

Whose global art (history)? Ancient art as global art¹

Cynthia Colburn

Dedication

When asked to write in honor of Donald Preziosi, I began rereading much of his scholarship. I started with *Rethinking Art History: Meditations on a Coy Science*,² and it brought me back to the moment I purchased this book at the Museum of Modern Art in New York City as I prepared to attend graduate school at UCLA, where I would study Aegean art history under Donald. I also remember the fear that came upon me when I realized that, though I found the book interesting and very impressive, there was much that I did not understand. Having completed my undergraduate degree in art history, I had never thought about the history of the discipline, the influences of its origins, or the complexity of its practice. I had come to think of art history as a fairly tidy, albeit fascinating, story of the world told through art. I would offer that this was probably not atypical of the average undergraduate in art history in the early 1990s. That fear increased as I began Donald's Art Historical Theories and Methodologies seminar at UCLA in 1995. We were working from a reader that would soon morph into his publication, *The Art of Art History*, but in the seminar the first author we read was Immanuel Kant, including excerpts from his *Critique of Judgment*. I know I was not alone in my feelings of intimidation; prior to the class in which we were to discuss Kant, I huddled with several other first year graduate students, trying desperately to make sense of what we had read. As the semester progressed, however, that fear quickly transformed into excitement, as Donald, like Ariadne's thread, led us through the labyrinthine historiography of art history, or as he so aptly described in his later scholarship, a veritable Crystal Palace that can ever be expanded and revised.³ In addition to causing us to question our assumptions and open our minds to innovative ways of thinking, this seminar gave us many tools with which to approach our study of art, regardless of chronological period or geographical origin. In other words, Donald spoke to us across our various specializations.

¹ I would like to thank Damon Willick, Marian Feldman, and Bradley Griffin for reading an earlier version of this essay. All errors or omissions belong solely to the author.

² Donald Preziosi, *Rethinking Art History: Meditations on a Coy Science*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

³ Donald Preziosi, *Brain of the Earth's Body: Art, Museums, and the Phantasms of Modernity*, Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 2003, 92-115.

Also striking in Donald Preziosi's publications is the incredible breadth and depth he brings to his writing on the discipline of art history. Those unfamiliar with his early monograph, *Minoan Architectural Design*,⁴ might forget that Donald was trained in the art, architecture, and archaeology of ancient Greece, and more specifically, the Bronze Age Aegean. Yet, a cursory reading of *Rethinking Art History*, or even his much more recent *Art, Religion, Amnesia: The Enchantments of Credulity*,⁵ shows clear evidence of his background in ancient Greek art, archaeology, and philosophy. Further, Preziosi's introductory essays that begin each section of *The Art of Art History*⁶ show a breadth of knowledge of art historical subfields well beyond ancient Greece and contemporary theory. One might argue, in fact, that it is precisely Donald Preziosi's breadth and depth of knowledge of the field of art history, as well as the value he places on all geographical areas and periods of art, that allows him to engage so fully and effectively in the discourses that impact the discipline of art history as a whole and that speak across our areas of specialization. This is why I would like to dedicate this essay, which argues for a greater role for pre-modern art in the mainstream theoretical discourse on global art, to Donald Preziosi, whose interest in art across time and space has informed his scholarship and that of his many students in order to advance the complex history of art in the world.

Theoretical discourse on global art (history)

Discourse on a global or world art history arguably dominates the field of art history today. This is evident across the discipline and can be seen in college courses, departmental mission statements, faculty hires, museum exhibitions, and recent scholarship.⁷ For example, recent museum exhibitions include *The Global Middle Ages* at the Getty, *Made in the Americas: The New World Discovers Asia* at the Museum of Fine Arts Boston, and *Transmissions: Art in Eastern Europe and Latin America 1960-1980* at the Museum of Modern Art in NY. And book titles such as *A Global History of Architecture*⁸ and *At the Crossroads: The Arts of Spanish America and Early Global Trade*⁹ increasingly draw our attention to a world art history. This trend appears to cut across time and space, with efforts to examine art throughout the

⁴ Donald Preziosi, *Minoan Architectural Design: Formation and Signification*, Berlin and New York: Mouton, 1983.

⁵ Donald Preziosi, *Art, Religion, Amnesia: The Enchantments of Credulity*, Hoboken: Taylor and Francis, 2013.

