

RESEARCH ESSAY

Scale Without Walls: Virtual Exhibitions and the Measure of Art

Daniel Walker Howe^{1,*}

¹Department of History, University of California, Los Angeles, United States

Correspondence: dw.howe@ucla.edu

A virtual exhibition can place a coin beside a cathedral without the physical difficulty of scale. That freedom is powerful, but it can turn size into an adjustable image property and weaken the bodily measure through which art is encountered. How should digital curation represent scale when there are no shared walls, distances, or walking bodies? Virtual exhibitions need relational measures that let viewers understand how objects address bodies and spaces, not merely how much screen they occupy. The apparent object is only the entrance to the problem. Following object dimensions, capture procedure, navigation, default zoom, comparative views, body references, and original installation paths shifts reading toward the association between digital visibility and embodied measure and away from claims based on appearance alone.

A manuscript detail fills a laptop display and reveals extraordinary brushwork. Without a view of the page in a hand or beside a ruler, the enlargement encourages viewers to remember it as painting-sized. The scene is useful precisely because it resists a simple moral. It contains both enabling and limiting effects, each traceable to a particular decision. Through those effects, the dynamic between digital visibility and embodied measure can be analyzed without assuming that every instance bearing the same label operates in the same way.

The proposed analytic route is interface-based spatial interpretation tested across screens, input devices, and access settings. It begins with a descriptive pass that postpones motive and records variations before grouping them. A second pass asks which variation changes access, sequence, or authority. The final paired analysis uses whether viewers can recover consequential differences among holding, facing, circling, entering, and looking up as a discriminating test, so reading cannot expand

merely by collecting attractive examples.

Provenance changes the meaning of detail. Object dimensions, capture research design, navigation, default zoom, comparative views, body references, and original installation paths acquire authority through preservation, description, and access, each of which can favor one account. A source-critical reading therefore connects the association between digital visibility and embodied measure to the history of the record itself. It accepts the conclusion only where whether viewers can recover consequential differences among holding, facing, circling, entering, and looking up survives that additional layer of mediation.

Simulating physical scale can reproduce inaccessible architecture and deny the digital medium's legitimate capacity for enlargement and alternative navigation. There is no adequate reply at the level of principle alone. The argument must be tested against the members most likely to experience its failure. Where the evidence does not establish whether viewers can recover consequential differences among holding, facing, circling, entering, and looking up, the study should report conflict or uncertainty instead of manufacturing balance.

A scanned installation is navigated through a smooth three-dimensional model. The model preserves geometry but lets users float above barriers and ignore the slow detour through which the original work controlled approach. Comparison also exposes a temporal problem. Practical results that seem minor at the moment of production can become decisive after circulation, repetition, or institutional adoption. The scene therefore expands the alignment between digital visibility and embodied measure beyond immediate experience and into the artifact's later social life.

A relational account avoids both technological determinism and unlimited construction. Interface-based spatial reading

tested across screens, input devices, and access settings shows how materials constrain action without dictating meaning. It also shows how institutions shape the tie between digital visibility and embodied measure without controlling every response. The concept is strongest where the record links these levels and weakest where intention is substituted for aftermath.

Curators should combine free zoom with honest dimensions, multiple body references, pathway notes, and optional access routes that state how they transform the encounter. The practical proposal matters because values enter through routine operations. Budget lines, schedules, interfaces, contracts, and rehearsal habits determine whose knowledge can affect the outcome. Recording those judgments also lets future interpreters distinguish an accidental success from a repeatable and governable activity.

Transferability should be handled cautiously. A procedure developed around one technology, genre, institution, or cultural protocol may fail elsewhere even when the surface activity looks similar. The portable element is the question of the association between digital visibility and embodied measure; the form of evidence and the meaning of whether viewers can recover consequential differences among holding, facing, circling, entering, and looking up must be negotiated in each setting.

A larger corpus should be assembled by variation rather than convenience. Cases need to differ in institution, audience, duration, and degree of member control while remaining comparable through the link between digital visibility and embodied measure. Sampling only celebrated instances would confuse public visibility with explanatory importance; including abandoned and routine cases reveals the ordinary work that makes the phenomenon possible.

Future inquiry should also study refusal. People who decline participation, documentation, preservation, or inference may identify costs that cooperative cases hide. Their reasons should not be treated as missing data to overcome; they can refine the meaning of the connection between digital visibility and embodied measure and expose where the proposed criterion assumes forms of openness that

are not equally safe.

The broader value is diagnostic. The framework helps locate where account becomes authority, where participation becomes labor, and where preservation becomes transformation. Those boundaries are rarely fixed, but they can be documented well enough to support practical disagreement.

The result is not a formula but a sharper field of responsibility. Scale online should remain plural: measurable, imaginable, and adjustable without pretending those modes are identical. A virtual exhibition gains measure when the screen becomes a translator of spatial relations rather than a wall that makes every object the same size.

Copyright © 2025 The Author(s). Published by *Opera News: Journal of Music and Performing Arts* under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licence (CC BY 4.0).