
Introduction

Understanding Authenticity in Chinese Cultural Heritage

Anke Hein and Christopher J. Foster

Authenticity concepts are both culturally and historically contingent. Whether constructed in terms of originality in the material sense (Spencer 2004), imbued with a unique aura (Benjamin 1936), or being true to the self (Trilling 1973), no single approach to “authenticity” satisfies universally. What is deemed to be authentic follows norms agreed upon by particular communities in specific contexts; it is the “product of the relationships between people and things” (Jones 2010:200). *Understanding Authenticity in Chinese Cultural Heritage* explores how attitudes toward authenticity in China have varied between communities and object types while also changing over time. It examines authenticity through a fourfold division—between (i) art and material culture; (ii) cultural heritage management and preservation; (iii) living and intangible heritage; and (iv) texts and manuscripts—engaging in a critical and interdisciplinary conversation that ultimately seeks to transcend these very divisions. This conversation continues efforts to diversify discourses on authenticity and cultural heritage (e.g., Wijesuriya and Sweet 2018), questioning Eurocentric assumptions that have shaped international accords (Grimberg, this volume), and tempering the bemusement often leveled at China’s “copycat” culture in popular media outside of China (Op-ed 2007; Greenspan 2018). With growing anxieties over fake news, misinformation campaigns, and how to navigate a post-truth world, we encourage readers of *Understanding Authenticity in China’s Cultural Heritage* to reflect upon their own views of authenticity and, in the process, hopefully foster empathy toward the perspectives of others.

To illustrate how beliefs about authenticity can impact approaches to cultural heritage, here we want to start with a brief comparison of sites from Greece and China. Rising prominently above Athens, the modern capital city of Greece, the Acropolis and its temple complex—including most famously the Parthenon—stand as testament to a storied past (Figure 0.1, left). First built in the mid-5th century BCE, the Parthenon today is only partially preserved, with its roof collapsed, columns crumbling, and marble a barren white. This aesthetic is not just an accident of circumstance, but rather, the result of deliberate conservation choices (Lambrinou 2013). In the center of Beijing, the capital of the People’s Republic of China (PRC), the massive palace complex now known as the Forbidden

DOI: 10.4324/9781003290834-1



Figure 0.1 Left: Parthenon, Athens, Greece, viewed from the west (Mountain 2006); right: the front gate of the Forbidden City, Beijing, China (Hebel 2015).

City (*Gugong* 故宫) likewise stands as testament to another storied past, where Ming and Qing Dynasty emperors once ruled over their expansive territories (Figure 0.1, right). Constructed over five centuries ago, the Forbidden City as it stands today reflects a starkly different approach to conservation than the one applied to the Parthenon (Grimberg, this volume). The wooden architecture is continuously refurbished with new beams and kept brightly painted, with PRC flags flying alongside a portrait of Mao Zedong over the front gate, who gazes down at the visitors crossing the threshold below.

In deciding how best to preserve and display sites like the Parthenon or the Forbidden City, choices have been made as to what the important elements of these sites are, what makes these sites authentic, and what therefore is worth saving. Cultural expectations, especially of domestic audiences, impact these conservation choices. In the 18th century, as archaeology first developed into a formal discipline in Europe during the Age of Enlightenment, the neoclassical movement characterized antiquity through the seeming austerity witnessed in Greek and Roman remains, believed to always have been of pure white marble—a vision that has been shown to be historically incorrect by the discovery of paint remains on classical statues (Brinkmann et al. 2017). Until recently, “paint [was] seldom taken into account in art-historical studies of ancient marble sculpture” (Bradley 2009:427), since colored statuary contradicts widespread European presumptions about how Greek antiquity *should* appear. Even though it is now widely known that the Parthenon’s friezes were originally painted in bright pastel colors, European audiences today still expect white marble pillars as a mark of authentic Greek antiquity. It is an aesthetic that works in concert with the fragmentary nature of the stone remains, to the effect of rendering the passing of time visible and lending an air of antiquity to the site (Schnapp et al. 2013).

No such imperative for aesthetic austerity informed by European neoclassicism manifests in the vibrant imaginations of colorful ancient palaces depicted on popular Chinese TV historical dramas such as *Wu Meiniang zhuanqi* 武媚娘傳奇

(*The Empress of China*), which aired in 2014. Chinese audiences bring a different set of cultural expectations to bear, not just on TV dramas but also on sites like the Forbidden City. Furthermore, the susceptibility of wood to fire and rot makes it less durable than stone. Where wooden architecture predominates, as with the Forbidden City, authenticity claims tend to focus less on preserving the original building materials and more on replicating the construction methods and appearance of architecture, continuity in the geography or occupation of the site, and the practices performed there (Stubbs and Thomson 2017). Conservation of the wooden Sakyamuni Pagoda 釋迦塔 of Fogong Temple 佛宮寺, Yixian County, China, and the Ise Shrine, Mie Prefecture, Japan, offer two other prominent examples of this orientation from East Asia, guided moreover by religious beliefs. The former has been repaired extensively since its initial construction, and hardly any fragments of the original wooden structure now remain (Cameron and Inaba 2015); the latter has been rebuilt every 20 years since the medieval period to symbolize the cycle of death and rebirth (Adams 1998; Larsen 1994).

When archaeology arose as a discipline in China during the turbulent early 20th century, it was wed closely to both historiography and nationalism (Falkenhausen 1993). On the one hand, Chinese archaeologists inherited a long-standing native antiquarian interest in using past material remains to supplement a venerated corpus of received textual classics. On the other hand, following the century of humiliation and facing calls for a modernized new culture, archaeology promised a way forward by establishing the origins of a Chinese people and a Chinese state (Fiskesjö 2017). With the Communist Party's rise to power, ideological antagonism toward traditional culture wrought destruction, most notably during the Cultural Revolution (1966–1976). Yet sites like the Forbidden City offered symbolic capital that could solidify national identity (Ledderose 1988), continuing policies that “considered architectural conservation helpful for nation-building” (Chen and Shen 2022:1). In 2020, President Xi Jinping called for the development of an archaeology with Chinese characteristics, with emphasis placed on “cultural self-confidence” (*wenhua zixin* 文化自信). In this regard, displaying the imperial grandeur of the Forbidden City, through well-maintained and brightly painted edifices, paired with a portrait of Mao and PRC flags, recalls and reaffirms the palace as a powerful political center, both past and present (Weatherley and Zhang 2017).