⁶ Donald Preziosi, *The Art of Art History*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

⁷ Kristen Chiem and Cynthia S. Colburn, 'Global Foundations for a World Art History', *Visual Resources* 31: 3-4, 2015, 177-199.

⁸ Francis D.K. Ching, Mark Jarzombek, Vikramaditya Prakash, *A Global History of Architecture*, 2nd edition, Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2011.

⁹ Donna Pierce and Ronald Otsuka, eds, *At the Crossroads: The Arts of Spanish America and Early Global Trade, 1492-1850*, Denver: Denver Art Museum, 2012.

world and its global connections while still valuing the significance of local art histories.

Recent theoretical scholarship on a global art history is also abundant. Edited volumes on the subject, such as Elkins' *Is Art History Global?* (2007), Zijlmans and Van Damme's *World Art Studies: Exploring Concepts and Approaches* (2008), Belting and Buddensieg's *The Global Art World* (2009), Belting et al.'s *Global Studies: Mapping Contemporary Art and Culture*, and Casid and D'Souza's *Art History in the Wake of the Global Turn* (2014) are just a few of the many works dealing with global art and a global art history that have appeared in the last decade. New journals dedicated to the subject, such as *World Art*, are also gaining ground.¹⁰ While one might expect all of this scholarship to clarify what is meant by a global art history and provide some consistent approaches toward its study, there appears to be no consensus in the field. Indeed, there are at least two distinct lines of discourse.

The first explores the possibility of a truly global or world art history.¹¹ For example, in *Is Art History Global?* (2007), James Elkins asks whether there exists a worldwide practice of art history.¹² He and others analyze the discipline of art history in an attempt to discern whether art historical practice can be considered global. Others, such as David Summers in *Real Spaces: World Art History and the Rise of Western Modernism* (2003), attempt to provide examples of what a world art history might look like.¹³ The 2011 Clark Conference, 'In the Wake of the "Global Turn": Propositions for an "Exploded" Art History without Borders,' asked questions such as: 'What would it mean to understand art history's global turn as something that does not merely expand, but potentially explodes the borders between fields and even the discipline itself? What models might scholars turn to in order to deal with the radical difference, unevenness, and even untranslatability that emerge when one attempts to bring into conversation fundamentally different instances of cultural production?'¹⁴ The volume that resulted from this conference attempts to respond to these questions in both theory and practice.¹⁵ Much is at stake in this discussion. As Whitney Davis notes: '...without world art studies, the discipline of art history has little prospect of maintaining a coherent project as a

¹⁰ *World Art*, published by Routledge, first appeared in 2011.

¹¹ Even the terms 'global' and 'world' are used in a variety of ways when describing art or art history and often cause confusion. See Whitney Davis, 'Comment: World without Art', *Art History* 33: 4, 2010, 711-716.

¹² James Elkins, 'Art History as a Global Discipline', in James Elkins, ed, *Is Art History Global?*, New York and London: Routledge, 2007, 4.

¹³ David Summers, *Real Spaces: World Art History and the Rise of Western Modernism*, New York: Phaidon, 2003.

¹⁴ Aruna D'Souza, 'Introduction', in Jill H. Casid and Aruna D'Souza, eds, *Art History in the Wake of the Global Turn*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2014, vi.

¹⁵ Jill H. Casid and Aruna D'Souza, eds, *Art History in the Wake of the Global Turn*.

global enterprise – as practised and taught around the world – in relation to worldwide phenomena of art and visual culture, past and present.¹⁶

The second discourse focuses on a global art history as departing from global art and emphasizing hybridity in this art. However, this discourse takes as its starting point the definition of global art *as* contemporary art, though some would stretch the definition back further in time to include some modern art. Proponents of this definition justify it by arguing that contemporary art is the only art created in the age of globalization. Advocates of this identification of contemporary art as the only truly global art include Hans Belting, Peter Weibel, and Andrea Buddensieg. In her editorial essay accompanying the proceedings of a 2006 conference published in 2007 as *The Global Art World*, Buddensieg states that the project, *Global Art and the Museum* (GAM) distinguishes between world art, identified as ‘the world heritage of art from all ages and countries’, and global art, which is argued to be a uniquely ‘contemporary development.’¹⁷ Indeed the title of Belting’s subsequent introductory essay to the volume, ‘Contemporary Art as Global Art: A Critical Essay’, confirms this very narrow definition of global art.

