Ming times, important as it is, does not necessarily give us a reliable insight into what was really played.

(b) Plays are always played in front of a temple. In Taiwan it was sometimes technically impossible to do this, because the temple was surrounded by so many buildings, that there was no space for setting up a platform and reserving a space for the audience. In such cases, a temporary shrine, built of bamboo poles and cloth, was set up as close as possible to the real temple. Many temples which I saw in Chekiang in 1934 had a permanent stage opposite the temple gate, as some Taiwanese temples also have. The plays are played for the deity of the temple to thank the deity for help; persons who had made vows to the deity paid for the performances, so that the audience did not have to pay. This is still the prevalent way of financing companies. Theatrical companies go from temple to temple when they are invited by temple guardians upon the demand of sponsors. The performances are thought to entertain the deity; the only rule which I have
heard is that no play should be played which could be resented by the deity; thus, no play based upon the novel San-kuo chih yen-i should be played in front of a Kuan-ti temple in which the death of Kuan-ti would be shown. We know that even in the imperial palace a little temple was opposite to the imperial stage. Thus, theatre has retained until the present day the character of a religious act, whether or not the audience is aware of it. The same, of course, is valid for the various types of puppet, marionette, and shadow plays. An exception are the commercial theatres which seem to have existed already in Ming time and which charged entrance fees. Wealthy patrons today and in former times, could and did invite troupes to their houses to perform solely for the entertainment of guests, and many patrons kept famous actors permanently in their houses. Yet, these developments are not characteristic for the folk theatre and not even for the opera.

As theatre is still basically connected with religion, folk plays are not always performed on any odd day of the year. The main seasons for plays in Taiwan are (1) the seventh month, the period during which the "gates of hell are opened", when the souls are on earth and many temple festivals are arranged for them, and (2) at New Year, when the souls of ancestors are in the home, while the deities are in heaven most of the time. In both periods, then, the performances of folk theatre are connected with the cult of the dead plus the worship of deities.

(c) The majority of folk plays is derived from folk novels. I would say that far more than hundred plays of the opera as well as the folk theatre are based upon the novel San-kuo chih yen-i, other novels are based on Yang-chia chiang (Generals of the Yang Family), Hsieh Jen-kui cheng tung (Hsüeh Jen-kui fights against the East), Hsüeh Ting-shan cheng hsi (Hsüeh Tong-shan fights against the West), Sui T'ang yen-i (The story of the Sui and T'ang dynasty's fate), and numerous others. And even now, at least in Taiwan, new plays are constantly developed. It seems that in general only comedies are totally freely invented. Now, the same topics of the folk theatre are also the themes of the opera, and there are connections between the two: some actors in Taiwan who were members of specific companies, occasionally played not only in other companies but also in the opera of Taipei; not though, in singing roles, because their singing style differed from that of the opera (the one is Taiwanese style and language, the other Peking style and language), but mainly in roles which require acrobatics.

Secondly, there is a close connection between the folk plays and the ballads. There are ballads which have no parallels in the plays, but a great number of the topics of popular ballads are topics of the theatre as well as of the novels.

Thirdly, a number of titles or key words of plays are found on some (not all) sets of oracle slips (ch'ien). Here, the oracle-taker supposedly should compare his own situation with the situation of the person of the play mentioned.

Fourthly, a great number of temple paintings represent scenes of Chinese history which are taken not from the history books but from plays. Often the paintings have texts which directly refer to plays.

Thus, we may say in conclusion that there is a unity between folk plays, folk ballads, folk oracles (this means, books like the I-CHING are excluded here), folk temple paintings, shadow plays, marionette and puppet plays— all also containing an element of folk religion. The opera is, then, another member of this unit, but changed for the taste of the educated, upper class.