The scattered marble remnants of the 18th-century Old Summer Palace (*Yuanmingyuan* 圓明園), just a few miles from the Forbidden City in northwest Beijing, offers a poignant example of how political frameworks can influence attitudes toward the conservation and consumption of cultural heritage, but here, with a very different outcome. Looted and destroyed by British and French troops led by Lord Elgin, James Bruce, during the Second Opium War, the ruins of the Old Summer Palace complex have never been restored. Heated debates over if, or how, to conserve the site reflect the complex entanglement of issues of authenticity with China's relationships with Western nations (Lee 2009; Mengzhi 2020; Weatherley and Rosen 2013). The ravages of war, more so than of time, have been deemed worth preserving, a position attested by frequent signage reminding

visitors of the violent transgressions enacted here by foreign troops (Gruber, this volume). Analogous messaging underlies the construction and design of the Acropolis Museum and serves a modern Greek nationalist agenda, by pressing for the repatriation of statuary removed by a different Lord Elgin, Thomas Bruce (Plantzos 2011), touching upon the issue of authenticity in display contexts.

With the above comparisons, we urge consideration of authenticity for individual sites as a part of specific communities—communities who bring to bear their own value systems and histories. Such a contextualized approach allows both for a diversity of understandings about what authenticity can entail (e.g., as reflected in the conservation choices for the Parthenon vs the Forbidden City) while forgoing cultural essentialism (e.g., the parallel messaging of the Acropolis Museum and the Old Summer Palace). Pitting an “Eastern” versus “Western” orientation toward principles of heritage conservation and authenticity creates a false dichotomy. Natsuko Akagawa addresses this issue for Japanese heritage practices, showing, for example, how in Japan traditionally every step of restoration work was meticulously recorded, a practice that satisfies the seemingly Western principle of clear documentation, as a means of assessing when and where changes are introduced (Akagawa 2015:73–77). At the same time, Akagawa notes (2015:77) that past restoration work in Europe, such as Eugène Viollet-le-Duc’s 19th-century work on Notre-Dame (Paris), often moved beyond a strictly evidentiary basis to follow, instead, the spirit in which other similar buildings were constructed. Greater awareness of European and non-European traditions, their complex histories, and—crucially—their own diverse communities could foster a more inclusive understanding of heritage concepts and ideas of authenticity.

Unfortunately, and especially in the perception of a non-Chinese public, China remains stereotyped as a “copycat” culture, without acknowledging the sociocultural relativism of authenticity and its consequences. Authors such as Byung-Chul Han (2011), Yu Hua (2011), and Winnie Wong (2012) have begun to press back against this stereotype, especially by championing the subversive capacity of forgery and imitations in China, while others have highlighted how copying can spur on both creative innovation and economic growth (Raustiala and Sprigman 2013). More work remains to be done, however, if we are to not just cast “copycat” culture in a positive light but move beyond the stereotyping altogether.

Part of this work entails unpacking the narrow application of a modern Eurocentric model for “heritage,” described often as authorized heritage discourse (AHD), which forwards a materialistic view of “authenticity” that “privileges expert values and knowledge about the past and its material manifestations” (Smith 2006:4), especially “the authorial voices of the upper middle and ruling classes of European educated professionals and elites” (Smith 2006:28; Smith and Waterton 2012). The influence of AHD in China, and the language of *wenhua yichan* 文化遺產 (“cultural heritage”), is a relatively recent phenomenon. This is especially apparent with the 1985 launch of a protection scheme for so-called major Chinese cultural and natural heritage (*Zhongguo zhongda wenhua he ziran yichan* 中國重大文化和自然遺產), leading to the successful application for World Heritage

Status for six sites in 1987 (Svensson 2016; Zhao 2014). Indeed, the state-run Chinese Cultural Heritage 中國文化遺產 program was only initiated in the early 2000s, making the terminology and official status conferred to certain monument a rather recent phenomenon in China. Prior to the 1980s, what in an English-language context would be broadly summarized as cultural heritage is usually discussed in a more concrete sense, in talking about Chinese civilization or Chinese culture (*Zhongguo wenming/wenhua* 中國文明/文化 or *Huaxia wenming/wenhua* 華夏文明/文化) or about traditions (*su* 俗 or *xisu* 習俗), practices (as in burial practices, *zangsu* 葬俗), cultural relics (*wenwu* 文物) or material traces (*yiji* 遺跡) or sites (*yizhi* 遺址). Until the present day, excavation reports mostly use this type of very concrete terminology, as do ethnographic studies, rather than employing the broad conceptual term *wenhua yichan* (“cultural heritage”).

Nevertheless, even though China’s participation in this discourse is recent and one may look in vain for a specific term that can be equated with “cultural heritage” in Chinese literature pre-1980, this does not mean that the complex of issues surrounding what are now referred to as “heritage” and “authenticity” were absent. For instance, debates on who actually created paintings signed with the names of famous Chinese artists go back to at least the Tang period (Kerr 1990). During the Song Dynasty, for instance, scholars started studying ancient bronzes and their inscriptions to reconstruct and revive early dynastic court rituals (Visconti 2015) but also to correct errors in historical texts (Clunas 1991). They started collecting, cataloging, and categorizing bronzes (and to a lesser extent jades) based on style and inscriptions, amassing both objects and knowledge of them at a fast pace and noting down their observations and views in a broad range of antiquarian writings (Sena 2019:65–97). At the same time, the interest in ancient objects spread beyond the higher-level elite to lower officials who did not have access to the imperial collections. This spurred the production of imitations and an entirely new range of objects inspired by ancient jades and bronzes but executed, for instance, in ceramic material (Sena 2019:95–152). While scholars with access to the imperial collections tasked with compiling catalogs developed criteria for dating vessels based on style and inscriptions, the period also saw the re-creation of ancient bronze vessels for the purpose of conducting the reconstructed rituals. Attitudes toward material originality were thus much more fluid than rigid Western notions of “real” versus “fake.” Old and new were still being distinguished, but the real focus was on reconstructing rituals and learning about the past. The study of inscriptions on stone and bronze continued and experienced a second boom during the early modern period when China was searching for its place in the world and questioning the veracity of transmitted texts, checking them against material evidence as the Song scholars had (Falkenhausen 1993). This work eventually became ancestral to both archaeology and modern paleography (*jinshixue* 寶石學) (Chang 1981).