It is no surprise, therefore, that the overwhelming majority of theoretical scholarship on a global art history or even world art studies concerns contemporary and, though less frequently, modern art. In some cases, examples date back as early as the Renaissance in an attempt to ‘explode’ the borders of art history,¹⁸ but even this is rare. Conspicuously absent from almost all *mainstream* theoretical discourse on a global art history is pre-modern art. For the remainder of this essay, I argue that much pre-modern art can indeed be seen as global art, meaning art produced under the conditions of globalization.¹⁹ As such, historians of pre-modern art have much to contribute to the current theoretical discourse on a global art history.

Whose global art history?

Some scholars have suggested that the privileging of contemporary art at the expense of historical art represents a current crisis in art history.²⁰ For example, according to Patricia Mainardi, ‘...art history has become part of the global economy, but not all art history can participate in this economy: only contemporary

¹⁶ Whitney Davis, ‘Comment’, 711.

¹⁷ Andrea Buddensieg, ‘Editorial’, in Hans Belting and Andrea Buddensieg, eds, *The Global Art World: Audiences, Markets, and Museums*, Karlsruhe: ZKM Center for Art and Media Karlsruhe and Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz Verlag, 2009, 10.

¹⁸ See Jill H. Casid and Aruna D’Souza, eds, *Art History in the Wake of the Global Turn*.

¹⁹ By globalization I refer to the exchange of people and information in a transcultural environment on a global scale, at least in relative terms.

²⁰ See, for example, the papers on ‘The Crisis in Art History’ in *Visual Resources*, 27:4, 2011, 303-343. This issue includes revised papers delivered at the 2011 College Art Association meeting in New York in the ‘Critical Issues in Art History’ series.

art offers the kinds of economic benefits that can be reaped by these international emporia.²¹ Instead, contemporary and, to a lesser extent, modern art is *the* art that dominates the current global art economy. Maxwell L. Anderson adds: 'The fields of nineteenth-century art and modern and contemporary art now dominate departments of art history in the United States to the point that undergraduate and graduate interest and instruction in the first 5,000 years of art history is in precipitous decline.'²² This has changed the topography of departments as well, as the faculty positions of many art historians who specialize in the art history of pre-modern eras are being consolidated or eliminated after retirements to allow for those funds to be redirected to faculty lines in contemporary art subjects.²³ Even more seemingly 'global' positions, such as hires in African or Latin American art, frequently call for specialization in the contemporary arts of these areas.

This is not to say that contemporary or modern art should be valued less, but rather that historical art history has much to add to what could be called the more 'mainstream' discussion of a global or world art history, even in terms of theory and methods.²⁴ One might argue that the pre-modern era lacked global interconnectedness. However, as Noël Carroll rightly points out, even today, many parts of the world have not been integrated into global networks, and certainly not in equal measure.²⁵ Exchange, artistic or otherwise, dates to the prehistoric era all over the world, and could be considered global in the modern usage of the word given that goods and artistic ideas frequently flowed across what were the known limits of the world at the time. Examples include, but are certainly not limited to, the Bronze Age civilizations of Europe, Asia, and North Africa, the Persian Empire, the Hellenistic world, the Roman Empire, trade along the Silk Route from Asia to Europe, the Islamic Caliphates, the Mongol Empire, the Mexica/Aztec Empire, the Inca Empire, and later the Manila Galleon trade from Asia to Mexico and beyond. Thus, as Carroll notes, '...globalization is not especially recent; it is, arguably, a process with a probably immemorial lineage.'²⁶ Nor is hybridization unique to

²¹ Patricia Mainardi, 'Art History: Research that "Matters"', in *Visual Resources* 27: 4, 2011, 305.

²² Maxwell L. Anderson, 'The Crisis in Art History: Ten Problems, Ten Solutions', in *Visual Resources* 27: 4, 2011, 337. See also Keith Moxey, *Visual Time: The Image in History*, Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2013, 337.

²³ Mainardi, 'Art History: Research that "Matters"', 306; Anderson, 'The Crisis in Art History: Ten Problems, Ten Solutions', 337.

²⁴ See also Whitney Davis, 'Radical WAS: The Sense of History in World Art Studies', *World Art*, 3:2, 2013, 201-210, who argues for the investigation of prehistoric arts, as well as for the acceptance of the 'pre-historicity' of all art.

²⁵ Noël Carroll, 'Art and Globalization: Then and Now', *Journal of Aesthetics and Criticism*, 65: 1, 2007, 131.