Now, it may be possible to say that this complex came into origin in the late periods of Chinese history only, but as the religious element is so important, this seems to be un-
likely. We have many notices about temple festivals during the last thousand years, with indications that performances of some kind were done, but to my knowledge, there is usually no description or a name of a play given. For the Sung period, we hear of performances on public places, we even have a number of names of such performances and we think that these were early folk theatre plays. These references have been much studied, but they contain no reference to temples, so that the impression of scholars is that the plays were played on the market place simply for the entertainment of people. I would like to point out that there were normally temples on market places so that the writer did not have to indicate the connection of theatre and the temple. We also know that court theatre existed in T’ang time: a government office for theatrical training and performance (Li-yüan) was established. The first mention of a theatrical performance is for the sixth century. Clearly, this show as well as the shows of the T’ang-time Li-yüan were shows for the upper class and the court. Did folk theatre exist only from Sung time on, if the early reports refer to real theatre plays? Is the Chinese folk theatre only "gesunkenes Kulturgut", the little man’s entertainment? As far as I know the performances of the Li-yüan had no religious background, but, we may assume, served for the entertainment of imperial guests and celebrations such as the emperor’s birthday.

We know from texts that in Han time great performances were shown at the court for foreign ambassadors and at other occasions. Such performances are often shown on stone reliefs and paintings of Han time; they were in the main of the acrobatic type, though, it seems, normally accompanied by music. It seems that they were under the control of the yüeh-fu (Office of music for the court), the duties of which were taken over in T’ang time by the chiao-fang. Acrobatic plays (sword dances, etc.) are until now part of some of the most popular theatre plays; many operas consist of hardly any words, only of dance and acrobatics. Can it be that the acrobatic plays of Han time had no religious connotations? The texts which mention such performances under the name “a hundred plays” never point out that they had religious connotations. The representations on stone slabs or the paintings on tomb walls in fact never seem to show any temple, though we know from texts that temples existed. Or did we misinterpret some of these scenes as performances for a worldly audience and persons in a building nearby as people and not as deities in a temple? Then, did no folk plays exist in Han time or before? Texts would not mention them, if they were not connected with the court.

A. Bulling has hypothesized that scenes on Han reliefs and frescoes may not depict historical events but theatrical plays. It seems that her theory has not been accepted. I feel that her theory should be reconsidered. I always wondered for what reason carvings or frescoes in tombs were done. There are some which show scenes of the life of the person in the tomb, at least we think so. Bulling again asserted that even these scenes are not simply depicting scenes of the career of the dead person, but also his way into the other world. But why show so many scenes of supposedly historical events which took place hundreds of years before the dead person was even born? These scenes have nothing to do with the dead person and the way of their representation does not seem "natural" but much more theatrical. There is still a close connection of folk plays with religion and especially with death. For the dead person in Taiwan theatre troupes are invited to give performances down to this day. It seems to me to be a logical conclusion that these pictures are scenes from performances and serve to give enjoyment to the person in the tomb. In my opinion, only this conclusion makes sense. I cannot give
proofs for this hypothesis. Bulling has pointed to a few details of the pictures which seem to strengthen her theory, but not enough yet.

I think, we can divide the scenes in tombs, and the closest related pictures on objects in the tombs, such as lacquer bowls and baskets, into three classes: (a) Confucian scenes: K'ung-tse and his pupils. Such scenes would be appropriate for officials who have studied Confucian texts and received an official position. (b) Scenes of filial sons and daughters. Again, such scenes would be appropriate for persons with a Confucian education. (c) Historical scenes.

If we assume that the pictures of at least classes (b) and (c) are theatre scenes, we could not bring any proof for class (b), except saying that plays about filiality are not rare even in modern times, but that it is likely that few of them have been preserved in the collections of plays, simply because these collections do not contain folk theatre plays. However, the paintings in the Ho-lin ko-erh tomb show Min Tse-ch'ien, one of the filial sons. Min is the subject of a modern folk ballad dealing with the 24 examples of filial piety. He is at least once depicted in a Taiwanese temple, and there is a modern folk play in Hunan, and an early court play, Min is also depicted in Han stone reliefs.

In the Ho-lin ko-erh tomb we also find Ch'iu-hu of Lu (Lu Ch'iu-hu tse). He is found also on other Han reliefs. Under the name “Ch'iu-hu flirts with his wife” (Ch'iu-hu shih ch'i) it is regarded as a Yüan play, a modern opera has the title “Sang-yüan hui” (Meeting in the mulberry garden) or “Ts'ai sang” (Plucking mulberry leaves) and there is a shadow play with just the name Ch'iu Hu as title. We hear, that it was one of the plays performed in Chêkiang during the lantern festival.

