

1 Article

2 The Modern Expression of Traditional Aesthetics: On the 3 Inheritance and Innovation of Classical Aesthetics in 4 Contemporary Chinese Art

5 Jie Qiu ^{1,*}

6 ¹ School of Art, Wuhan University, 430000, Wuhan, China; bbb888@whu.edu.cn

7 * Correspondence: bbb888@whu.edu.cn

8 Abstract

9 This paper examines how contemporary Chinese art reworks classical aesthetics without
10 reducing tradition to decorative quotation or treating modernity as a simple break from
11 the past. Rather than approaching tradition as a fixed archive, the study interprets
12 classical aesthetics as a living set of perceptual principles, formal disciplines, and
13 cultural imaginaries that continue to shape artistic production under new historical
14 conditions. Through a theoretical and interpretive analysis of contemporary Chinese
15 artistic practices across ink art, mixed media, installation, public visual culture, and
16 digitally mediated expression, the paper shows that inheritance and innovation are not
17 opposing processes. They operate as mutually constitutive dynamics through which
18 artists selectively translate brush-and-ink logic, spatial emptiness, poetic symbolism,
19 literati sensibility, and craft-based material thinking into contemporary forms. The paper
20 argues that the most significant innovation in contemporary Chinese art lies not in the
21 abandonment of classical aesthetics, but in their critical reactivation within urbanization,
22 marketization, museumization, and digital culture.

23 **Keywords:** contemporary Chinese art; classical aesthetics; inheritance; innovation;
24 tradition; modernity; visual culture

26 1. Introduction

27 The relationship between tradition and modernity has long occupied a central place
28 in the study of Chinese art. In contemporary debates, this relationship is often framed as
29 a dilemma between preservation and transformation, authenticity and experimentation,
30 or cultural continuity and global contemporaneity. Such oppositions are analytically
31 convenient, but they obscure the complex ways in which contemporary Chinese artists
32 actually work with inherited aesthetic resources. The present study starts from the
33 proposition that classical aesthetics remain active in contemporary Chinese art not
34 because they survive unchanged, but because they are repeatedly reformulated through
35 new media, new institutions, and new modes of reception. [1,2]

36 The phrase classical aesthetics in the Chinese context does not refer only to a canon
37 of ancient masterpieces. It includes historically sedimented principles of form,
38 perception, embodiment, and artistic self-cultivation that were shaped across painting,
39 calligraphy, poetry, garden design, craft, and ritual culture. Ideas such as qiyun,
40 emptiness and fullness, the productive relation between likeness and unlikeness, the

31 Academic Editor: Quanrong Fang

32 Received: 11 February 2026

33 Revised: 21 March 2026

34 Accepted: 23 March 2026

35 Published: 24 March 2026

36 **Copyright:** © 2026 by the authors.

37 Submitted for possible open access

38 publication under the terms and

39 conditions of the [Creative Commons](#)

40 [Attribution \(CC BY\)](#) license.

41 integration of emotion and scene, and the ethical depth of literati practice constitute a
42 durable aesthetic vocabulary. In the contemporary period, these elements continue to
43 inform artistic production even when works are made with photography, video,
44 installation, digital imaging, industrial materials, or curatorial formats that differ
45 sharply from premodern practices. [3,4]

46 The problem, then, is not whether tradition still exists, but how it is translated into
47 modern artistic expression. Translation here is neither mechanical continuation nor
48 superficial borrowing. It involves selection, abstraction, displacement, and
49 recombination. Some artists inherit compositional logic while abandoning traditional
50 media. Others preserve brush-based sensibility but relocate it in conceptual or
51 performative contexts. Still others draw on established scholarly understandings of
52 classical landscape symbolism — such as the cosmological significance of sacred
53 mountains examined by Munakata [5]—while reworking these symbolic repertoires into
54 critical languages suited to urban life, consumer culture, environmental anxiety, and
55 global exhibition systems.

56 This paper argues that the inheritance and innovation of classical aesthetics in
57 contemporary Chinese art should be understood as a dynamic process of modern
58 expression. Modern expression does not mean the replacement of tradition by
59 Westernized form, nor does it mean the nostalgic restoration of historical style. It refers
60 instead to the capacity of contemporary artistic practice to activate classical aesthetic
61 principles under the conditions of modern subjectivity, institutional differentiation,
62 technological mediation, and transnational cultural exchange. This approach makes it
63 possible to analyze continuity and rupture together rather than in isolation.