²⁶ Carroll, 'Art and Globalization', 131.

contemporary or modern art.²⁷ Hybridity in the arts, regardless of motivation, has been present since the prehistoric era and is not dependent on newer technologies, as some might think, though newer technologies have changed the speed at which cross-cultural hybridization may occur.

Indeed, the Bronze Age Aegean, the period on which Donald Preziosi wrote his doctoral dissertation, provides ample evidence for artistic exchange and even hybridity in the arts, as well as sophisticated methodological approaches that prioritize historical agency to determine the potential meaning(s) of the works of art in question.²⁸ This period saw the expansion of trade from India to Europe, and these transcultural contacts are represented in artistic production and consumption. For example, the Late Bronze Age, and more specifically the period from ca. 1400-1200 B.C. has long been considered an age of 'internationalism' that brought about an 'international style,'²⁹ or, as referred to more recently, 'artistic internationalisms.'³⁰ Works of art from this period clearly show evidence of different kinds of contacts, such as mercantile exchange, diplomatic exchange, and combat. One well-known artistic example that is probably the result of mercantile exchange is the relief carving on the lid of a round ivory container known as a pyxis (Figure 1). It was found in Tomb III at Minet el-Beidha, on the Syrian coast. The ivory lid dates to the 13th century BC in the Late Bronze Age and currently resides at the Musée du Louvre, Paris.

The plurality of artistic quotations in the work has resulted in its extensive study by scholars.³¹ The relief carved into the lid, though damaged, depicts a female

²⁷ Carroll, 'Art and Globalization', 134. It should be noted, however, that Carroll goes on to argue for the existence of a transnational institution of art today.

²⁸ Talinn Grigor argues: '...perhaps a global turn in art history is only possible with the prioritization of historical agency in art-historical narratives.' Talinn Grigor, 'What Art Does: Methodological Privileging of Agency and Art History's Global Dispute in 1901', in Jill H. Casid and Aruna D'Souza, eds, *Art History in the Wake of the Global Turn*, 140.

²⁹ It should be noted that nations in the modern sense of the word did not exist in the Bronze Age, and so though the term is common in Bronze Age scholarship, it is applied anachronistically. The regions involved in the development of this style refer to both known political states, such as Egypt and Babylonia, or more broadly to cultural regions, such as Mesopotamia, the Levant, or Anatolia. See Marian H. Feldman, *Diplomacy by Design: Luxury Arts and an 'International Style' in the Ancient Near East, 1400-1200 BCE*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2006, 3.

³⁰ Marian H. Feldman, 'Qatna and artistic internationalism during the Late Bronze Age', in Peter Pfälzner and Michel Al-Maqdissi, eds, *Qatna and the Networks of Bronze Age Globalism*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2015, 34.

³¹ Helene Kantor, 'The Aegean and the Orient in the Second Millennium BC', *AJA Monographs*, 51, 1947, 86-89; Marie-Henriette Gates, 'Mycenaean Art for a Levantine Market? The Ivory Lid from Minet el Beidha/Ugarit', in Robert Laffineur and Janice L. Crowley, eds, *Eikon. Aegean Bronze Age Iconography: Shaping a Methodology*, Liège: Université de Liège, 1992, 77-84; Paul Rehak and John G. Younger, 'International Styles in Ivory Carving in the Bronze Age', in E.H. Cline and D. Harris-Cline, eds, *The Aegean and the Orient*



Figure 1: Lid of a pyxis with mistress of animals, c. 1250 BCE, Minet el Beida, Port of Ugarit, Tomb 3, elephant ivory. The Louvre, Paris. Photo Credit: Scala/Art Resource, NY

figure seated on what could be called an Aegean style altar offering palm fronds to two goats that flank her. She wears a long, split flounced skirt and is nude on top, with the exception of an elaborate necklace. She appears to be in a mountainous landscape, as indicated by the rocky formation with drill holes below her feet, the two mountainous cones flanking her lower body, and the scale design on the upper part of her skirt – a pattern that long denoted mountains in the ancient Near East. This type of composition, with two animals heraldically flanking a central figure, is known as the Master or, as in this case, Mistress of Animals, and it has a long tradition in the ancient Near East, with examples dating to the fourth millennium BC. Mountains were frequently the domains of divinity in Near Eastern religions, and Ugarit was no exception to this rule. In the mythological literature, the storm