In the Ho-lin ko-erh tomb there is also a representation of Sun-shu Ao, a hero of the Chan-kuo period, mentioned in Han Fei-tse. Sun-shu Ao is a friend of Chiang Hsiung and saves him in a Ming drama in which events taken from Hsin-hsiü are used.

Another picture in the Ho-lin ko-erh tomb shows King Chao and the woman from Yüeh (Ch'u Chao Yüeh chi). This is certainly a scene from the cycle of legends around Fan Li and Wu Tse-hsiü. Wu Tse-hsiü alone is represented in another sections of the tomb. The legend cycle is alluded to also on the lacquer basket from Lo-lang where the King of Wu, the King of Yüeh and a beautiful woman, together with a queen are shown. The stories of Wu and Fan are still very popular in the opera. The Lo-yang lacquer baskets have two other pictures which are down to recent times topics of famous plays. The one person mentioned is Li Shan, a servant who was loyal to the family of his master. His story is the theme of the Ming drama I fou chi.

The basket also shows the Szu-hao (Four enlightened), who visited Emperor Hui of the former Han dynasty and Chang Liang. Chang Liang is the hero of numerous plays, but I have not found a play in which he acts with the Szu-hao. Similarly, the basket shows Chou-wang, the last ruler of the Shang, with Po-i, the man who remained faithful to a ruler, though the ruler was totally immoral. Here again, I cannot refer to a specific play, but the event is found in the novel Feng shen yen-i.

Many plays of today's opera, the so-called wu-hsi (Military plays) have very little text and consists mainly of scenes of fight - perhaps they should rather be called "war dances". We should mention that a number of Han tomb scenes also depict scenes of fight.

I naturally will not say that most scenes in Han tombs or tomb objects are taken from actual theatre performances. I have tried to bring together which data could make such
an interpretation likely, at least for scenes of types (b) and (c). Scenes of fight seem to refer what in Han time was called “Pai-hsi”, the Hundred Plays, and we have thought that acrobatics shown in such scenes on Han reliefs may refer simply to acrobatic performances as we still can see them today on markets and streets, at least in Taiwan. But I think that they may just as well be sections of “military plays”.

If my hypothesis should be tenable, we would have to say that Chinese folk theatre did exist at least from Han time on, perhaps earlier. Such plays are not mentioned in the Chinese texts which deal with theatre and its history, simply because they were amusements of simple folk, in folksy language, and not ordinarily seen by the educated, except then they were children. Once, plays were adopted by the upper class, i.e. from the 6th century on, we find literary texts about them, and soon we hear of an official bureau for the training of actors. This training means, of course I would say, that the actors had to use the language and style of the upper class, that therefore their texts would have to be written down and then memorized, so that it could not happen that the actors would by using vulgar language offend the emperor, the court or the upper class audiences. From then on, we have opera and folk theatre as two strands which were and still are in contact, but differ in style. The one belongs to “oral” literature and at the same time to “folk” or “popular” literature. The other – even if their source should be a folk play, belong to “high literature”, because the plays were written down in a language suited to their audience, and this even if the theatre language, as we find it in Yüan, Ming and Ch’ing operas, is not the same as the language of classical texts, but a special language which differs from ordinary language in style and grammar.

Notes

1 The series is published under the general title Chung-kuo ti-fang hsi-chü chi-ch’eng (Peking 1959–1962), one volume per province, but not all volumes seem to have been published.

2 This project was directed by the principal investigators Prof. Ch’en Ch’i-lu of the Taiwan National University and myself. Five assistants did the field-work, though I often was present at the theatre performances. I have seen the articles written by the assistants in their first drafts, but they seem not to be published yet. The articles did not discuss the topic of this essay. Fieldwork was done in 1976, but the texts used here were collected after my return in early 1977. I want to thank all members of our team, especially Prof. Ch’en Ch’i-lu.

3 The first play of Hsin-ch’i sheng in front of the Ta-t’ung movie theatre (chin. text 1); the second in Fu-shan street (chin. text 2). The Hsin-ch’i sheng play was performed in Ta-li street (chin. text 3).

