

in mind, of course. And if he means liberal democracy, many Chinese would question whether it is necessarily the best for China in view of its huge population, its vast territory, and its complexities, and the need for national unity and social stability at all times.

Voting as a Rite has many strengths as seen from the above. The only quibble I have is its lack of a discourse on the pro-democracy movement during the Republican period. The omission is understandable as it seems irrelevant to Hill's narrative. But it is a tad glaring as one wonders what the elections tell us about the kind of democracy the intellectual and political elites desired. There was no consensus among them, with some (like Hu Shi 胡適) favouring Anglo-American-style democracy, others (like Carsun Chang 張君勱) advocating European-style social democracy and state socialism, and still others (like Chen Jiongming 陳炯明) championing provincial autonomy or (like Liang Shuming 梁漱溟) rural reconstruction, not to mention a bunch of Marxists wanting a socialist political system. How did the elections relate to such political aspirations? Hill could have gone beyond his narrative to reflect on the struggle for democracy in the pre-Communist period.

This quibble aside, *Voting as a Rite* is a well-crafted narrative, highly original and important. It will remain the authoritative work for a long time to come.

EDMUND S. K. FUNG
Western Sydney University

Bronze and Stone: The Cult of Antiquity in Song Dynasty China. By Yunchiahn C. Sena. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 2019. Pp. xiii + 220. \$60.00.

The idea that Song-dynasty scholars initiated a new a set of approaches to understanding the Chinese past is almost taken for granted in modern scholarship—and has been for centuries, especially in the studies of ancient bronze vessels and stone inscriptions (*jinshixue* 金石學). Yet it is far from easy to explain why such developments happen—let alone why they happen when, where, and how they do. In *Bronze and Stone: The Cult of Antiquity in Song Dynasty China*, Yunchiahn Sena takes on the challenge of explaining the spread of a vision of antiquity that has informed taste, imagination, and knowledge-making into the present. To give a simple example, many terms used for the forms and motifs of ancient Chinese bronze vessels by contemporary archaeologists were fixed by Song-dynasty scholars, who tried to match what they saw in unearthed objects with words they read in early texts.

This book combines textual and visual/material sources to understand Song-dynasty antiquarianism as a set of connected practices that developed and grew over time, from the study of the past through recovered artefacts to the propagation of archaic models through new objects imitating, or borrowing from, ancient ones. Since the early twentieth century, the study of such issues has progressed from a simple search for antecedents to modern academic disciplines (historiography, archaeology, art history) toward more contextual analyses of pre-modern engagements and considers differences across time and space among approaches to the past and to its material vestiges. This study is in line with these anti-teleological and comparative trends, which make the ideas and outputs of Song antiquarians richer and more human. The introduction surveys scholarship on the Song antiquarian movement up to the present, judicious in its assessment of the imperfect match between the trajectories in Europe and East Asia.

The focus on the particulars of Song antiquarian practice serves Sena well in the close reading of the abundant but imperfect sources that survive from the period. We have several monumental pieces of scholarship (almost always in later editions) from an original body of works that was an order of magnitude larger (some surviving partially in quotations or registering in bibliographies). As befits a study of practices of close material observation, recording, and copying, Sena pays due heed to the physical production of Song antiquarian works, showing that the constraints and possibilities of the materials and techniques used—paper scrolls, rubbings, and eventually printed codices—shape how scholars in the Song, and subsequently, engaged with the objects they reproduced and described. She pays particularly close attention to how the rubbing, a mode of duplication that can seem to bypass the human agency inherent in, for example, drawing or even tracing. Sena argues that a rubbing of an inscription is not a “reproduction,” but rather a “translation,” because it does not even pretend to have the same physical attributes as the original (pp. 47–49). This is true, strictly speaking, but does not tell us what sense Song scholars might have had of what to consider original, or essential, attributes of an artefact. If a rubbing could stand in for, or even be preferable to, the object from which it was drawn, especially in cases where the object had deteriorated and the rubbing preserved a more intact state, the “copy” could be a better source of information than the “original”—much as an old photograph of a ruined building might be the basis for its restoration.

The first chapter is devoted to the study of a foundational scholar in the Song antiquarian movement, Ouyang Xiu 歐陽脩, and his *Records of Collecting Antiquity* (*Jigu lu* 集古錄). Sena is sensitive to the social, political, and intellectual context in which Ouyang worked, and to the materiality of his work, which was as much a collector’s personal archive of notes and facsimilia as a book in the sense implied

by modern publication practices. Sena describes Ouyang's work as a "*conceptual collection*" (original emphasis) built on a "non-materialistic strategy" of assembling rubbings rather than realia (p. 63). Of course, the *Records* themselves were subject to the material constraints of rubbing production and circulation, and to the material survival of Ouyang's copies and notes, as originals and in copies. Sena shows how the reconfiguration and distortion inherent in transmission and recopying redefine and re(con)figure the material that Ouyang and his peers studied.