In the field of textual criticism, as developed through the study of Greco-Roman literature and the biblical canon, authenticity is author based. The goal of a textual critic is to restore the original version of a text, as penned by the hand of the

author—the autograph—by identifying and eliminating where later hands have corrupted the content, whether via scribal mistakes, intentional editorial manipulations, or other processes (Maas 1958:1). Author-based authenticity in textual studies has a long history in China. Already in the Han Dynasty, the bibliographer Liu Xiang 劉向 (79–8 BCE) noted false attributions of authorship (e.g., Ban 1962 [ca. 1st–2nd cen.]: *juan* 30, 1731; Fischer 2008–2009:5–10). Medieval Chinese Buddhist catalogs mark works that claim to have Indic origins yet likely were composed initially in Chinese and thus were never translations, as *weijing* 偽經 “spurious books” or *yijing* 疑經 “doubtful books” (Buswell 1990:3–7). Over the centuries, Chinese scholars designed sophisticated methodologies for analyzing textual authorship, a pursuit that came to be known as *bianwei xue* 辨偽學 or “authentication studies.” Yet it has become increasingly apparent that premodern—and especially pre-imperial—textual production did not necessarily involve individuated authors and singular moments of composition (Fischer 2008–2009; Smith, this volume). Moreover, as Susan Cherniack has argued for Song book culture (1994:8–18), Chinese scholars often approached textual transmission as an opportunity to improve upon the canon, following Confucius’s model as an active editor. Despite Confucius (551–479 BCE) famously claiming to “transmit but not innovate 述而不作” (after Lau 1992:56–57), it is unclear what precisely is to be transmitted and, when applied to textual studies, where that feature resides in a text itself. When criticized for being too innovative, Yang Xiong 揚雄 (53 BCE–18 CE) cleverly replies that while he *zuo* 作 “created” new writings, he faithfully transmits the *shi* 事 “traditions” (Nylan 2013:78–79), alternatively rendered as “the heart of matters.” A similar logic underlies, for example, Shu Xi’s 束皙 (ca. 263–302 CE) attempt to “fill in” lyrics missing from the *Shi* 詩 (*Odes*), thereby restoring old institutions—in this case, the Rite of the District Symposium. Shu Xi’s “Missing Odes” occupy “a different space, one between forgery, criticism, pastiche, and imitation . . . best understood as ‘actualizations’ of the orthodox outlook of the *Book of Odes*” (Mazanec 2018:20).

In the Chinese context, as elsewhere in the world, heritage discourse is shaped by these cultural and historical particularities, as well as by local sociopolitical forces, leading to potential conflicts with AHD (Su 2018; Su 2021; Wu and Qin 2016). The integration of Chinese monuments and practices into international world heritage lists, therefore, has forced both China and international bodies, such as ICOMOS (Burke 2012) and UNESCO, to reconcile varied interpretations of “heritage” and “authenticity.” The Venice Charter of 1964 acknowledges that the concept of authenticity was established in the 19th and 20th centuries through the lens of Western heritage conservation (ICOMOS 1964). With the 1994 Nara Document on Authenticity, these origins were problematized, with a call to eschew “judgements of values and authenticity” based on “fixed criteria.” This appreciated that values varied with cultural context and were subject to change over time, and “the respect due to all cultures requires that heritage properties must be considered and judged within the cultural contexts to which they belong” (ICOMOS 2014). UNESCO’s evaluation (2013) of the Sakyamuni Pagoda exemplifies this

change in thinking, as UNESCO pronounced the pagoda to be authentic, giving as justification the fact that continuity persists in its structural form, that the building still stands in the same location, that the same kinds of building materials and designs have been used for its construction, and that inscriptions note where later repairs and modifications have been made (Jerome 2008). Yet both in the Nara Document and as shown with UNESCO's evaluation of the Sakyamuni Pagoda, despite sensitivity to the cultural relativity of authenticity, fixed criteria are forwarded and prominence is given to the principles underlying prior understandings of authenticity (Jones 2010:186). This is troubling, considering the crucial role authenticity plays in nomination dossiers for World Heritage recognition (Feilten and Jokilehto 1998; Labadi 2013; Labadi and Long 2010). Fortunately, over the past few decades, the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention have undergone major reassessment, both widening definitions of "heritage" to include the ordinary in addition to the monumental (Stovel 1995) as well as embracing differences in authenticity concepts around the world (Akagawa 2015; Byrne 1995; Gao and Jones 2021).

Similar reassessments have taken place regarding authenticity in intangible cultural heritage. The Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage adopted in 2003 allows for fluidity and change in practice (UNESCO 2003), and more recently, UNESCO has argued that "authenticity and exclusivity should not constitute concerns and obstacles in the safeguarding of ICH" (UNESCO 2015: Art. 8). Some scholars have called for the empowerment of practitioners over government bodies or international committees (Aikawa-Faure 2009; Chhabra 2019). Others have suggested to conceive of authenticity in ICH as a constant negotiation between stakeholders (Gao and Hein, this volume; Labadi 2013). Ironically, while UNESCO has moved to deemphasize authenticity in ICH, in China, authenticity has become entrenched in ICH law (Chen and Cai 2012; Dai 2012; Han 2011). The aim, according to China's 2011 ICH laws, is to maintain ICH as it was in the past and stay true to its historical original while avoiding variation or distortion (Xin and Zhang 2011:14). China's treatment of authenticity for ICH, in other words, has become less flexible than the conventions now forwarded by UNESCO. Whether this entrenchment is an expedient to manage local political dynamics or simply the consequence of years of attempting to fulfill UNESCO requirements to frame Chinese cultural heritage within European frameworks, it stands as a curious inversion of the stereotype, bemoaned before, of China as a place of *shanzhai* imitations and forgeries.

In light of these developments, one may rightfully wonder if we should cast away the concept of "authenticity" altogether. David A. Scott (this volume) argues that authenticity is multivalent and that therefore "in this sense, there is no such thing as 'authenticity' per se." Yet, as shown above, and as becomes clear throughout this book, the question of authenticity—in its many forms, applied to objects, texts, and practices alike—has been under debate in various parts of the world for a long time and continues to be debated today. It is linked to identity, both cultural and individual, expressed via practices of creating, re-creating, admiring,

displaying, using, and even researching. Authenticity debates are also closely related to definitions of (cultural) heritage and the connections of both with claims to and expressions of power. While authenticity in the positivist sense as an absolute, immutable value is no longer tenable, a range of interrelated concerns that might be seen as falling under a more broadly defined notion of authenticity is still very much under debate and of actual relevance in everyday life, politics, and heritage practices. Discussing authenticity concepts and highlighting their fluidity, relativity, and contextuality gives voice to universal concerns over identity, ideology, and meaningfulness (Bagnall 2003; Graham et al. 2000; Mclean 2006). Framed in such a way, discussions on authenticity concepts (rather than authentication) reveal power dynamics surrounding the use of the term, thus opening space for a broader range of communities in various parts of the world—both past and present—to make their voices heard.