4 The tapes are in Taipei in the Taiwan National University. I have transcriptions of large parts of them, made by Miss Weng Li-li.

5 Miss Wang Ch’un-hua was kind enough to assist me in reading the Taiwanese language transcript and preparing a “translation” into Kuo-yü for me. A few words remained doubtful, because the original tape was not clear enough to allow Miss Weng Li-li to transcribe correctly.


7 I took notes on about 1000 paintings in temples on Taiwan, as well as some photographs. The way of representing persons on these frescoes or paintings is taken from the theatre, not from reality. I have heard from painters that they often relied on illustrations in popular novels; these illustrations, too, are in theatre style. This style can also be seen on small colored pictures added to cigarette packs or chewing gum.

8 It is interesting that in a text as late as the end of the 16th century the novel Chin P'ing Mei (edition Chin P’ing Mei ts’u-hua, chap. 60), a description of an entertainment in a house is given, in which at first Pai-hsi (Hundred plays) were performed, then music was played and finally two actors played theatre scenes, i.e. lyric and not acrobatic scenes.
A. Bulling has first published her theory in “Die Kunst der Totenspiele in der östlichen Han-Zeit,” *Oriens Extremus*, volume 3, no. 1, 1956, p. 28–56. Identification of scenes on the walls of tombs with theatre plays which in changed form were still played down to the present is done in “Historical Plays in the Art of the Han Period”, *Archives of Asian Art*, vol. 21, 1967/8, p. 20–38. In the earlier “Three Popular Motives in the Art of the Eastern Han Period”, *Archives of Asian Art*, vol. 20, 1966–7, p. 25–53 two motives common in Han art are discussed, but an identification with known plays was not possible.

Discussed by A. Bulling in “The Guide of the Souls Picture in the Western Han Tomb in Ma-wang-tui near Ch’ang-sha”, *Oriental Art*, vol. 20, no 2. 1974, p. 158–73. Incidentally, the canope above several scenes (Bulling 1967/8, figures 9 and 11) cannot easily be explained as decoration of a room, but looks exactly like the canope used in folk performances. Even the name plates on the scenes have their counterpart in similar plates which give the name of the play being played.


In the Chung-shun miao in Mu-shan, Taiwan (seen 1964).

*Hunan ch’ang p’ing (i-yao, Ch’ü-hai*, (Verf. Yao I-chih, Canton 1929), p. 65, Ta-lu-hua.


K. Finsterbusch, *Verzeichnis und Motivindex der Han Darstellungen*, Wiesbaden 1966, s.v. F.

Also on a Szu-ch’uan relief (Wen Yo, *Szu-ch’uan Han-tai hua-hsiang hsüan chi*, Peking 1956, plate 40)


*Ti-fang hsi-chü*, Anhui, p. 25–42.


*Tse ying chi* (Taking off the headdress bands), *Ch’ü-hai* p. 578–561.

His help for King Chuang of Ch’u (chapt. 2, section 15) and his meeting with the two-headed snake (chapt. 1, section 3).


*Wu Yuan ch’ui hsiao* (Wu Yuan plays the flute) (Ch’ü-hai p. 65–66); *Hsi Shih* (Kuo-hsi chi-ch’eng, p. 1); *Huan-sha chi* (Story of washing silk) (Kuo-hsi chi-ch’eng, p. 192); *Wu chao kuan* (The Wu-chao barrier), played in Taipei (on June 6, 1975), *Yü tsang chien* (A fish hidde a sword), played in Taipei (April 10, 1969), and *An-choa kuan* (The An-choa barrier) are all sections of the long play *Ting sheng Ch’un-chi*. *Wen-choa kuan* (The Wen-choa barrier) in *Kuo-hsi chi-ch’eng*, p. 19.

Hamada, p. 7. Li Shan has a biography in the *Hou Han shu*. He is also depicted on Han reliefs (Finsterbusch, s.v.).

Ch’ü-hai, p. 314–5.

Ch’ü-hai, p. 160–5 “Ch’ih Sung chi” (Story of the Master of the red pine), as one example of plays with Chang Liang.