in the Second Millennium, Liège: Université de Liège, 1992, 250; Jean-Claude Poursat, 'Ivoires chypro-égéens: De Chypre à Minet-el-Beida et Mycènes', in Philip P. Betancourt, Vassos Karageorghis, Robert Laffineur, and Wolf-Dietrich Niemeier, eds, *MELETEMATA: Studies in Aegean Archaeology Presented to Malcolm H. Wiener as He Enters His 65th Year*, Liège and Austin: Université de Liège and University of Texas at Austin, 1999, 683-87; Jacqueline Gachet-Bizollon, *Les ivoires d'Ougarit et l'art des ivoiriers du Levant au Bronze Récent*, Ras Shamra-Ougarit 16, Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 2007, 87-91; Sophie Cluzan, 'Pyxis Lid with Mistress of Animals', in Joan Aruz, Kim Benzel, and Jean M. Evans, eds, *Beyond Babylon: Art Trade and Diplomacy in the Second Millennium B.C.*, New York, New Haven and London: Metropolitan Museum of Art and Yale University Press, 2008, 408-409; Feldman, 'Qatna and artistic internationalism during the Late Bronze Age', 34 and 39.

god, Baal, dies and returns to the underworld, or the mountains. A goddess then gathers the pieces of Baal's body in the mountain and gives him new life, which ensures regeneration on earth. This is clearly linked to the changing of the seasons that were so important to human lives. The figure on this pyxis lid could, therefore, represent the divinity appearing in the mountains and giving new life, as represented by the palm fronds. And yet, stylistically the figure is carved in what would be considered by many an Aegean style. She also wears a flounced skirt typical of the Minoan and Mycenaean worlds, though her completely bare top differs from the open bodices depicted in Aegean art and is, instead, consistent with examples of divinity from the Levant.³²

So how do we begin to analyze a work of this complexity? The context of this work in a private tomb located in the necropolis of Minet el-Beidha, which served as the harbor town for the prominent Bronze Age city of Ugarit, may suggest that the tomb owner was involved in seaborne mercantile trade. The presence of a stone anchor built into the tomb adds credence to this suggestion. It has been argued that the plurality of artistic styles and iconography in the relief carving on the pyxis lid would make it appear exotic in any market in the Aegean and eastern Mediterranean. This may have been intentional on the part of the artist in order to 'enhance its appeal in any market.'³³ Or perhaps the mixed style and iconography on the lid appealed to the tomb owner because they reminded him of the diverse cultures encountered during his travel throughout the Aegean and eastern Mediterranean. Regardless of the specific meaning to the owner of the tomb, it appears that the relief on the pyxis lid reflects the contemporary world of the Late Bronze Age Aegean and Eastern Mediterranean in which art was used to speak across political, cultural, and religious boundaries during a period of great economic exchange across distant lands.

The relief on the pyxis lid differs, however, from other luxury objects considered to be part of what Marian Feldman refers to as an 'international koiné.'³⁴ This elite koiné style is seen on the famous gold sheath and dagger from the Tomb of Tutankhamun in the Valley of the Kings, Thebes, as well as on other objects (**Figure 2**). In her work, Feldman fine-tunes the concept of hybridity to identify a group of objects that likely played a role in elite diplomatic exchange between the states of Egypt, Babylonia, and Hatti, as well as smaller kingdoms in Syria, the Levant, and the Aegean.³⁵ Rather than quoting styles or iconography specific to a region, a genuinely hybrid style that communicated among the elite through the

³² See Cluzan, 'Pyxis Lid with Mistress of Animals', 408-409 for a thorough description of this relief sculpture.

³³ Paul Rehak and John G. Younger, 'International Styles in Ivory Carving in the Bronze Age', 250.

³⁴ Indeed, Marian Feldman elaborates on this distinction in *Diplomacy by Design*.

³⁵ Feldman, *Diplomacy*.



Figure 2: Gold dagger and sheath from the Tomb of Tutankhamun, Valley of the Kings, Thebes, Egypt, 18th Dynasty, c. 1333-1323 BCE. Egyptian Museum, Cairo. Photo Credit: Araldo De Luca / The Art Archive at Art Resource, NY

blurring of distinctions between diverse artistic traditions developed.³⁶ Feldman arrives at this conclusion through analysis from multiple perspectives, including ‘formal, material, stylistic, iconographic, historical, cultural, social, and political.’³⁷ This elite artistic koiné consisted of a standard formula that is similar to those in the textual evidence from the archives at Tell el-Amarna (ancient Akhetaten), Egypt, Hattusas in modern Turkey, and elsewhere. This approach privileges historical agency in order to discern potential functions and meanings for the objects in question.