With this objective in mind, we initiated the “Understanding Authenticity in China’s Cultural Heritage” project (<https://authenticitychina.web.ox.ac.uk>) as a way to constructively explore discourses on authenticity, and their consequences, in relation to China’s cultural heritage. In a series of talks, conferences, workshops, and informal meetings starting in 2019 within a local southern England network, this project has consciously pursued cross-disciplinary dialogue, between a diverse array of stakeholders, not only about conceptual issues but also on the practical ramifications that debates about authenticity and forgery have for work done in cultural heritage management, museums, the antiquities trade, law enforcement, and other professions, in addition to academic research. Following the onset of the coronavirus pandemic in 2020, it transitioned to a primarily online platform, allowing for collaborations more global in their reach. The chapters in this volume are drawn from participants in the “Understanding Authenticity” series of events, with many papers first presented during our international conference from 16 to 20 March 2020. Together, the volume shows how concepts of authenticity, their sociocultural impacts, and political frameworks, both converge and diverge, based on different variables: object classes, time, locality, and/or actors involved.

In Part I, “Art and Material Culture,” the ontological status of a copy, and its relationship to an original, constitutes a major concern. David A. Scott (Chapter 1) surveys Western philosophical treatments of authenticity and brings them into dialogue with the Chinese art canon. He finds that the valorization and recreation of ancient pieces is a defining characteristic of the Chinese context, which necessitates embracing a multivalence to authenticity that can incorporate copies. To do this, Scott distinguishes between three fields for authenticity: material, conceptual, and aesthetic/historical. In her analysis of 15th- to 17th-century *fang* 仿 (“imitation”) paintings in the style of the famous 14th-century artist Ni Zan 倪瓚, Penny Dan Xu (Chapter 2) compares the relationship of copies and originals to that of intertwined branches of a single tree, connected and yet unique in and of themselves. As such, Xu argues the *fang* Ni Zan paintings are “sub-originals,” not only continuing the aura of a prior work but also cultivating their own aura, as

derived from the unique social contexts and meanings in which the *fang* paintings were produced and circulated.

As with the prior two chapters, Gillian Yanzhuang Zhang (Chapter 3) challenges presumptions that authenticity must derive from an original. At the end of the 11th century, the famed Su Shi 蘇軾 reportedly discovered a marvelous stone, which he called the Snowy Wave stone. Zhang examines written testimonies of visits to the Snowy Wave stone up to the 18th century, showing how these audiences separated authenticity claims from originality; for instance, a visitor may be perfectly aware that the stone they viewed differed in appearance from prior descriptions or that the inscription on the stone's basin had not been carved by the hand of Su Shi himself and yet they did not find this concerning. Zhang argues that, rather, for these audiences, authenticity was generated through what Pierre Nora calls the *lieu de mémoire*, a site of memory, which bonded a stone to other heritage objects (both old and new) within a particular location—Su Shi's studio at the Confucian temple of Dingzhou. It is an alternative conceptualization of authenticity that elevates place and context over the continuity of an original object and anticipates the later discussions, in Part II, on modern tourist experiences to archaeological sites or even simulacrascapes.

Differences in cultural expectations toward the value and utility of copies prestage a potential conflict in heritage diplomacy today, Jennifer Kreder (Chapter 4) warns, having witnessed parallel tensions in the intellectual property field. Kreder surveys US and Chinese intellectual property law, showing how the former prioritizes protection of the original creator, while the latter makes greater accommodations to protect the public good. This discrepancy has led to international disputes over copyright infringement, illustrated by Kreder with the case of Chicago's *The Bean* statute and its counterpart in Karamay, Xinjiang, which she refers to as *The Bubble*. Sensitivity to this relativity in cultural expectations, especially toward the authenticity of copies, is needed to avoid similar conflicts in international exchanges involving cultural heritage, from the loaning and exhibiting of replicas in museums overseas to diplomatic disputes over the status of looted artifacts in repatriation claims.

Part II, focusing on the issue of “Cultural Heritage Management and Preservation,” picks up on several of the themes discussed in Part I and moreover considers how the views of nonacademic stakeholders, including tourists, locals, and cultural heritage practitioners, intersect with the concerns of archaeologists and conservation specialists. Complementing Kreder's legal analysis and providing important background for the discussion of cultural heritage practices in subsequent chapters, Phillip Grimberg (Chapter 5) introduces UNESCO's stance on the matter of authenticity in the case of built structures in China. He describes a shift from a Eurocentric emphasis on material-based authenticity to a more open approach showing greater sensitivity to cultural differences and treating authenticity as relative. This has allowed non-European regions and actors to participate in a discourse that has become “glocal” (a global-local hybrid), as Grimberg suggests. While he attempts a definition of authenticity that focuses on material

originality—as remains common in cultural heritage contexts faced with conservation issues—the crucial point he underlines is to allow for local agency.

This local agency plays out in Tao Li's chapter on the archaeological park of the Linzi Qi State Site (Chapter 6). Following Wang Ning, she reflects on the visitors' "dreams, stereotyped images, and expectations" (Wang 1999:351), as they conflict with the views and aims of archaeologists and museum experts in particular. The interpretation dilemma that she encounters is based on differing assumptions about authenticity, with the caretakers of the sites prioritizing objective authenticity (found in an original), whereas tourists visiting the sites subscribing to constructive authenticity (a social product of beliefs, dreams, expectations, and so forth). This dilemma is particularly poignant in the case of damaged or otherwise visually unimpressive archaeological remains, which must not only be preserved but at the same time also explained—and made attractive—to visitors. Solving this dilemma, Tao Li suggests, demands all stakeholders work together, to accommodate diverse views and needs for a shared cultural resource.

Focusing on three segments of the Great Wall, Stefan Gruber (Chapter 7) likewise discusses conservation strategies and display choices, showcasing how they vary in regard to authenticity, based on environmental, economic, and political concerns. The Great Wall, as Gruber notes, offers a particularly complex case study, owing to its importance for Chinese identity construction, economic value as a tourist attraction, and unique preservation challenges. The nuances Gruber articulates for the conservation strategies adopted for different sections of the Great Wall in many ways help reaffirm Tao's call to balance between material preservation and the needs of various stakeholders, whether that be political messaging, to sell tickets and generate revenue, or to satisfy tourists' expectations—which, one may add, includes communicating historical and archaeological information to visitors in an educational, culturally enriching, yet hopefully entertaining way. This balance is difficult to strike and has to be rethought and renegotiated between different stakeholders for each particular case, only to be renegotiated yet again as time passes and views change.