I think here of A. Conrady and E. Erkes’s attempt to interpret Ch’ü Yuan’s poem *T’ien wen* as describing a set of paintings in a temple. If this theory should be correct – we still have such paintings in presentday temples – it could indicate that dramatic performances existed even at that time, considering the close relation of frescoes and plays in later times.
1. 新菊声 1977. 2.3 撫順街
2. 新菊声 1977. 2.2 大同戲院
3. 新琴声 1976. 10.20 理山街

一. 甘國安向表姊王連：「借錢不成，爭吵後，王連？破的話。
連：哎呀，你家死人，燒厝提桶跑－－你家喪事。
哎呀，天壽死國仔，－－我心臟強要走去，手都麻啊。
真的打我，我這雙手是細綿綿，我幾就教不敢對我怎樣。
這樣打我，甘國安！這世人你吃我最教，新年頭舊年尾，
壞話給我罵這多，我要留意眼給你看著你以後會
做官，做什麼都沒。做官！內面阿鄉我交代幾次甘
國安那來，大門、後門、中門都關好。新年領賀金才來，
我才換一双木屐給你換，氣了心臟強要走去，緊來裏面
燉一隻參仔鶏來吃，沒會帶心臟病。

2. 連：哎呀，天壽死國仔，你出去要給卡車弄死，給自行車
幹死才被殺死不知自殺呀他殺。我死於病，你也不
去替人死。天壽死國仔，前輩人牽牛去弄破他的
黃金甕仔蓋，這世人甲他做親成。我就知影，早
上起來要喝茶，喝得嗽歟。碰到這漏面，喝影的人
想他是催命鬼，不知的人以為是送財神。沒見沒笑，
你會做官，早啲你聽有沒？哎呀！實在狼狽，我起
踏出門就有這個散鬼艱鬼在髒；纜。我一世无什
麼不怕，上怕沒錢人，散鬼。那散鬼人走過來，那散鬼
味真重，你知影沒？哎呀！給他氣一下，強要帶心臟
病,肉面阿花。我给你交代过几次,我说甘国宝一来,前门后门都关起来,你是没听到吗?死国仔!就是土脚 dès没清道,这有笑狗来这株骨,气了会昏去,凑到肉面嫩参仔�.setOutput会补一下。

3. 逢:肉面家丁,长短拿出来,气了要生病,气了吃不肥;一直散落去。你想做官,自己不想了,做鬼卡快;做官?!

“为我不知之台语”

1. 逢:哎呀,你家死了人,房子着火提着桶子跑——“你家棉草”哎呀,短命死小鬼,激得我心爱快要停止了,手都麻掉了,真的打了我,我这双手是又细又软的,我先生都不敢对我怎摩样,你这样打我,甘国宝,这一辈子你最会欺負我,新年初,我说了这么多不好的话,我要眼睁睁的看你,看你以后会不会做官,做什么都没你的份,做什么官,阿香,我吩咐过几次了,如果甘国宝来,大门,后门,中门都要关闭好,等新年初赏金才买一双木屐给春生装得我心爱快要停止了,赶快到背面,嫩一隻人参鸭来吃,要不然,会得心病。

2. 逢:哎呀,短命死小鬼,你这出去将给卡车撞死,给自行车压死,才不会死了。不知道是自杀还是他杀,人千萬人会死,你总不去代替别人死,短命死小鬼,前一輩子牵牛去弄破他的骨灰罐的盖子,这一輩子才和他有
親戚關係,我早巳知道,早上喝茶時,喝得咳了,遇到這
種人,知道他的人說他是催命鬼,不知道他的人以為
他是送財神,真是不要臉,你會當一名官,還早得很呢!
你聽見了嗎? 哎呀! 實在狠狠,我丈夫剛出門,就來
這個貪窮鬼,賭鬼纏纏我,我這輩子什麼都不怕,最怕
是沒錢的人,貪窮的人,如果有貪窮人走過來,那貪窮
的味道很重,你知道嗎? 哎呀! 讓他這一激快要得
心臟病阿花,我已吩咐你多次,我說,甘園王,如果來前
門後門都問起來,你是沒聽到嗎? 死小鬼,就是因地
上沒掃乾淨,才會有這隻瘋狗來添骨頭,生氣得我快
暈倒,趕快到裏面,煩人參鴨來補一補。

3. 連: 家丁們,將武器(長短為銜)拿出來,生氣了要生病,
生氣了吃也不長胖,一直瘦下去,你想要當官,自己也
不想一想,當鬼比較快! 做什麼官?!

