

## INTERVIEW WITH PROFESSOR DONALD PREZIOSI

**Donald Preziosi** is Emeritus Professor of Art History at the University of California, Los Angeles, where he developed and directs the art history critical theory program. He is one of the leading scholars in the field of art history, theory, and criticism, publishing on a wide scope of topics ranging from Greek art to the Ottoman city, and from museology to contemporary art. In his writing he combines disciplines as diverse as intellectual history, critical theory, linguistics and museology. Prof. Preziosi has published several books and many articles scrutinizing the interrelationships of language, meaning, semiotics, art, art history, museums, architecture, and the built environment including the *The Semiotics of the Built Environment* (1979), *Rethinking Art History: Meditations on a Coy Science* (1989), *The Ottoman City and Its Parts: Urban Structure & Social Order* (1992), *Seeing Through Art History* (1999). He is also the author of a dozen books on aspects of art and architectural history, contemporary critical theory and the historiography of cultural institutions and museums, including most recently *Brain of the Earth's Body: Art, Museums, and the Phantasms of Modernity* (2003); *Grasping the World: The Idea of the Museum* (2004); *In the Aftermath of Art: Ethics, Aesthetics, Politics* (2006). His groundbreaking book *The Art of Art History: A Critical Anthology* (1998) is considered the most widely used English-language introduction to art history.

Prof. Preziosi was interviewed for *Tarih* by **Nilay Özlü** and **Gizem Tongo**.

\*\*\*\*\*

*First of all, Professor Preziosi, thank you for agreeing to be interviewed by the Graduate History Journal. You have taken on an active role in academic debates since the early 1970s. How did you position yourself with respect to the emergence of the post-modern critique? Do you think your work played a role in the establishment of the post-modern critique in the United States? Is there any gap or rupture between your earlier and later works in terms of your academic position and epistemological stance?*

PROF. PREZIOSI

There was a gap or rupture in my work between earlier and later works. The earlier was focused on archeology and the attempt to interpret ancient Bronze Age architecture. The work I did, which was fairly extensive, was done for a field which was really very much itself still in the bronze age;

---

still very traditional. And so there was very little place for my work at that time because when I was doing that work I was also reading Derrida and Lacan so on and so forth, and that was not something that was part of that discourse at all. So gradually I migrated to working with these issues of postmodernism. Interestingly, however, the field that I did my earlier work in has caught up, but it's taken 25 years to do this! So a lot of people who are doing work in that kind of archeology also have a background in critical theory and a lot of postmodern debates. So I think I was a generation too early in the kind of work I was doing then... Anyway, I got more involved in the history of the production of ideas about art and about cultural institutions, so that became a more general background, and that has become the framework for the work I have done since then.

*In your introduction to The Art of Art History: A Critical Anthology, you define art history as a keynote enterprise in making the visible legible, "made of its legibilities a uniquely powerful medium for fabricating, sustaining, and transforming the identity and history of individuals and nations." And you conclude by claiming that the principal product of art history "has thus been modernity itself." Can you explain further the interconnectedness between art history and modernity?*

PROF. PREZIOSI

In the introduction to *The Art of Art History*, I mention that it was my impression that the basic product of art history has been modernity itself. In other words, I think, the focus on art in such a way has become the definition of modernity; the way that modernity distinguishes itself from other fields, other times. And specifically the secularization of art; in fact, art has become a general kind of cultural practice, apart from its religious roots. And that has been to enhance the focus of modernity. And so in a sense it is perhaps literally true that the product of disciplines like art history has often been to instantiate or strengthen the idea of modernity as something distinct from the past, and as a kind of observation point for the past and for other alternative identities.

*You distinguish between visible and legible, so the legible is not a piece of art, but...*

PROF. PREZIOSI

Well, I was using that phrase because it was traditionally the function of art history to translate artworks into texts; into textual impressions and textual interpretations. So interpretation was never in terms of another art

work; you didn't make another art work, but you were making a text. So it's that distinction. So you have to somehow find ways to translate.

*And what is your understanding of modernism as a product of art history?*

PROF. PREZIOSI

Well I think it has to do with the problem of how you understand the world as part of a general narrative. One of the things that art history did was to make it clear that modernity consisted of seeing the world as a picture, and as a picture which had its own iconography. And that the job of the art historian was then basically to provide keys to that iconography.