Turning to modern practices of architecture creation, rather than preservation, Guo Boya (Chapter 8) and Patrycja Pola Pendrakowska (Chapter 9), examine architectural mimicry and simulacrascapes. Guo's case studies entail themed communities located on the outskirts of Beijing, namely Jackson Hole, a replica of a town with the same name in Wyoming, USA, and W-Town or Gubei Waterfront Town 古北水鎮, a replica of the historic Wuzhen 烏鎮, Zhejiang. In the dialectics between "copying from the West" and "copying from [China's] past," Guo finds a search for a new cultural identity in China—one born out of a mixture of reality and fantasy, the collapse of which poses a distinct challenge to prior theories of authenticity. Yet as Pendrakowska notes, many tourists visiting theme parks like The Window of the World 世界之窗 (Shenzhen) or replica of European towns such as Hallstatt in Huizhou, do not confuse the ontological status of the copies they visit, but rather, embrace artificiality, allowing the site's aesthetics to inspire the imagination. In this way, authenticity lies in the experiences derived from the

imitations, irrespective of, or even consciously separate from, any original. Pendrakowska thus proposes a theory of “tourism for the sake of imitation,” where value is not derived from originals, but from experiences that stand in a—often reconfirming—dialogue with prior expectations.

Part III, “Living and Intangible Cultural Heritage,” continues with the focus on modern practices and, in particular, the recognition of Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH), as embedded in debates over authenticity. As these chapters make clear, in ICH practices, the line between material and intangible is often blurred, and tensions arise between ensuring continuity and allowing for change. In their chapter on contemporary craft-making in China, David Francis and Zhang Lisheng (Chapter 10) discuss two cases: the Rong Design Collective reworking paper umbrellas into a chair; and changes in design and technique among Dai potters. With the Rong Design Collective’s paper chair, materials and craft process remained the same, while shape and function changed. Creating the paper chair brought contemporary Euro-American design theory to traditional Chinese crafts, and moreover, for Zhang Lei, one of the team’s members, entailed a search for origins, returning from Milan to the outskirts of Hangzhou. In the second case, of Dai pottery, while the use of clay and wheel-throwing technique have persisted, and a master-discipline lineage is retained (though with changes to its gendered component), the forms, functions, and aesthetics of the vessels have been altered over time. Outside influences have played a key role in this phenomenon, with, for instance, Dai potters making teapots to benefit from a newfound craze for pu’er tea that began elsewhere in China. Francis and Zhang eloquently observe a shift from the makers “safeguarding the authenticity of a craft to safeguarding the identity of a community . . . which acts as the source of authenticity of the heritage it sustains.” This puts into stark relief the main conflict in defining and guarding ICH—namely, the wish to preserve traditions as they are versus the need for practitioners to adapt their craft to new customer demands so as to survive as artisans and continue their practice, albeit in an altered way. Yet, as Francis and Zhang admirably demonstrate, productive protection (“sell to save”) is much more than an economic calculus. It is the selling of a narrative (as with the Rong paper chair), one that must align with the relationships bonding makers to a place (as with Zhang Lei’s return to Hangzhou or the concerns for the Mekong River reflected in Nam’s “Dai pottery of now”).

The same issue is also raised by Gao Xuyang and Anke Hein in their chapter on contemporary *zisha* 紫砂 teapot-making (Chapter 11). This practice was nominated as national ICH in 2006 and defined based on the use of a specific type of clay, forming technique, and tools. All three elements, however, have undergone changes, due to limited availability of said clay and the pressure of market demand to produce in greater quantities and to do so more expediently. As ethnographic research among the potters has shown, there is a major disconnect between local potters and governmental institutions in the definition, safeguarding, and promotion of the craft and its products, especially in regard to what is deemed essential (or “authentic”) about *zisha* ware and its production. A major

issue in such debates, so Gao and Hein argue, is that while the making of these wares is a practice and thus intangible, the making involves material elements, and the resultant products are tangible as well—though one may add that they are then used in further intangible practices: in this case, tea-brewing and consumption. The official definition of what constitutes “real,” “authentic,” or “traditional” *zisha* ware production has been quite rigid and focused on material aspects, leading to a disconnect with actual potting practices that are much more flexible and undergoing constant change. Gao and Hein argue that in the context of ICH practices, change is not only permissible, but expected, and its ramifications need to be discussed between the various stakeholders to allow for both safeguarding and modification in existent practices.

The contributions by Jean DeBernardi (Chapter 12) and Robin A. Wilson (Chapter 13) likewise focus on tea—the former focusing mostly on tea production and the latter on production (and usage) of tea wares, though both touch upon practices of tea-making and consumption as well. DeBernardi provides a case study of the Mother Trees of Big Red Robe Tea (*Dahongpao* 大紅袍), which are the subject of intense debates over their age and “authenticity,” in light of how they have been reproduced, as biological organisms, through both natural and scientifically supported means. Furthermore, as in the case of the *zisha* wares, market demand for Big Red Robe tea is much higher than what a limited number of ancient trees in one particular region can possibly fulfill. Highlighting the strong connection between Confucian and Buddhist practices and tea-drinking and the impact of the inclusion of Wuyishan Tea (*Dahongpao*) production skills among the first batch of national ICH, DeBernardi showcases the long historical development in tea growing and making practices in certain locales, whether with ancient trees or newer plants or even scientific interventions. She concludes that, while some elements have changed, tea plants link histories and memories of past and present practices, with the trees at Jiulongke specifically having been “fashioned to create a link to what Henry James described as a ‘palpable imaginable visitable past’ that is both distant and close, different and familiar.”

Wilson likewise tells the story of a play on and with traditions—namely, that of the Japanese veneration of *karamono* 唐物 or “Chinese things”—in this case, ceramics made for tea consumption—which, in turn, developed a new tradition of Japanese tea wares and tea rituals, centered on the appreciation of unique imperfections of the Japanese wares, contrasted against the polished *karamono*. This appropriation and deliberate alteration of Chinese traditions, as understood by Japanese practitioners, responded to local Japanese kiln technologies and social dynamics. Wilson’s chapter, in particular, connects the old and the new, as it recounts the history of *karamono* and *wabi*-style Japanese wood-fired ceramics, their changing roles in *chanoyu* tea ceremony, and how this history continues to inform contemporary Japanese concepts of authenticity.