二甘園王離福建時,和雲姊惜別,雲姊送金鳳釵。

1. 嫂: 你這樣想法,我很高興,還有這回要過台灣去,假使
你那思鄉還是台灣和我們這一樣,有人賭博,你一定
會走壞路,所以,我不放心,這有一隻鳳釵給你隨身到
那台灣去,你在無聊,看到鳳釵好像看到我們本鄉的
人,可以安慰你的精神上,假使你要走壞路,要賭博要
嫖要賭,看到鳳釵好像看到我在你的身邊在叫,表哥,
你不要去。
2. 娇：你在這是嫖賭飲，雖是你這回要參戦，我為你真擔心，恐怕你性情不改，所以不放心。我這有一份金鈴，你那到台灣去，假使無聊，看到金鈴就好像看到我鼓勵，也好象看到我們本國的人一樣，再講你要去賭博，想當它你那這鈴金鈴，也沒去賭博走上壞路，做壞事，可以約束你的終身回頭。

3. 娇：表哥，你要有志氣，去台灣出頭天鈴金鈴送給你做為記，保佑你終身行善。

1. 娇：你有這樣的想法，我很高興，還有這次你到台灣去，如果你想念家鄉，還是在台灣和我們這兒一樣有人賭博你一定會走壞的路子。所以我不放心，這兒有一支金鈴送你隨身帶到台灣去，如果你無聊看到風鈴好像看到我們本國的人，可以安慰你的精神，假如你要走上壞的路（學壞事），想要賭博想要嫖想要賭博，看到這風鈴就好像看到我在你的身邊，叫你，表哥你不要去，表哥！你不要去，（記起我的叮囑）。

2. 娇：你在這兒是嫖賭和飲，雖然你這次要參戰，我真為你擔心，恐怕你的性情不改，所以我不放心。我這兒有一支金鈴，你若是到台灣去，假如無聊之時，看到金鈴就好像看到我在鼓勵你，也好像看到我們本國的人一樣。再說你要走上壞的路想去賭博，你看這隻金鈴，也不會去賭博走上不好的路，你不好之人，可以控制你的終身（改變你的人生）。
3. 媳: 表哥,你一定要有志氣,這一到台灣出人頭地,風釵送給你做為紀念,保佑你(榮華富貴)衣錦還鄉。

四、國宏死後復生回去見秀，及媽，前，秀，及媽之對白:

1. 秀: 自從國宏死後經過已久，為什麼國宏自從他來他也不對我好，他今天會死，一來二去那不是我秀？害他國宏，你知沒，你死後，你知我秀？每日在思念你。

媽: 不要講了，死去不能回來，靜一下。

秀: 媽，你怎講這話，你想想人都有一點感情一起那麼久，你都不傷心。

媽: 有傷心，不過他死了，再傷心也沒用。

秀: 媽：你看國宏死了。

2. 秀唱: 國宏死去太冤枉，他死是我害他，自己心甘情願心越急，想起眼淚落下土。

秀: 想不到國宏為了我，一命別開世間，我每天思念他，他死都是我害他，國宏，你赦免我，你死後，我會為你守節，在此等。

3. 沒有，國宏在此劇未死過。

1. 秀: 自從國宏死後已經過好久，自從國宏來，他也是對我很好，他今天會死去，總而言之都是我秀？害他的，國宏，你知道嗎？你死之後，你可要我秀？每日都在想念你。
媽：不要說了，死了又不能回生，安靜些。
秀：媽，你怎說這種話，你想一想，人都是有一種感情，我們在一起那麼久，你都不傷心嗎？
媽：我是傷心，不過他已死了，再傷心也沒用。
秀：媽，我看，國宏死了。

2. 秀唱：國宏死得太冤枉，他之死是我害的，自己越想心中越難過，想此眼淚滴下來。
秀：想不到國宏為了我，就如此學來，我每天思念他，他之死都是我害的，國宏，你要原諒我，你死了，我會為你守寡(節)。

3. 沒有，甘國宏在此劇未死過。