exegesis and through an English translation, but if Rouzer somewhat scants the English in order to keep focused on the Chinese text, the trade-off seems acceptable.

Rouzer’s commitment to the art of reading is at the heart of Writing Another’s Dream. That commitment leads to both its weakness as well as its strengths. In the end, however, its faults are minor: Rouzer’s success in presenting the texture of reading Late Tang poetry to an English-speaking audience makes Writing Another’s Dream a unique and valuable contribution to the study of Chinese literature.

University of California, Irvine

Michael A. Fuller

1 Rouzer sees Wen and Li Shangyin 李商隱 as representing the Late Tang style, but at least in the Song, they do not. For modern readers, Wen and Li may be the most interesting and distinctive poets, but when Song dynasty writers referred to Late Tang, they meant Jia Dao 賈島, Yao He 姚合, etc. Rouzer’s final chapter gives a good overview of this “Late Tang style” 晚唐體.

2 Liu Sihan 劉斯翰, Wen Tingyun shi ci xuan 溫庭筠詩詞選 (Hong Kong: Sanlian, 1986), p. 82.


Along with Li Xinchuan’s 李心傳 jianyan yilai xinian yaolu 建炎以來繫年要錄 and Li Tao’s 李濤 Xu Zizhi tongjian changbian 續資治通鑑長編, Xu Mengxin’s Sancho beimeng huibian 三朝背盟會編 (or Compendium of Broken Treaties from Three Imperial Reigns) is one of the “three legs of the grand tripod of Song annalistic historiography.” Covering the reigns of Huizong 徽宗 and Qinzong 欽宗, the last two emperors of Northern Song, and that of Gaozong 高宗, the first emperor of the Southern Song, the work is an indispensable source for the years of the Song and Jürchen confrontation, from 1117–62, particularly since this era is essentially missing from Li Xinchuan’s history. Xu Mengxin’s compilation incorporates some 200 sources, ranging in genre from imperial rescripts, memorials, records, to private notes, grave inscriptions, and other forms of historical sources.
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T’oung Pao LXXXII
Werner has translated Chapters 64–69 of the *Compendium of Broken Treaties from Three Imperial Reigns*, which describe the events of December 4, 1126 to January 9, 1127 that ended with the fall of the Song capital of Bianliang 毗陵 (modern Kaifeng) to the Jürchen. She has also provided a valuable, if not comprehensive, introduction, discussing textual sources and the political and military background of the period. The book concludes with several excellent and helpful appendices, including glossaries of terms, of personal names, and of place names, and a list of sites in Kaifeng, some keyed to one of three maps: Northern Song China, the capital circuit, and the capital of Kaifeng itself.

The translations are generally accurate and are quite readable. Part of this is due to the source material itself, which can sometimes be remarkably lively, but also to a translation that is not without its own qualities. Readers who are looking for more than actual fact, however, should be cautioned not about the reliability of the translation, but about the issue of editions and variants. This is a work that existed only in manuscript form until 1878, when it was first published in a moveable wooden-type edition.\(^1\) That publication was marred by a reliance on a manuscript of poor quality and by sloppy collations.\(^2\) A second edition, based on the manuscript used for the *Siku quanshu*, appeared in woodblock format in 1908.\(^3\) The original *Siku* manuscript has been edited thoroughly by the committee members of the commission, and in the eyes of one textual critic is one of the three most valuable manuscripts.\(^4\) A third, typeset and punctuated edition appeared in 1939.\(^5\) The question of which edition or editions to use is important because of the long and complicated history of manuscript transmission. The Yuan Zu’an edition, which is the most widely available, is also the most troublesome in terms of textual corruption. But we must use it cautiously for more reasons than simply accuracy: the language of the texts varies considerably from that of the other editions. As Mei Zulin has pointed out, much of the material in the *Sanchao beimeng huibian* was extremely colloquial.\(^6\) His interesting analysis of how intelligence was transmitted, first as oral reports from court emissaries (*yulu* 訪錄), then later written down (still in vernacular), to be retranslated into literary Chinese in other historical records is a good cautionary against simply accepting one edition. One must add this caution to those caused by textual corruption – later editors may have altered essentially colloquial passages to bring the text closer to