Chapter 2 offers an overview of a wider range of Northern Song antiquarian writings, linking them to the uses of the knowledge they contained by Song elites and the state. The most familiar setting in which this learning was deployed was in ritual, both official and private, but Sena finds several examples of "secular" purposes to which ancient artefacts were put, such as understanding the material culture of the classical period and even as ostentatiously archaic implements of daily life.

The third and final body chapter of the book focuses on aspects of Song material culture influenced by this new knowledge of ancient things. The archaizing trend is a well-known feature of Song art history, apparent across multiple media from metalwork to ceramics to clothing. In the most literal cases, such as bronze vessels, Song artisans produced objects closely modelled on the ancient examples studied by scholars, in some cases imitating them so well that later collectors mistook them for pre-Qin artefacts or, if anachronism was detected, decrying them as forgeries (as which they may, in a few cases, have been intended). But much more widespread were objects that borrowed or quoted ancient design language in otherwise new idioms. For example, no one would mistake a porcelain flower vase for the ancient jade *cong* 琮 tube whose shape it took, or treat the two as functionally equivalent (the original use of the *cong* being uncertain). The Song is unquestionably the period in which many ancient forms and motifs were revived and reinterpreted, with results that have coloured Chinese visual culture ever since. Among ritual artefacts (for domestic settings and in temples), objects such as censers and libation vessels commonly feature shapes and décor traceable to the ancient vessels that Song antiquarians studied, and more particularly to the illustrations appearing in antiquarian texts. The same is no less true of more secular objects, particularly but not exclusively those according with "literati taste." The book identifies three strands (or "modes of production") in the Song use of antiquity in the production of new material culture: "overall emulation," "semiotic borrowing of forms," and "adapting ancient motifs" (pp. 96–100). The first is especially prominent in ritual contexts. The second she identifies with Song elite taste, for example, the use of markers of antiquity to emphasize understanding of and ties to the past on the part of the educated class. The third also grows out of literati taste, but grew beyond it to become part of visual culture more widely.

This study adds depth and texture to our understanding of Song antiquarianism, a field that has attracted a great deal of interest over the past decade.¹ It is part of a growing body of scholarship that is sensitive to the need to examine textual knowledge in conjunction with visual and material sources, and that links antiquarian knowledge to artistic production. The study of Song antiquarianism, in turn, offers a wealth of comparative possibilities and can fruitfully be compared, as the introduction does, with early modern Europe and also with other times and places.

One of the limitations of this new field of “World Antiquarianism,” to cite the title of a recent volume, is that we tend to look for family resemblances among practices and people who meet our expectations, often Eurocentric in origin, of how antiquarianism should look.² Thus, we have focused on Song scholars practising what looks like a proto-scientific form of early archaeology, however distant the resemblance, but paid less attention to milieus in which the past played less familiar roles. For example, up to the mid-eleventh century, the primary sources for understanding the material culture of Chinese antiquity and, thus, the proper forms for ritually significant objects were classicists’ largely textual studies, culminating in the early Song in Nie Chongyi’s 聶崇義 *Illustrations to the Three Ritual Classics* (*Sanli tu* 三禮圖). This work, both for antiquarian scholars in the Song and for modern scholars more generally, has mainly acted as a foil, an example of misguided pedantry. Only recently, thanks to a landmark exhibit and catalogue by François Louis, have we begun to appreciate this tradition in its own right.³ Just as importantly, Song scholars did not create their tools for understanding antiquity *ex nihilo*: they used sources and techniques developed over the course of centuries, if often for other purposes. For

¹ Important recent studies include Patricia Buckley Ebrey, *Accumulating Culture: The Collections of Emperor Huizong* (Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 2008); Jeffrey Moser, “The Ethics of Immutable Things: Interpreting Lü Dalin’s *Illustrated Investigations of Antiquity*,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 72, no. 2 (December 2012), pp. 259–93; Ya-hwei Hsu, “Antiquaries and Politics: Antiquarian Culture of the Northern Song, 960–1127,” in *World Antiquarianism: Comparative Perspectives*, ed. Alain Schnapp et al., Issues & Debates (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2013), pp. 230–48; Chen Fangmei 陳芳妹, *Qingtongqi yu Songdai wenhuashi* 青銅器與宋代文化史 (Taipei: Guoli Taiwan daxue chuban zhongxin, 2016); see also the contributions in Peter N. Miller and François Louis, eds., *Antiquarianism and Intellectual Life in Europe and China, 1500–1800*, Cultural Histories of the Material World (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2012).

² Schnapp et al., eds., *World Antiquarianism*.