All the chapters in Part IV, “Text and Manuscripts,” problematize author-based notions of textual authenticity in unique ways. One of the most notorious debates over textual authenticity in Chinese history concerns the “ancient script” (*guwen*

古文) chapters of the *Shangshu* 尚書 classic. Corina Smith (Chapter 14) lays bare how this debate and its “authentic-forged” framework, a (in part misrepresented) legacy of late imperial *kaozheng* 考證 polemics, continues to bias scholarship today, with the “ancient script” *Shangshu* chapters treated as lesser in status than their “modern script” counterparts. Smith argues however that, as neither the “ancient script” nor “modern script” chapters may stand as documentary witnesses to the events they record—or in other words, as their historical authorship is uncertain and patently distanced from traditional attributions—there is little ground for maintaining such a distinction today. Doing so, rather, ignores the reverence paid to the “ancient script” chapters for centuries. Smith urges us to instead celebrate *shu* 書 as a focal point of an ongoing cultural praxis.

While Smith forwards a methodological suggestion to set aside the “authentic-forged” framework for *shu*, in favor of their study as cultural praxis, Rachel McVeigh (Chapter 15) demonstrates that authorial attributions, and authenticity claims to which such attributions are allied, are themselves a form of dynamic cultural praxis. McVeigh takes as her case study the *Ershisi shipin* 二十四詩品, an influential compilation of poems that engage in literary criticism. It is only in the late Ming that the *Ershisi shipin* is explicitly attributed to the Tang poet Sikong Tu 司空圖. McVeigh argues that, in this historical moment, such an attribution allowed Ming *fugu* 復古 (“archaist”) theorists to bolster the antiquity and status of the *Ershisi shipin*, with the text in turn supporting their vision of a “true poetry” based on individual authenticity (here: genuineness, via expression of true *qing* 情 emotion). Today, authenticity claims (here: origins, being by the hand of) supporting Sikong Tu’s authorship of the *Ershisi shipin* serve a different function—namely, to protect the *Ershisi shipin* as a lynchpin of Chinese literary theory at a time when such a native tradition has been sought to challenge a perceived hegemonic Western discourse on Chinese literature.

Whereas the prior chapters have explored how to handle texts with uncertain or contested authorship, Xiaojing Miao (Chapter 16) problematizes yet another facet of author-text relationships. Focusing on the Tang poet Song Zhiwen 宋之問, Miao notes seeming contradictions between biographical details recorded in historical treatises and how Song represented himself through his poetry. Miao understands authenticity in literary self-representation as a rhetorical effect, one constructed through compositional skills such as ensuring a consistent narrative, utilizing the language of an appropriate register. Her analysis of three of Song’s poems shows how he effectively constructed several “authentic” versions of himself that fit differing social contexts—from playing the role of court poet to that of a Daoist recluse who eschews officialdom for seclusion in nature. Regardless of whether these imagined roles match the life Song Zhiwen once lived, Miao suggests that the literary self can be made authentic, by communicating a specific vision of oneself to one’s audiences in a convincing way.

Lena Henningsen and Duncan Paterson’s study (Chapter 17) of Cultural Revolution-era *shouchaoben* 手抄本, handwritten entertainment fiction, in many ways

serves as a fitting conclusion to Part IV, as it is touching upon many of the themes discussed in the other chapters. Henningsen and Paterson introduce a corpus of manuscripts, which they collectively refer to as *Three Journeys to Jiangnan* (e.g., some are titled *Sanxia Jiangnan* 三下江南), along with their efforts to digitize and document these stories. As a form of ephemera that lacks distinct authors and has uncertain textual histories, digitization and documentation of the *Three Journeys to Jiangnan* corpus presents similar methodological problems as those faced by Smith with the *Shangshu* chapters. Much like Miao's analysis of Song Zhiwen's poetry, Henningsen and Paterson anchor authenticity in the mechanics of literary production itself—in this case, the existence of a (albeit fluid) narrative core underlying fragile materiality and textual content. Yet they too are concerned with the interplay between literary fantasy and the actual lived experiences or *zeitgeist* of the Cultural Revolution. Akin to McVeigh's interpretation of how late Ming and contemporary intellectual dynamics both shape(d) and are/were shaped by debates on the *Ershisi shipin*'s authorship, Henningsen and Paterson argue that the limitations of information flow during the Cultural Revolution opened a space where the *Three Journeys to Jiangnan* stories could play creatively with real-life events, inventing their own historical imaginations. One wonders, as they do, how these historical imaginations in turn influenced policymakers and public opinions, in a sense creating new, lived realities and thereby inadvertently moving beyond literary fantasy.

While certain topics thus rise to the forefront of each of the four parts to *Understanding Authenticity in Chinese Cultural Heritage*, shared themes emerge that run through the volume as a whole. As many chapters caution, authenticity need not be defined by an “original.” We see how the “copy” is granted an elevated ontological status in Chinese art, while for literary studies, authenticity can be a narratological or rhetorical effect. Even where notions of an original—of material, practice, or place—do underlie authenticity claims, a tension is felt between continuity and change. Does cloning from cuttings constitute an unnatural disruption in the biological lineage of tea trees, thereby impacting the authenticity of their tea products? How much modification is permissible in the interest of catering to modern audiences, such as rebuilding the dilapidated sections of the Great Wall to match the imaginations of domestic tourists? From the appropriation of *karamono* use by a medieval Japanese merchant class to the contemporary dialectic of “copying from the West” and “copying from the past” in Chinese-themed communities, authenticity informs identity formation and expression, especially through the encounter of local with nonlocal. Similarly, numerous chapters address how political, economic, and social concerns have influenced the presentation of cultural heritage, whether by late imperial polemics over modernizing China shaping the reception of the *Shangshu* corpus or through the impact of official ICH designation and subsequent market pressures forcing changes to Yixing *zisha* pottery production. Throughout the volume, it is revealed how past and present, object and action, and tangible and the intangible are closely intertwined in debates over authenticity. That Ming *fugu* theorists championed Sikong Tu's authorship of

Ershisi shipin in the past helped reify the status of this work in Chinese literary theory today, making the veracity of this attribution a point of heated contention. Terroir and clay resources constrain pottery production, forcing innovations in craft technique. Yet, despite these shared themes, each chapter of *Understanding Authenticity in Chinese Cultural Heritage* approaches authenticity and cultural heritage in conceptually unique ways, through varied disciplinary lenses, and as embedded in distinct contexts. Ultimately, it is this diversity that unifies the message of the book.