64 Methodologically, the paper adopts a theoretical and interpretive design. It does
65 not claim to present new empirical data. Rather, it synthesizes major debates in art
66 history, aesthetics, and visual culture studies in order to construct a conceptual account
67 of how classical Chinese aesthetics are inherited, transformed, and re-signified in the
68 contemporary field. The discussion pays particular attention to changes in medium,
69 space, audience, and discourse because these domains reveal the practical mechanisms
70 through which tradition enters modern art.

71 The rest of the paper proceeds as follows. The next section reviews relevant
72 scholarship on Chinese aesthetics, modern Chinese art, and contemporary visual culture.
73 The third section develops the theoretical framework used to interpret inheritance and
74 innovation as relational rather than oppositional categories. The fourth section analyzes
75 the principal modes through which classical aesthetics are reworked in contemporary
76 Chinese art. The fifth section discusses the broader cultural implications of this process
77 for identity, creativity, and the politics of representation. The final section concludes by
78 reflecting on the significance of modern expression as a key concept for understanding
79 aesthetic continuity in contemporary China.

80 2. Literature Review

81 Scholarship on Chinese aesthetics has generally emphasized the philosophical and
82 civilizational depth of classical artistic traditions. Foundational studies have focused on
83 the cosmological and ethical dimensions of Chinese art, often highlighting the
84 relationship between artistic form and broader modes of world understanding. Within
85 this body of work, concepts such as *qiyun*, *xieyi*, the balance of void and solid, the
86 resonance between human feeling and natural scene, and the cultivated unity of poetry,
87 calligraphy, and painting have been interpreted as distinct features of the classical
88 Chinese aesthetic system. [6,7]

89 A second line of research examines the transformation of Chinese art under the
90 pressure of modernization from the late Qing period onward. These studies often

91 explore the institutional impact of academies, reform movements, print capitalism,
92 urban visibility, and contact with European and Japanese models. Much of the literature
93 has shown that modern Chinese art was formed through selective adaptation rather
94 than simple imitation. The encounter with realism, oil painting, modern exhibition
95 culture, and nationalist discourse altered the function of art while also prompting new
96 efforts to redefine tradition. In this respect, modernity became a site in which classical
97 aesthetics were contested, defended, fragmented, and reassembled. [8,9]

98 A third area of scholarship addresses contemporary Chinese art after the reform era,
99 especially its relation to globalization, marketization, biennial culture, and new media
100 environments. Researchers have noted that the category of contemporary Chinese art
101 cannot be reduced to avant-garde rupture. Alongside politically charged conceptual
102 practices and transnational installations, there has been a sustained return to ink,
103 calligraphic abstraction, craft materiality, and culturally coded image systems. This
104 return, however, rarely takes the form of direct revival. It is usually mediated by
105 curatorial discourse, museum display, urban spectatorship, and global expectations of
106 cultural difference. [7]

107 Recent scholarship on experimental ink art is particularly relevant to the present
108 discussion. Nien-Ming Ch'ien's analysis of Xu Bing's language art exemplifies how
109 inherited symbolic systems can be critically rearticulated within contemporary
110 conceptual frameworks, [10] while other studies in this field suggest that ink today
111 functions less as a fixed medium than as an expanded conceptual language. [11-13]
112 Ink-based practices may preserve the gestural temporality and philosophical
113 atmosphere associated with classical painting while also incorporating photography,
114 performance, video projection, or installation. This body of scholarship collectively helps
115 demonstrate that inheritance can occur at the level of process, temporality, perception,
116 and symbolic reconfiguration rather than only through iconographic resemblance.