³ François Louis, *Design by the Book: Chinese Ritual Objects and the Sanli tu* (New York: Bard Graduate Center, 2017).

instance, deciphering ancient inscriptions on bronze vessels was challenging even for a polymath like Ouyang Xiu, but the basis for doing so was not mere intuition or study of bronzes alone. Rather, scholars drew on a received body of palaeographic scholarship tied to the *Shuowen jiezi* 說文解字 and other philological works as well as living calligraphic traditions. The same is true of the historical and geographic knowledge that Song antiquarians relied on to put the objects in context and that, in turn, they advanced based on their discoveries. A full account of these connections remains to be written.

By the same token, it would be helpful to have some sense of the limits of Song antiquarianism. It is easy, from a study like this, to get the impression that antiquarianism was a passion shared among the whole educated population, when in fact we are looking at a small number of individuals, even relative to the pool of those whose writings we can consult today. Many Song literati seem not to have had much to say about ancient objects, and surely only a minority possessed any or studied them systematically. It is hyperbole to claim that an “unfailing interest in ancient objects among Chinese literati manifested itself in the act of collecting” (p. 30). This interest did fail, or at least falter: not only was it not universal, it was limited in scope: those literati who collected did so selectively, based on principles that define their particular form of antiquarianism and distinguish it from others, including those we see in later periods of Chinese history. The most familiar of these constraints is a focus on objects bearing inscriptions, which served the preference for verbal forms of knowledge. Although Song collectors did collect uninscribed objects, they tended to collect things of types that *could* be inscribed (especially stelae and bronze vessels, but also jades). And they tended to focus on objects that could be sources for understanding issues arising from textual scholarship and contemporary needs, such as the proper form and arrangement of ritual implements. Interest in other ancient objects, such as everyday ceramics, tools, and tomb figures, was slower to develop. And histories of the studies of materials that do not fit the mould of “studies of metal and stone” (*jinshixue*), such as coins, seals, and bricks, have also been excluded from much of the scholarship on Chinese antiquarianism, although they too took on distinct and systematic forms in the Song period.

Sena’s definition of antiquarianism limits it to the study of the past through the study of objects, excluding textual learning even when it is directed toward the material and intended to produce material results (for example, the study of medical and pharmacological classics). It also leaves out the worship of ancient figures, whether or not this involved the use of objects (such as relics, remains, or representations) linked to them. What, then, is the “cult of antiquity,” a phrase appearing in book’s subtitle but nowhere in its body? The devotions in which these artefacts were deployed, Sena explains, were not directed toward antiquity itself but toward the present: ancient artefacts, and new ones modelled on them, served political and

social goals. It would be helpful to offer more precision about the relationship between antiquarianism and the factional conflicts for which late Northern Song politics are known. For example, Sena mentions in the introduction and conclusion that tension between the Old and New Parties lies in the background of antiquarian scholarship and their writings, such as the major catalogues of private and imperial collections, “were often used by different political factions to insinuate their stance in political idealism” (p. 5). But we learn very little about which scholars or which texts belong with which factions, what issues divided them, and how specific interests guided their selections from and interpretations of antiquity. Thus, the so-called Zhenghe 政和 cauldron is described in detail as a prime example of the Song court’s production of archaizing bronzes, without any mention of the fact that it was cast to reward the emperor’s favoured eunuch, Tong Guan 童貫, or that the bureau that produced it was founded at the instigation of the New Party chancellor, Cai Jing 蔡京.⁴

Some of these socio-political significances are explored in depth in other recent scholarship on the period. Sena adds a sensitive reading of the object’s use of a reinterpreted *taotie* 饕餮 motif based on Shang precedents and shows more broadly how scholarly interpretation of these objects inflected artisanal production in many areas, especially funerary display. One particularly noteworthy example is a close examination of how stelae and other carved stone features of some elite tombs of the Southern Song borrowed from early imperial design features, a development not commonly discussed in connection with Song antiquarian learning (pp. 109–23). The book highlights many such details that reveal how knowledge of ancient design was absorbed and interpreted by Song tastemakers and craftspeople. It helps us understand more precisely how features of Song visual culture, including those of objects not themselves strictly archaizing, or with limited archaic features, relate to broader aesthetic trends, such as the fondness for unadorned objects that highlight forms and materials—a preference that can seem to be at odds with the often ornate, intricate décor of the ancient objects many of the same collectors favoured. In short, the book opens up many avenues for understanding how antiquarianism permeated the intellectual and aesthetic lives of Song people—a small minority of elite collectors, at first, but in time a broader and more diverse group of people.

BRUCE RUSK

University of British Columbia

⁴ The founding of the Lizhi ju 禮制局, the Bureau (or Service) for Ritual Regulations, *not* “Bureau of Ritual Production,” occurred in 1112 (not 1113), when Cai returned from forced retirement. See Ya-hwei Hsu, “Antiquities, Ritual Reform, and the Shaping of New Taste at Huizong’s Court,” *Artibus Asiae* 73, no. 1 (2013), pp. 149–50. Cf. Sena, pp. 107–8.