References

- Adams, Cassandra. 1998. Japan's Ise Shrine and Its Thirteen-Hundred-Year-Old Reconstruction Tradition. *Journal of Architectural Education* 52 (1):49–60.
- Aikawa-Faure, Noriko. 2009. From the Proclamation of Masterpieces to the Convention for Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage. In *Intangible Heritage*, edited by Laura Jane Smith and Natsuko Akagawa, pp. 13–44. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Akagawa, Natsuko. 2015. *Heritage Conservation and Japan's Cultural Diplomacy: Heritage, National Identity and National Interest*. London: Routledge.
- Bagnall, Gaynor. 2003. Performance and Performativity at Heritage Sites. *Museum and Society* 1 (2):87–103.
- Ban Gu 班固 (32–92 CE). 1962 (ca. 1st–2nd Century). *Hanshu* 漢書. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju.
- Benjamin, Walter. 1936 (repr. 1970). *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*. *Walter Benjamin Illuminations*. Edited by Hannah Arendt. London: Macmillan.
- Bradley, Mark. 2009. The Importance of Colour on Ancient Marble Sculpture. *Art History* 32 (3):427–457.
- Brinkmann, Vinzenz, Renée Dreyfus, and Ulrike Koch-Brinkmann, eds. 2017. *Gods in Color: Polychromy in the Ancient World*. Munich: Prestel.
- Burke, Sheridan. 2012. Tolerance for Change: Introducing a Concept and a Challenge to ICOMOS Members. In *Conservation Turn—Return to Conservation: Tolerance for Change, Limits of Change. Proceedings of the International Conferences of the ICOMOS, International Scientific Committee for the Theory and the Philosophy of Conservation and Restoration, 5–9 May 2010, Prague Český Krumlov, Czech Republic, 3–6 March 2011, Florence, Italy*, pp. 77–94. Firenze: Polistampa.
- Buswell, Robert E., Jr. 1990. *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Byrne, Denis. 1995. Buddhist *Stupa* and Thai Social Practice. *World Archaeology* 27 (2):266–281.
- Cameron, Christina, and Nobuko Inaba. 2015. The Making of the Nara Document. *APT Bulletin* 46 (4):30–37.
- Chang, K. C. 1981. Archaeology and Chinese Historiography. *World Archaeology* 13 (2):156–169.
- Chhabra, Deepak. 2019. Authenticity and the Authentication of Heritage: Dialogical Perceptiveness. *Journal of Heritage Tourism* 14 (5–6):389–395.
- Chen, Shujie, and Zhenjiang Shen. 2022. The Architectural Conservation Movement in China: Approaches to Nation-building. *The Historic Environment: Policy & Practice*:1–13.

- Chen, Xiang'er 陳享爾, and Jianmin Cai 蔡建明. 2012. Lüyou keti zhenshixing yu zhuti zhenshixing jiheshi guanxi taolun yi wenhua yichan gugong weili 旅遊客體真實性與主體真實性集合式關係探討—以文化遺產故宮為例. *Renwen Dili* 人文地理 126 (4):153–160.
- Cherniack, Susan. 1994. Book Culture and Textual Transmission in Sung China. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 54 (1):5–125.
- Clunas, Craig. 1991. *Superfluous Things: Material Culture and Social Status in Early Modern China*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Dai Yongming 戴永明. 2012. Jiyu youke ganzhi de gucunluo zhenshixing yanjiu—yi xiti he hongcun weili 基於遊客感知的古村落真實性研究—以西遞和宏村為例. Master Dissertation, School of Management, Zhejiang University 浙江大學, Zhejiang.
- Falkenhausen, Lothar von. 1993. On the Historiographic Orientation of Chinese Archaeology. *Antiquity* 67:839–849.
- Feilten, Bernard M., and Jukka Jokilehto. 1998. *Management Guidelines for World Cultural Heritage Sites*. Rome: ICCROM.
- Fischer, Paul. 2008–2009. Authentication Studies (辨偽學) Methodology and the Polymorphous Text Paradigm. *Early China* 32:1–43.
- Fiskesjö, Magnus. 2017. Chinese Autochthony and the Eurasian Context: Archaeology, Mythmaking and Johan Gunnar Andersson's "Western Origins". In *Fitful Histories and Unruly Publics: Rethinking Temporality and Community in Eurasian Archaeology*, edited by K. O. Weber, E. Hite, L. Khatchadourian, and A. T. Smith, pp. 303–320. Leiden: Brill.
- Gao, Qian, and Sian Jones. 2021. Authenticity and Heritage Conservation: Seeking Common Complexities Beyond the "Eastern" and "Western" Dichotomy. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 27 (1):90–106.
- Graham, Brian, Greg Ashworth, and John Tunbridge. 2000. *A Geography of Heritage: Power, Culture and Economy*. London: Arnold.
- Greenspan, Sam. 2018. 11 Amazing Fake Harry Potter Books Written in China. *11 Points*. <https://11points.com/11-amazing-fake-harry-potter-books-written-china/>. Updated 12 March 2018. Accessed 22 May 2022.
- Han, Byung-Chul. 2011. *Shanzhai: Dekonstruktion auf Chinesisch*. Orig.-ausg. ed. Berlin: Merve.
- Hebel, Maximiliano. 2015. Forbidden City Beijing. *Creative Commons*. [https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Forbidden_City_Beijing_China_\(164849005\).jpeg](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Forbidden_City_Beijing_China_(164849005).jpeg). CC BY 3.0 <<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>>, via Wikimedia Commons. Created 11 September 2015. Accessed 20 May 2022.
- ICOMOS. 1964. *The Venice Charter: International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites*. www.getty.edu/conservation/publications_resources/research_resources/charters/charter12.html. Created 1964. Accessed 21 October 2022.
- . 2014. *The Florence Declaration*. www.icomos.org/images/DOCUMENTS/Secretariat/2015/GA_2014_results/GA2014_Symposium_FlorenceDeclaration_EN_final_20150318.pdf. Created 2014. Accessed 21 October 2022.
- Jerome, Pamela. 2008. An Introduction to Authenticity in Preservation. *APT Bulletin* 39 (2/3):3–7.
- Jones, Sian. 2010. Negotiating Authentic Objects and Authentic Selves: Beyond the Deconstruction of Authenticity. *Journal of Material Culture* 15 (2):181–203.
- Kerr, Rose. 1990. *Later Chinese Bronzes*. London: Bamboo, Victoria and Albert Museum.
- Labadi, Sophia. 2013. *UNESCO, Cultural Heritage, and Outstanding Universal Value: Value-based Analyses of the World Heritage and Intangible Cultural Heritage Conventions*. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.