*You stress the dependence of the modern nation-state, as an imaginary entity, on an apparatus of powerful cultural fictions for its existence, which were the novel and the museum. Yet, if we can claim that the nation-states lose importance in today's globalized world, then how is this reflected in how museums view themselves and how we view museums?*

PROF. PREZIOSI

That's a difficult question. I think in one sense because museums have detached themselves from the narratives of individual states or citizenship, they then become part of a multinational network of sites for the display of heritage, for the display of modern art. Essentially, they're part of a network of visual practices to commodify things, to commodify everything.

*During your lectures here at Boğaziçi University, you stated that we should ask the question "when is a museum; not what is a museum" and you defined the museum as a process of recontextualization to confirm meaning; meaning for a certain purpose. In this respect, can you articulate the relationship between museology and identity?*

PROF. PREZIOSI

So is the question how museums then confirm identity or produce identity? Identity is then a product of the museum? Well, you find yourself - you find your place - in the museum. You find your identity in the museum reflected in exhibitions or in aspects of exhibitions. So the museum becomes a place to stage personalities, where you can stage your interests, stage your tastes, and thereby know yourself because you have something to see yourself against and in relationship to. So it's that kind of retextualisation which makes for

identity. It's very powerful. So you are always contending with, always dealing with the controls that museums are trying to force on to you and find your place in, or reckoning with that problem. Because a museum will give you a context for something, and then you will have to somehow struggle to see whether this can be a context for yourself. And so in the course of that dialogue you create a kind of relational identity; a relative identity in terms of what the museum presents. It's as if the museum gives you a vocabulary to think about yourself, and then you either adopt it or don't adopt it or adopt something else as a result of the engagement or interaction with it: you create a kind of third space.

*Art historians such as Ernst Gombrich, Erwin Panofsky, and Peter Burke have distinguished between iconography and iconology. According to Erwin Panofsky, "the discovery and interpretation of the symbolical values (which are often unknown to the artist himself and may even emphatically differ from what he consciously intended to express) is the object of what we may call 'iconology' as opposed to 'iconography'." Panofsky also justifies his hierarchical distinction through the etymology of these words, where graphein means 'to write' and logos refers to 'thought' or 'reason'. In this respect how do you define museography and museology and what is the basis of your distinction between museography and museology?*

#### PROF. PREZIOSI

Yes I tried to make a distinction between museology and museography because I was trying to bring out the fact that museums are themselves a form of writing; a form of text. So museography would be the study of the way museums function to produce meanings. So in that sense it's not just simply a representation of thought but the production of thought in the forms of a narrative; a narrative unfolding in terms of how things are positioned or juxtaposed to each other, the kinds of space or trajectory or pathway that museums afford which then becomes a narrative, which then becomes a text, or becomes equivalent to a text because it's linear or multilinear, so in that sense it resembles a text. And by using the museum you create a kind of dance or choreography... and you create meaning through the way things unfold, through your interaction with it, in space, in time. So museums need an audience for them to really work. For a museum to make its meanings manifest, you have to use it.

*Can I have a couple of words about this audience? Could it be anyone or could the audience be selected, or created? And is it possible to transform this audience? Is it important for the museum who their audience are?*

## PROF. PREZIOSI

Well in both cases, that's the case. There's a kind of gap between the initial intention of a museum or a museum exhibition, and what's expected of its audience. There's a general expectation that whatever you do is going to affect people's perceptions, and so it becomes an active process of reaching out to people, attempting to create something - to create more knowledge, to create different senses of themselves - because museums play on the conundrum that, once you put something in space, you have to then create a context in which its actual meanings can be unfolded, because in itself the object is indeterminate and unclear. I think the point is that a museum provides the opportunity for seeing things differently than you might have thought of them before. In that sense a museum is a transformational object; it is something that transforms things into different kinds of things. Things really are different when they're in a museum than when they're outside because of the context. In one sense it's a very simple fact - it's just a different context for the same things, or the things are no longer the same because the context is different - but museums focus on the process of those changes. Museums put things on pedestals or behind glass, and so forth, and so they remove them from the ordinary way in which you would touch or hold these things, so that you see them at a distance, giving a new perspective. Museums create different perspectives on things, and so a museum could be seen as a kind of factory for the production of perspectives on how to situate yourself in connection with an object. In that respect, museums are in a very difficult position because they really do change an audience's understanding of things. They also make clear, or should make clear, the lines of power about how things are controlled. In a sense, museums become examples of how power operates; of how you control things. And I think that's a very important thing that's often missed. People think about museums having power by making things appear in certain ways, but it goes beyond that, it's much more than that. It's really about how you show that power is being exhibited.