117 At the same time, critical observers have warned against romanticizing continuity.
118 Some argue that invocations of tradition can become market labels, state-cultural
119 branding tools, or curatorial shorthand for civilizational identity. From this perspective,
120 the language of classical aesthetics can be mobilized strategically within global art
121 circuits, sometimes flattening historical complexity into exportable cultural signs. This
122 line of critique is valuable because it reminds us that inheritance is always socially
123 mediated. It occurs within institutions that shape what counts as authentic, innovative,
124 national, or internationally legible. [14]

125 Another relevant body of literature comes from visual culture studies and
126 anthropology of art. Here the focus shifts from canonical artworks to broader sensory
127 environments, material practices, and everyday aesthetics. Such perspectives allow
128 contemporary Chinese art to be analyzed not only through elite gallery production but
129 also through public installations, digital interfaces, design culture, revived craft practices,
130 and urban image economies. This expanded field of inquiry also encompasses
131 interdisciplinary studies that trace the adaptation of classical aesthetic principles across
132 different cultural forms; Drayton's examination of the contemporary rejuvenation of the
133 *biji* tradition, for instance, demonstrates how classical modes of observation and literary
134 cultivation are being reworked beyond the visual arts. [15] This broader view is
135 important because many modern expressions of classical aesthetics appear in hybrid
136 spaces where fine art overlaps with architecture, media display, and cultural
137 consumption. [16]

138 Despite these contributions, existing scholarship still leaves two gaps. First, many
139 studies either remain at the level of philosophical exposition or focus on individual
140 artists without connecting micro-level analysis to a wider conceptual model of aesthetic
141 transformation. Second, the relation between inheritance and innovation is often

142 described rhetorically rather than analytically. The literature frequently states that
143 contemporary art combines tradition and modernity, but it provides fewer tools for
144 explaining how this combination works across media, institutions, and audiences. This
145 paper addresses these gaps by proposing a relational framework that treats classical
146 aesthetics as a set of transferable aesthetic operations rather than a closed historical style.

147 **3. Theoretical Framework: Inheritance as Translation, Innovation as** 148 **Rearticulation**

149 The central theoretical claim of this paper is that inheritance in contemporary
150 Chinese art is best understood as translation, while innovation is best understood as
151 rearticulation. Translation refers to the movement of aesthetic principles from one
152 historical and material configuration into another. Rearticulation refers to the
153 restructuring of meaning that occurs when those principles are relocated within new
154 media systems, institutional regimes, and social experiences. These concepts avoid two
155 common errors: treating tradition as static essence and treating innovation as radical
156 discontinuity.

157 In classical Chinese aesthetics, form is inseparable from process. Brushwork,
158 rhythm, spatial balance, and suggestiveness are not merely decorative features. They
159 encode relations between body, environment, temporality, and cultivated perception.
160 When contemporary artists inherit these qualities, they need not preserve the original
161 object format. A video installation may inherit the logic of emptiness and interval. An
162 urban public artwork may inherit the scenic sequencing of the classical garden. A
163 digitally generated image may inherit calligraphic movement through patterned
164 compression and release. In each case, the inherited element is not a surface motif alone,
165 but an operational logic.

166 This framework requires a distinction between three layers of aesthetic continuity.
167 The first is formal continuity, which includes line, composition, texture, tonal restraint,
168 and rhythmic contrast. The second is sensorial continuity, which concerns modes of
169 looking, pacing, immersion, and atmospheric suggestion. The third is cultural-semantic
170 continuity, which includes symbols, literary associations, moral dispositions, and
171 historically coded ideas of cultivated taste. Contemporary Chinese art often works
172 across all three layers, but not necessarily at the same time or with equal intensity.

173 Innovation emerges when these layers are redistributed. A contemporary work
174 may minimize direct iconographic reference while intensifying sensorial continuity.
175 Another may foreground cultural symbolism but disrupt classical harmony through
176 fragmented or ironic form. Still another may preserve a traditional medium while
177 transforming its scale, display context, or audience interaction. Innovation, in this sense,
178 is not external to inheritance. It is the very process through which inherited elements
179 become legible under contemporary conditions.

180 The relational model proposed here also takes institutional mediation seriously.
181 Classical aesthetics do not enter the present in a pure state. They are filtered through art
182 education, museums, criticism, markets, urban redevelopment, digital platforms,
183 heritage discourse, and international exhibitions. These mediating structures shape both
184 production and reception. They determine which traditions are elevated, which are
185 marginalized, and which can be translated into contemporary visual language without
186 losing intelligibility.

187 Finally, the framework assumes that modern expression is historically uneven.
188 Contemporary Chinese art exists within overlapping temporalities. Premodern aesthetic
189 concepts, twentieth-century modernization projects, socialist visual regimes, reform-era
190 market transformations, and platform-based digital cultures all coexist in tension. The

191 inheritance of classical aesthetics therefore unfolds within a stratified present.
192 Understanding this layered temporality is essential for explaining why contemporary
193 Chinese art can appear simultaneously rooted, experimental, national, and
194 transnational.