- Labadi, Sophia, and Colin Long. 2010. *Heritage and Globalisation: Key Issues in Cultural Heritage*. Milton Park, Abingdon: Routledge.
- Lambrinou, Lena. 2013. Preserving a Monument: The Example of the Parthenon. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites* 12 (1):60–74.
- Larsen, Knut Einar. 1994. *Architectural Preservation in Japan*. Trondheim: Tapir Publishers.
- Lau, D. C. 1992. *The Analects*. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.
- Ledderose, Lothar. 1988. Die Gedenkhalle für Mao Zedong: Ein Beispiel von Gedächtnisarchitektur. In *Kultur und Gedächtnis*, edited by J. Assmann and T. Hölscher, pp. 311–339. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Lee, Haiyan. 2009. The Ruins of Yuanmingyuan. *Modern China* 35 (2):155–190.
- Maas, Paul. 1958. *Textual Criticism*. Translated by Barbara Flower. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Mazanec, Tomas J. 2018. Righting, Riting, and Rewriting the *Book of Odes* (*Shijing*): On “Filling out the Missing Odes” by Shu Xi. *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews* 40:5–32.
- McLean, Fiona. 2006. Introduction: Heritage and Identity. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 12 (1):3–7.
- Mengzhi. 2020. Should the Old Summer Palace Be Rebuilt? *China Daily Online*. <https://global.chinadaily.com.cn/a/202011/14/WS5faf2c10a31024ad0ba94036.html>. Published 14 November 2020. Accessed 11 May 2022.
- Mountain. 2006. Parthenon from West. *Public Domain via Wikimedia Commons*. https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Parthenon_from_west.jpg. Created 26 November 2006. Accessed 20 May 2022.
- Nylan, Michael. 2013. *Exemplary Figures/Fayan* 法言. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press.
- Op-ed. 2007. Memo to the Dept. of Magical Copyright Enforcement. *The New York Times*. Created 10 August 2007. Accessed 22 May 2022.
- Plantzos, Dimitris. 2011. Behold the Raking Geison: The New Acropolis Museum and Its Context-free Archaeologies. *Antiquity* 85 (328):613–630.
- Raustiala, Kal, and Christopher Sprigman. 2013. Fake It Till You Make It: The Good News About China’s Knockoff Economy. *Foreign Affairs* 92 (4):25–30.
- Schnapp, Alain, Lothar von Falkenhausen, Peter N. Miller, and Tim Murray. 2013. *World Antiquarianism: Comparative Perspectives, Issues & Debates*. Los Angeles, CA: Getty Research Institute.
- Sena, Yunchiahn C. 2019. *Bronze and Stone: The Cult of Antiquity in Song Dynasty China*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Smith, Laurajane. 2006. *Uses of Heritage*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, Laurajane, and Emma Waterton. 2012. Constrained by Commonsense: The Authorized Heritage Discourse in Contemporary Debates. In *The Oxford Handbook of Public Archaeology*, edited by R. Skeates, C. McDavie, and J. Carman, pp. 153–171. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Spencer, Ronald D., ed. 2004. *The Expert versus the Object: Judging Fakes and False Attributions in the Visual Arts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stovel, Herb. 1995. Working towards the Nara Document. In *Conference on Authenticity in Relation to the World Heritage Convention, Nara, 1–6 November 1994, Proceedings*, edited by Kurt Einar Larsen, pp. xxxiii–xxxvi. Paris: UNESCO World Heritage Centre.

- Stubbs, John H., and Robert G. Thomson. 2017. *Architectural Conservation in Asia: National Experiences and Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Su, Junjie. 2018. Conceptualising the Subjective Authenticity of Intangible Cultural Heritage. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 24 (9):919–937.
- . 2021. A Difficult Integration of Authenticity and Intangible Cultural Heritage? The Case of Yunnan, China. *China Perspectives* (2021/03):29–39.
- Svensson, Marina. 2016. Evolving and Contested Cultural Heritage in China: The Rural Heritagescape. In *Reconsidering Cultural Heritage in East Asia*, edited by A. Matsuda and L. E. Mengoni. London: Ubiquity Press.
- Trilling, Lionel. 1973. *Sincerity and Authenticity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- UNESCO. 2003. *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*. Paris: UNESCO World Heritage Centre.
- . 2013. *Wooden Structures of Liao Dynasty—Wooden Pagoda of Yingxian County, Main Hall of Fengguo Monastery of Yixian County*. UNESCO Website. <https://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/5803/>. Created 29 January 2013. Accessed 4 May 2022.
- . 2015. *Ethical Principles for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage*. Spain: UNESCO.
- Visconti, Chiara. 2015. The Influence of Song and Qing Antiquarianism on Modern Chinese Archaeology. *Ming Qing yanjiu* 19 (1):59–86.
- Wang, Ning. 1999. Rethinking Authenticity in Tourism Experience. *Annals of Tourism Research* 26 (2):349–370.
- Weatherley, R. D., and A. Rosen. 2013. Fanning the Flames of Popular Nationalism: The Debate in China over the Burning of the Old Summer Palace. *Asian Perspectives* 37 (1):53–76.
- Weatherley, Robert, and Qiang Zhang. 2017. *History and Nationalist Legitimacy in Contemporary China: A Double-edged Sword*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wijesuriya, Gamini, and Jonathan Sweet, eds. 2018. *Revisiting Authenticity in the Asian Context*. Rome: International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and the Restoration of Cultural Property. Available online at ICCROM. www.iccrom.org/sites/default/files/publications/2019-03/revisiting_authenticity_cha-2_web.pdf. Published 15 March 2019. Accessed 20 May 2022.
- Wong, Winnie Won Yin. 2012. The Panda Man and the Anti-Counterfeiting Hero: Art, Activism and Appropriation in Contemporary China. *Journal of Visual Culture* 11 (1):20–37.
- Wu, Zongjie, and Bailan Qin. 2016. Zhao Mu: The Presence of the Past in the Meaning(s) of Space in Confucius' Graveyard. *International Journal of Intangible Heritage* (11):8–34.
- Xi Jinping 習近平. 2020. Jianshe Zhongguo tese Zhongguo fengge Zhongguo qipai de kaoguxue genghao renshi yuanyuan liuchang bodai jingshen de Zhonghua wenming 建設中國特色中國風格中國氣派的考古學 更好認識源遠流長博大精深的中華文明. *Xinhua wang* 新華網. www.xinhuanet.com/politics/leaders/2020-11/30/c_1126803588.htm. Published 30 November 2020. Accessed 4 May 2022.
- Xin Chunying 信春鷹, and Zhang Shicheng 張世誠. 2011. *Zhonghua Renming Gongheguo feiwuzhi wenhua yichan fa shiyi* 中華人民共和國非物質文化遺產法釋義. Beijing: Falü Chubanshe.
- Yu Hua. 2011. *China in Ten Words*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Zhao, Wei. 2014. China: Managing Cultural Heritage and the World Heritage List. In *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*, edited by C. Smith, pp. 1421–1433. New York, NY: Springer.