*In your 1989 book, Rethinking Art History: Meditations on a Coy Science, you criticize how traditional art historians take art historical methods to be innocent and natural, and how these conventional art-historical practices rarely reflect on their own methodologies. In that sense, as you claim, art history fails adequately to appreciate the relationship between cultural objects and cultural subjects. How then should art history develop a language that neither mystifies nor reduces, but rather “demonstrates and articulates, in its finest details, what cultural domination is about” as you suggest?*

---

PROF. PREZIOSI

They don't tell you what the presuppositions are in most art history texts; they rarely give you an explicit sense of what they feel about artists, how they feel you should understand art, what they understand history to be, and things like that. Or even, what the point of knowing about these things is. There's a general presumption, which is often unsaid, that, of course, this is something that's going to benefit you, but they never explain *how* - how is it supposed to do that? And so it's almost as if art history is a demonstration of certain practices without the instruction booklet. There's no theoretical or critical instruction booklet about how things should be understood. And that's another manifestation of power relationships.

*In recent years, the field of aesthetics has seen a revival of interest in the issue of representation, mostly because of the demise of Formalism, of what we seem communally to think as the legacy of Clement Greenberg, and the returning interest in representation among postmodernists. Michel Foucault's The Order of Things, famously begins with a discussion of Diego Velázquez's painting Las Meninas to portray the relationship between reality and representation. What is interesting in Foucault's analysis is that his exploration of the painting is neither established by, nor prescribed through the various texts of art-historical investigation; the artist's biography is absent and there is no reference to technical virtuosity. How do you see this shift of the center of gravity away from the painting as an object and towards ideology and social context?*

PROF. PREZIOSI

I see that shift as becoming more explicit: it's more obvious, it's not taken for granted. This is because the engagement of painting as objects with ideology and social context has always been there, but it's become more explicit. In becoming more explicit, art calls even closer attention to its own techniques of staging power relationships and things like that. But that's something that's characteristic of late modernity anyway in a general sense. There's an increasing attempt to make clear these structures of power, these lines of power, these hierarchies of understanding, these social relations. The problem is that the awareness is only temporary; it's never fixed. You have to continually change the frame of reference to keep those things in focus. And Foucault was very aware of that in everything he wrote. He was very clear that you have to change your methods for making things apparent continually; they have to be refreshed. Sometimes that has become simply a kind of fashion statement; people are focused on the fashion of turns toward certain aspects of things, and then it becomes simply another commodified

game, which sort of misses the point. Underlying all of this is something that came out in the manifestos of the Russian formalists in the 1920s, whose basic idea was that the idea of art was to make things strange; make things appear as different from what they were before. So there's a notion of art as being something that was transformative; that transforms your perceptions of things; that makes everything look strangely unfamiliar from what it was. Art puts things in new contexts, and museums do the same thing; museums put objects in their contexts and so they become strange objects. Hence the game is to keep that strangeness fresh, keep it apparent, keep it always strange, keep it always provocative; keep always the message that this strangeness has important social and personal effects at all times. This is because it calls attention to our own sense of identity; it calls attention to the artifice of our identity, to the unnaturalness of what is taken to be natural.

*Don't you think at some point it becomes so strange that the audience and the creator lose their connection? I am especially referring to the late modern contemporary art installations and biennales. I feel that sometimes artists are somehow losing their connection with the public. Do you agree with this?*

PROF. PREZIOSI

I think that it is a very important question, but I think it is one that it is really misunderstood a lot because it presupposes that there should be a *proper* connection. What is unclear is what the proper connection is because the proper connection is always going to be a function of the context. So you can't answer that question outside of a given context. In other words, you can't really say what it might be in the abstract unless you specify what functions the connections should serve. If it's in order to promote changing the nature of the society, that's one context. If you assume that the function of art is to make the world better, as in those manifestos, then that's one thing, but how can you make those changes for the better actually remain and stay for the better? Because they can always decay, they can always lose their message, they can always become commodified, and they can always become dulled down and become over-familiar and domesticated. So it's a dialogue between making strange and making domestic; domestication and surrealistic change. These always exist in a dialogue with each other. So one of the functions of art history, criticism and theory is to maintain the tension as to the distinction between those things, and the functions they serve.