Earlier examples of transcultural exchange also abound, such as etched carnelian beads from the Early Bronze Age that made their way from the Indus to the ancient Near East and on to the Aegean in a variety of contexts, often elite, as well as other jewelry styles and technologies. Later artistic examples of transcultural connections from historical periods of the ancient world can also flesh out this picture. Why, then, are ancient artistic examples missing from the mainstream theoretical discourse on a global or even a world art history? It appears that many art historians who study the art of earlier periods are finding themselves more

³⁶ Feldman, *Diplomacy*, 62.

³⁷ Feldman, *Diplomacy*, 5.

engaged in the theoretical discourses of other fields, such as archaeology or anthropology.³⁸ Anecdotal evidence for this is the very low number of sessions on ancient art at the annual meeting of the College Art Association in the United States. Many historians of ancient art choose to present their research at other venues, such as the annual meetings of the Archaeological Institute of America or the Society of American Anthropology. While these are perfectly legitimate venues for art historians to introduce their research, an opportunity is missed when art historians from different subfields do not have the occasion to learn from one another. Speaking across our subfields may also help answer another important question proposed by those theorizing about a global or world art history, namely, can art historical methods, which were developed primarily to deal with a Western canon of art, be applied to world art regardless of period or location? One could argue that it already does and has done so for years in the case of Egyptian or Mesopotamian art, both of which entered the canon of so-called 'Western' art very early, even though neither culture had a concept of art in the 'Western' sense of the word.

Conclusions

As Donald Preziosi suggested almost two decades ago in *Rethinking Art History*, the discipline of Art History is a complex enterprise, one that is well positioned to analyze the social production of meaning vis-à-vis art.³⁹ It is precisely this complexity that allows it to be dynamic enough to explore a diverse array of art through time and space. However, in order to establish a robust world art studies, we must first expand our theoretical discourses to include all subfields of art history. In other words, just as the geographical boundaries of art history are being exploded, we must also begin to chip away at the great theoretical divide in our discipline between modern and contemporary art on the one side, and all historical art on the other. Only in this way can we reap the full benefits of world art studies. One might even argue that pre-modern examples provide a powerful historical lens with which to view contemporary global art. In other words, some understanding of the complex role of art in the past could sharpen our understanding of artistic production, consumption, and exchange today.

However, in an article honoring the work of Donald Preziosi, I would be remiss not to mention his skeptical stance on globalizing perspectives, in as much as his work demonstrates that, historically, art history's globalizing tendencies have been inextricably tied to the European colonial project of the early modern and

³⁸ This is interesting, since one approach to a global art history in more contemporary theoretical discourse is an anthropology of art, and yet historians of ancient art, who are often well versed in anthropological approaches to the study of art and culture, are not well represented in the mainstream theoretical literature. See, for example, the section of the anthropology of art in Zijlman and Wilfried van Damme, *World Art Studies*.

³⁹ Preziosi, *Rethinking Art History*, 160.

modern periods.⁴⁰ In speaking of the Crystal Palace at the Great Fair of 1851, Preziosi states:

It was the laboratory table on which all things and peoples could be objectively and poignantly compared and contrasted in a uniform and perfect light, and phylogenetically and ontogenetically ranked. All this in relation to a Europe that had been learning to stage itself as the eyes and ears of the world, as the brain of the earth's body.⁴¹

Thus, in discussing global art or art history, could it be that I am simply reifying Preziosi's earlier notions of the Crystal Palace as a 'blueprint of patriarchal colonialism'?⁴² Given the work of Preziosi and others to expose the colonialist agendas of art history, I certainly hope not. Rather than expanding the colonialist blueprint of the palace, what I am proposing is a rethinking of contemporary theoretical discourse on global art history or, if you will, a renovation of at least some of the palace rooms.

Cynthia Colburn is Associate Professor of Art History at Pepperdine University in Malibu, California. She earned her PhD from the University of California, Los Angeles. Her research interests include the art and archaeology of the ancient Mediterranean world, focusing on cultural interaction, identity, agency, and bodily adornment. She has also published on global foundations for a world art history.

cynthia.colburn@pepperdine.edu



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

⁴⁰ See, for example, Preziosi, *Brain of the Earth's Body*, 2003.

⁴¹ Preziosi, *Brain of the Earth's Body*, 98.

⁴² Preziosi, *Brain of the Earth's Body*, 98.