195 **4. Analysis: Modern Expressions of Classical Aesthetics in** 196 **Contemporary Chinese Art**

197 One major pathway through which classical aesthetics are inherited and
198 transformed is media translation. In many contemporary practices, traditional ink logic
199 survives even when ink itself no longer occupies a central place. Artists borrow from
200 calligraphic movement, tonal economy, and the productive use of blank space, then
201 relocate these features into photography, mixed media surfaces, projection
202 environments, or installation-based compositions. What persists is an attention to
203 interval, breath, pressure, and relational balance. Such works suggest that the modern
204 life of classical aesthetics lies partly in their capacity to exceed medium-specific
205 boundaries.

206 A second pathway is spatial reconfiguration. Classical Chinese art has long been
207 associated with mobile viewing, layered perspective, and the scenic organization of
208 perceptual experience. In contemporary art, these features are often reinterpreted
209 through installation design, exhibition choreography, and public-space interventions.
210 Rather than presenting a single stable viewpoint, many works invite movement, partial
211 access, and sequential discovery. This recalls the experiential logic of handscrolls and
212 gardens while adapting it to museum halls, urban plazas, and immersive environments.
213 Here the inherited principle is not representational content but a way of structuring the
214 viewer's passage through space.

215 A third pathway involves symbolic recoding. Contemporary artists continue to
216 draw on mountains, water, bamboo, stones, clouds, birds, and classical literary motifs,
217 but these signs are no longer confined to their premodern semantic frames. They may be
218 mobilized to address ecological crisis, urban alienation, memory politics, gendered
219 embodiment, or the commodification of heritage. In such cases, classical symbols
220 function as historically layered codes that can carry both continuity and critique. Their
221 modern expression depends on semantic displacement. The symbol remains
222 recognizable, but its social resonance is reorganized.

223 A fourth pathway is the revaluation of craft and material intelligence. Classical
224 Chinese aesthetics gave sustained attention to texture, making, and disciplined
225 technique across ceramics, lacquer, silk, wood, stone, and paper. Contemporary art has
226 revived this material sensitivity in ways that often challenge the hierarchy between fine
227 art and craft. Artists working with handmade processes, traditional materials, or
228 craft-derived procedures frequently produce works that are unmistakably contemporary
229 in scale, framing, and conceptual ambition. The inherited component here is the idea
230 that material transformation is itself a mode of thought, not merely a vehicle for finished
231 form.

232 A fifth pathway concerns public and digital visual culture. Classical aesthetics are
233 no longer transmitted only through elite artistic circles. They circulate through urban
234 screens, design branding, online exhibition interfaces, fashion imagery, animation, short
235 video aesthetics, and cultural tourism. This expansion has ambiguous consequences. On
236 one hand, it broadens the social life of classical visual codes and allows them to enter
237 contemporary everyday experience. On the other hand, it risks flattening subtle aesthetic
238 traditions into stylized surfaces. Yet even in simplified form, these circulating motifs

239 reveal the adaptability of classical aesthetics under technological conditions that classical
 240 theory could not have anticipated.
 241 To clarify these pathways, Table 1 summarizes the main dimensions of classical
 242 aesthetics and their contemporary modes of transformation.

243 **Table 1.** Dimensions of classical aesthetics and their contemporary transformation

| Classical aesthetic dimension | Contemporary transformation | Illustrative significance |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
| Brushwork and gesture | Migration into mixed media, photography, and digital mark-making | Preserves bodily rhythm beyond ink as medium |
| Void-solid spatial balance | Installation sequencing and immersive display | Reconfigures classical spatial perception |
| Symbolic repertoire | Ecological, urban, and memory-oriented recoding | Turns inherited motifs into critical language |
| Craft materiality | Revived handmade processes and hybrid fabrication | Restores making as conceptual labor |
| Literati sensibility | Reflective distance within contemporary institutions | Sustains cultivated restraint under new conditions |

244
 245 Table 2 then identifies several recurrent domains in which classical aesthetics are
 246 visibly reworked in contemporary Chinese art. The aim is not statistical measurement,
 247 but analytical comparison.