*The German literary critic, Peter Bürger, argued in 1974 that the avant-garde movements of the early twentieth century (particularly Dada, Surrealism, and the Left Avant-Garde in Russia and Germany) were*

---

*distinctive in their attack on the status of art in bourgeois society. It has been declared many times that the historical avant-garde failed in its effort to sublimate art within the practice of life. Today there are a number of different views on the reasons for and the consequences of such a failure. What are your comments on this “inevitable” failure and the future of the avant-garde art, if a future exists at all?*

PROF. PREZIOSI

So why this failure, why is it an inevitable failure? I think it is a failure - it has been a failure - because of a very conventional notion of time and change. Because there is a naive expectation that an avant-gardism would become permanent, but if an avant-garde universe becomes permanent then it becomes domesticated, it becomes commodified. How do you keep it from becoming commodified and keep it fresh? And this means not becoming or not staying strange or unusual but staying alive. So there is a difference between something remaining alive or remaining dead. And what often happens is that these manifestos then become dead after a while. And all these ideal utopian cities, utopian plans of houses and social relations and what-have-you, then become dead because they then become fetishes; they become idols in a sense. So people become idolaters in terms of those manifestos, those avant-gardisms. So it's almost a theological problem; people fetishize the new status-quo, the newness becomes the status-quo and becomes a fetish idol in some way. And so the reason why these things have always failed is because people have failed to realize the religious facet of this. That there's theological underpinning for so called secular art and so forth. So avant-gardism is really tied to a theological project for making the world better, transforming the world, redeeming the world for something new. But if you think this is a purely secular problem, then you miss the message. So you have to address it on both fronts.

*But, what is left for art and by art then?*

PROF. PREZIOSI

As I've been trying to suggest in our informal conversation, the problem of (and with) art only appears to be an impossible conundrum today only if art is taken to be a *kind* of thing, rather than a term reifying ways of using things – any kinds of things – in social life. So, what is “left for art” is a firm acknowledgement that the term is a historically-and culturally-specific cover – a reification – of a process, activity, or orientation upon things and their uses and functions by and for individuals and groups. Such a perspective constitutes an acknowledgement that what we call art exists within a series of

*relationships* between social activities. These are subjects explored at length in the forthcoming volume co-authored by Claire Farago and myself on “the idea of art” to be published next year by Blackwells’ *Manifesto* series of books, and further explored in my forthcoming volume from Routledge on art and religion.

*In the lecture “Art, God & Money” that you presented with Claire Farago at Boğaziçi University, you discussed the complex and intricate relation between art, the art market, religion, globalization, and commodification in the context of Australian Aboriginal culture. You argue that tourism, fashion, art, museum studies, and the art market are all connected under the umbrella of art history, which you defined as a tool for setting the relations between things and concepts. You also mentioned that your upcoming book “The Idea of Art” (whose final title will most likely be “Art Is Not What You Think It Is”) will discuss these issues in further detail. In arguing that art has the power to transform the world for better or for worse, do you believe that art still has the potential to break away from or disrupt this strictly organized global system?*

PROF. PREZIOSI

Do I believe that art still has the potential to break away from or disrupt this strictly organized global system? Yes but it can't do it alone! Because, in a sense, by making a question like that you then fetishize or reify art itself, take it out of its context. But if you mean the matrix of the whole processes of artistry and artifice, the whole relationship between thought and usage, and so forth—all those things that belong to the art matrix that we talked about in the last lecture—then I think it does have a potential to break free. As long as you try to avoid simply reducing it to a commodity like “art”—like an object—because objects don't exist in the abstract. Once you abstract them, or take them out of their context, then you can't break away from anything; you're just simply making it more domesticated.

*How do you see the future of the discipline of art history, then, in its critical forms?*

PROF. PREZIOSI

The problem with this is that art history has always considered itself to be a discrete institutional profession, but it never really has been; it's always been a set of relations between certain practices that have come together in the same place. I used the image of a telephone switch-board. So art history is really that set of relations—that network of relationships—

between certain kinds of things: the ideas of art, objects, interpretation, exhibition and all those other functions that art has acts; as commodity as advertising as tourism and as fashion industry. All these things are part of the same *fractal network*; I guess you can call it that. And if you don't understand that it's part of that network then you really can't expect it to change because what you've done is domesticated it again. And there's been an endless cycle of domestication and re-domestication of the material, which doesn't really advance anything. It gives me the impression that art history is always on this carousel going round and around, and every now and then it gets a gold ring of some new thing to pay attention to; and it's like "Oh let's now talk about Hegel again, or let's talk about Riegl, or let's talk about, I don't know, Peter Bürger, or Jacques Ranciere" or anyone you want to think about. But it's always a turn to one more thing. And having those things then keeps people focused on the fashion, on the game, and not looking outside to see where they can actually get off the carousel. My interest is in showing people that they can actually get off the carousel. So that means, in order to understand art history, you have to abandon it, you have to get out of it, you have to see it from outside. You have to see that it isn't necessarily something that exists on its own but it is really a network of power relationships using things for certain reasons, in certain contexts.

*In the "mechanisms of urban meaning" section of the book The Ottoman City and Its Parts you state that cities can not be read as if they were texts or paintings, as this would be a misreading. Rather, the cities should be "reckoned with," that is, simultaneously thought with and coped with. As an architect, I would firstly like to learn more about your insights into "decoding, reading, and interpreting" the spatial language of a building; in other words, is it possible to "read" an architectural artefact? Secondly, during the lecture discussions you also emphasized that a city, as a four-dimensional entity, has to be performed in space-time. You stated that "cities and their parts work to engender, reflect, legitimize, and sustain the lived realities of social groups". Can you articulate your ideas on urban semiology?*

#### PROF. PREZIOSI

Urban semiology is a nightmare we've been having for the last 50 years; It isn't always there, but it comes back! Urban semiology was born after WWII as an attempt by architects to rebuild the cities of Europe that were destroyed, using a visual language which didn't have any associations with fascism or Nazism, that also didn't connect to the same old neo-classical, early modernism either, but tried to create a new form of language; a new

---

visual vocabulary. And so, it always had a pragmatic aspect. It was always oriented toward issues for architects; that is, how you really think about something which is going to make a statement that says it really is different from all those mistakes we've made in the past, but without idealizing it; without then becoming another sort of fashion thing. In a sense that's an impossible project, but it's been going on for several decades and is still going on in fact. But, the state of urban semiology today is that I would divide it very sharply between those who still believe that they can read a city like a text, and those who really understand that a city is not a text at all: it's not like a text, it should have its own sort of logic, its own language, if you want to use it. The people who are trying to do that kind of thing are in the minority, and they really have not been able to make their case very strongly. Except that the case is being made; not in an obvious way, but it is being made in actual practice, by architects who are thoughtful about what they are doing, and who understand their historical situation, and where they're coming from historically. So, I think, urban semiology—or the more successful urban semiology—is being played out in actual practice, in confronting the process of design. I gave a master class for the architecture school in Copenhagen a couple years ago, and I talked about the ways in which I tried to understand ancient Minoan architecture and how that worked. I was involved in a series of dialogues with architects who were doing final degree theses for design projects. They found a lot of similarity to the kinds of problems I was facing in the interpretation of things that couldn't talk back, and for which we didn't have texts, and they had their own problems in trying to create something that responded to particular problems but that didn't repeat an already known formula. That was I think one of the most wonderful exchanges with architects, and it made it very clear that anything that de-commodifies all of these projects or aspects of the design process has to be supported which ever way it comes from, either through critical theory or from practice. That is why it has been so important that in the last decade or so architectural education has become more focused on looking at critical theory and theoretical issues, and studying, say, the engagement between Peter Eisenman and Jacques Derrida in terms of the projects in Paris and what that resulted in. That was a very fruitful attempt because you had a dialogue. And what that does, in effect, is something very very interesting that I think no one has really understood clearly, in that it shows that design is always a dialogic process, and that the romantic myth of the designer as in a world of his or her own—the great master designer—is a romantic fiction. Designers and builders and artists have always worked in groups dialogically and in some community. So people are always engaged in talking, thinking and arguing about what they are doing. It wasn't a kind of lonely process—the lone genius in a cave somewhere making paintings or making designs—it was always a matter of dispute and arguing. It's a very active thing, in the

---

world, in cities, in real space and real time. Then you realize that architecture is a craft, and is more engaged with the history of craft practices than with the history of abstract theories of design or the commodified factory of design practice that architectural design has become by and large today. Going back to those roots in real craft practice—real actual studio work in which art is in dialogue with—that's where the semiology is; it's in that multi-dimensional, multi-modal interaction. By debasing or degrading the romantic status of the architect and having the architect become a worker, or become a person engaged with actual practice, and in a communal sense, is much saner and much more realistic sense of what all this is about. But it's only a minority of people who really realize that, and you don't realize it unless you are really engaged in actual practice. It is hard to explain in the abstract.