248 **Table 2.** Recurrent domains of classical-aesthetic reworking in contemporary art

| Domain | Classical resource | Contemporary mode |
|-----------------------------|---|---|
| Ink-related experimentation | Gestural rhythm and tonal economy | Expanded ink, mixed media, installation |
| Spatial design | Garden logic and mobile viewing | Immersive exhibition and public art |
| Symbolic imagery | Landscape and literati motifs | Ecological and urban recoding |
| Material practice | Craft discipline and tactile refinement | Hybrid fabrication and artisanal revival |
| Audience interface | Cultivated contemplation | Digital circulation and participatory reception |

249
 250 Table 3 complements the previous two tables by outlining the enabling and
 251 constraining conditions that shape aesthetic innovation in the present. Together, the
 252 tables provide a structured account of how inheritance becomes modern expression.

253 **Table 3.** Conditions shaping the innovation of classical aesthetics in the present

| Condition | Enabling effect | Potential constraint |
|-----------------|--|---|
| Museumization | Provides visibility and curatorial framing | May canonize selective traditions |
| Marketization | Rewards recognizable cultural coding | Can commodify tradition as style |
| Urbanization | Creates new spatial and social themes | Accelerates visual simplification |
| Digital media | Expands circulation and audience contact | Encourages rapid surface consumption |
| Global exchange | Stimulates translation and comparison | May pressure artists into identity branding |

254

255

5. Discussion

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

The analysis above suggests that the inheritance of classical aesthetics in contemporary Chinese art should not be interpreted as a linear continuation of the past. It is a selective, mediated, and often contested process. What gives contemporary Chinese art its distinctive force is not the mere presence of traditional references, but the ability to convert inherited aesthetic operations into forms adequate to present experience. This process generates a specific kind of historical consciousness. Tradition becomes neither untouchable origin nor disposable residue. It becomes a resource that can be questioned, stretched, and reformulated. [17]

This point has important implications for how contemporary Chinese art is situated globally. International discourse has sometimes framed Chinese artistic identity through a simplified contrast between local tradition and global modernity. The present study suggests a different interpretation. Contemporary Chinese art often operates through internally complex translations in which classical aesthetics are already modernized before they enter transnational circulation. Global visibility does not simply add an external layer. It interacts with preexisting debates about medium, nation, urbanization, and cultural memory within China itself.

The discussion also highlights the importance of aesthetic discipline. In many successful works, innovation does not arise from arbitrary novelty. It depends on a deep understanding of inherited formal and sensorial structures. Artists who engage classical aesthetics productively tend to work through tension rather than imitation. They preserve a relation to restraint, rhythm, resonance, and spatial suggestiveness while simultaneously subjecting these qualities to contemporary pressures. This is why the most compelling modern expressions of tradition often feel neither antique nor rootless.

At the same time, critical caution is necessary. Not all appeals to classical aesthetics are equally substantive. In some cases, tradition becomes a legitimating sign used to secure market value, institutional prestige, or national-cultural branding. Such uses do not invalidate the aesthetic field, but they demonstrate that inheritance is inseparable from power. Museums, academies, policy frameworks, and commercial circuits influence which versions of tradition are made visible and which remain marginal. A serious account of contemporary Chinese art must therefore consider both artistic creativity and the structures that frame its recognition. [18]

287 From a broader cultural perspective, the modern expression of classical aesthetics
288 offers a model of non-reductive modernization. It shows that cultural continuity need
289 not depend on repetition and that innovation need not depend on cultural erasure. In a
290 period shaped by rapid technological change, accelerated urban life, and intense global
291 connectivity, contemporary Chinese art provides evidence that aesthetic tradition can
292 survive by changing its forms of appearance. This adaptive continuity may be one of the
293 most important features of Chinese art in the present.

294 6. Conclusion

295 This paper has argued that the inheritance and innovation of classical aesthetics in
296 contemporary Chinese art are best understood through the concept of modern
297 expression. Classical aesthetics persist not as intact historical residues, but as mobile
298 principles of form, perception, symbolism, and material thinking that are translated into
299 new artistic conditions. By examining media transformation, spatial reconfiguration,
300 symbolic recoding, craft revival, and digital circulation, the study has shown that
301 contemporary Chinese art sustains tradition through rearticulation rather than
302 repetition.

303 This conclusion carries two broader implications. First, it challenges binary
304 narratives that oppose tradition to modernity. In the Chinese context, the relation
305 between the two is more accurately described as recursive and productive. Second, it
306 suggests that contemporary Chinese art should be analyzed as a field of layered
307 temporality in which historical depth and present experimentation remain entangled.
308 The modern expression of traditional aesthetics is therefore not a residual phenomenon.
309 It is a defining condition of contemporary Chinese art and a key to understanding how
310 cultural continuity remains creative in the present.

311
312
313
314 **Author Contributions:** Conceptualization, J.Q.; methodology, J.Q.; software, J.Q.; validation, J.Q.;
315 formal analysis, J.Q.; investigation, J.Q.; resources, J.Q.; data curation, J.Q.; writing—original draft
316 preparation, J.Q.; writing—review and editing, J.Q.; visualization, J.Q.; supervision, J.Q.; project
317 administration, J.Q.; funding acquisition, J.Q. All authors have read and agreed to the published
318 version of the manuscript.

319 **Funding:** This research received no external funding.

320 **Data Availability Statement:** The datasets generated during and/or analysed during the current
321 study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

322 **Acknowledgments:** Not applicable.

323 **Conflicts of Interest:** The author declares no conflicts of interest.

324 325 References

- 326 [1] M. Sullivan, *Art and Artists of Twentieth-Century China*. Berkeley, CA, USA: University of California Press, 1996.
327 [2] J. F. Andrews and K. Shen, *The Art of Modern China*. Berkeley, CA, USA: University of California Press, 2012.
328 [3] J. Cahill, *The Compelling Image: Nature and Style in Seventeenth-Century Chinese Painting*. Cambridge, MA, USA:
329 Harvard University Press, 1982.
330 [4] S. Bush and H. S. Shih, Eds., *Early Chinese Texts on Painting*. Cambridge, MA, USA: Harvard University Press, 1985.
331 [5] K. Munakata, *Sacred Mountains in Chinese Art*. Urbana, IL, USA: University of Illinois Press, 1991.
332 [6] C. Clunas, *Art in China*, 2nd ed. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2009.

- 333 [7] H. Wu, *Contemporary Chinese Art: A History, 1970s-2000s*. London, UK: Thames & Hudson, 2014.
- 334 [8] M. Gao, *Total Modernity and the Avant-Garde in Twentieth-Century Chinese Art*. Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press, 2011.
- 335 [9] K. Smith, *Nine Lives: The Birth of Avant-Garde Art in New China*. Zurich, Switzerland: Scalo, 2005.
- 336 [10] E. Nien-Ming Ch' ien, "Symbolic revolutions: Xu Bing and his language art," *Wasafiri*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 56 - 67, 2008.
- 337 [11] C. Roberts, "Ink art: Past as present in contemporary China," 2015.
- 338 [12] C. Zuo, S. Rohitasuk, and D. Wongsarot, "A study of the evolution of visual language in Chinese painting from
- 339 traditional ink painting to contemporary ink painting," *Journal of Multidisciplinary in Humanities and Social Sciences*, vol. 8,
- 340 no. 1-2, pp. 285 - 308, 2025.
- 341 [13] A. Szomolaiová, "The importance of ink in Chinese contemporary art," *Nowa Polityka Wschodnia*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 184
- 342 - 189, 2021.
- 343 [14] G. Pollock and J. Zemans, Eds., *Museums After Modernism: Strategies of Engagement*. Malden, MA, USA: Blackwell,
- 344 2007.
- 345 [15] D. Drayton, *Staying Alive: A Contemporary Rejuvenation of the Biji*. Sydney, Australia: University of Technology Sydney,
- 346 2015.
- 347 [16] N. Mirzoeff, *An Introduction to Visual Culture*, 3rd ed. London, UK: Routledge, 2013.
- 348 [17] H. Wu, Ed., *Chinese Art at the Crossroads: Between Past and Future, Between East and West*. Hong Kong: New Art
- 349 Media, 2001.
- 350 [18] J. de Kloet and L. Scheen, Eds., *Spectacle and the City: Chinese Urbanities in Art and Popular Culture*. Amsterdam, The
- 351 Netherlands: Amsterdam University Press, 2013.

352 **Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual

353 author(s) and contributor(s) and not of IGP and/or the editor(s). IGP and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to

354 people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.