*The transcendental value attributed to the designer as the creator should be taken and grounded in the immanent world.*

PROF. PREZIOSI

Right. It was a kind of a double-edged sword when art and architecture became in the late Renaissance in Europe a kind of fine art, and became alive to things like literature and other kinds of things, to improve the status of the architect from being a craftsperson and a worker to being a master artist, a great genius. We see that process happening in Michelangelo, Leonardo, and all these people throughout the 16<sup>th</sup> century—you know, Sinan—making all these people into these great geniuses. Which of course they were, but they were also living in a real world; in a real world being workers and practicing and working with real problems.

*I would like to finish this interview with a rather personal question. Your family background is related to Istanbul. Your great-grand father Amadeo Preziosi (1816 - 1882), a painter from Malta, lived and worked in Ottoman Istanbul during the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. As far as we know, this is your third visit to Istanbul.*

PROF. PREZIOSI

Yes, this is my third visit to Istanbul, the first visit was in 1982 and the second in 1991-92 and I have been in the city for a month now as a guest lecturer of the history department.

*So almost every ten years?*

---

PROF. PREZIOSI

Every ten years, yes! I have to work on collapsing those gaps and come back more often. And I think I will come back next summer...

*In relation to the previous question, can you briefly explain how you “performed” Istanbul? Have the city and its environment had the power to transform you in any way?*

PROF. PREZIOSI

Very much so. As I think I said in my public lecture, it was working on the Boğaziçi Campus and working on lectures and things like that, that brought me in touch with a lot of things that I'd forgotten for many years, about the things I thought about and how things mean, like the pun about meaning and being and signifying and so forth. That's just one example. And there's that sort of obvious thing, that obvious effect of being here, that I become very, very aware of the rhythms of being in the city, of walking through the city. Something that I may have known when I was here before, but really had forgotten since then, is the way in which people who are inhabitants of the city use this city in ways that would take the breath away of the people who live elsewhere. The spatial scenography of the city is so complex, things are going at such a fast rate, it's such a huge population, and yet the people navigate as if they are fish swimming in the ocean—there are very few collisions!—because people know how to navigate this complex series of spaces. I would contrast this with other cities. My experience of being in Vienna, for example, years ago – where I noticed that people in Vienna always bump into each other; apparently much less aware of others, and less aware of their social space. But people in Istanbul seem to live in a much more interactive social environment. They are much more aware of everyone else. Even if they don't talk to each other, they know exactly where they are. Drivers, driving, taxi drivers, even people walking on the street, walking through the bazaar, walking through any part of the city, the old city or anywhere in the city, people are much more sensitive to spatial dimensions. The inhabitants of this city, they're like dancers. They are involved in a very complex and beautiful choreography of using the city and knowing the city and knowing things and knowing each other, through use. They maintain a kind of personal space and yet also they're supremely aware of others' space. In some places, especially I think in Anglo-Saxon countries, people have a much different sense of personal space, and there's much more of a hard and fast division between personal identity, space and others' space; it's almost antagonistic in some senses. Istanbul has existed for over 2500 years and it's been a city for so long, so it is much wiser about these things. And it's so

---

wonderful to be in touch with this wisdom again, and to realize how cities are actually used; that their meanings unfold in and as they are used. There's a particular spatial psychology in any city, as Michel de Certeau among others has so brilliantly reminded us. Except, you know, all cities really are works in progress, and Istanbul is no exception - somehow it should do more for integrating the public transportation network; connecting the parts of the metro to the subway. But that's another question!

*That's everybody's dream! Thank you so much for spending your time here in Istanbul and in Boğaziçi. It was a great honor and a pleasure to be with you.*

PROF. PREZIOSI

That is my pleasure. I feel like I have gotten a wonderful gift by being here. I've nothing but congratulations to all of you, and appreciation and thanks for all you have done for making this possible and for opening my eyes again to Istanbul.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Nilay Özlü** is a PhD student and **Gizem Tongo** is an MA student in the Department of History at Boğaziçi University. This interview was conducted in October of 2010 during Professor Preziosi's time in Istanbul as visiting professor at Boğaziçi University within the framework of the "Connecting Art Histories Initiative" funded by the Paul Getty Foundation.