

RESEARCH ESSAY

The Argument Between Images: Curatorial Sequence as Visual Reasoning

Liah Greenfeld^{1,*}

¹Department of Sociology, Boston University, Boston, United States

Correspondence: l.greenfeld@bu.edu

Two images placed together can disagree before a caption explains why. Scale, direction, color, chronology, and the cut between them produce a visual proposition that neither image contains alone. How does curatorial sequence reason through images without turning arrangement into a hidden assertion? Visual sequence becomes accountable reasoning when its comparisons are strong enough to notice and explicit enough to challenge. The central difficulty is not a shortage of examples but a mismatch between the scale of the evidence and the scale of the claim. Concentrating on wall order, spacing, scale, sightlines, captions, installation revisions, and visitor movement between paired works keeps the connection between juxtaposition and curatorial authority within view.

The inquiry design follows sequence mapping that writes the implied connective proposition at every significant visual transition. Each instance is reconstructed through wall order, spacing, scale, sightlines, captions, installation revisions, and visitor movement between paired works, with gaps marked rather than silently repaired. Instead of counting examples as equivalent units, account asks how each was produced and received. Its strongest check is whether viewers can perceive both the basis of juxtaposition and the remainder that resists it, which defines what contrary evidence would look like.

An exhibition places an official redevelopment rendering beside a resident's photograph of demolition dust. Shared perspective creates continuity, while differences in atmosphere and human presence expose incompatible futures. Several readings remain possible, yet they are not equally supported. The case gives priority to the explanation that accounts for its situated sequence and material limits. It thus turns the association between juxtaposition and curatorial au-

thority into a bounded interpretation, one connected to this situation rather than elevated prematurely into a universal rule.

A counterfactual sharpens the reading: if one choice about wall order, spacing, scale, sightlines, captions, installation revisions, and visitor movement between paired works were reversed, would the dynamic between juxtaposition and curatorial authority also change? Asking that question separates causal features from details that merely accompany the outcome. It also turns whether viewers can perceive both the basis of side-by-side inquiry and the remainder that resists it into a genuine test, because the interpretation names what would weaken it rather than collecting only confirming observations.

A later wall groups portraits by color rather than date or identity. The arrangement produces formal energy but risks making unrelated subjects interchangeable inside the curator's palette. The contrast prevents the first scene from becoming a template. Here, authority, timing, and exposure are rearranged, so the same vocabulary carries a different practical meaning. Juxtaposition clarifies the alignment between juxtaposition and curatorial authority by showing what changes when responsibility moves among respondents and institutions.

The framework treats mediation as substantive evidence. Through sequence mapping that writes the implied connective interpretation at every significant visual transition, choices that might otherwise appear technical become part of the account of the relation between juxtaposition and curatorial authority. This does not mean that every minor decision carries equal weight; it means weight must be demonstrated by showing a plausible pathway from choice to experienced or documented impact.

Explaining sequence too fully can reduce discovery, while visitors often move

unpredictably and never follow the intended order. This limit guards against a familiar interpretive shortcut: turning complexity into automatic approval. Complexity can describe exploitation as readily as emancipation. The claim therefore remains conditional on whether viewers can perceive both the basis of case alignment and the remainder that resists it, with dissenting evidence preserved where it changes the outcome.

Curators should test multiple paths, record discarded arrangements, attribute contextual knowledge, and use spatial cues that invite return rather than enforce one reading. These actions are modest by design. They do not resolve every conflict; they move conflict to a stage where affected people can still influence form. Evaluation should follow implications over time rather than end with a launch, premiere, publication, or exhibition opening.

Comparative work should resist aligning cases only by title or medium. The stronger variables are who can decide, what can be revised, how long aftereffects last, and which evidence becomes discernible to outsiders. Organizing a corpus around those questions gives the interdependence between juxtaposition and curatorial authority explanatory precision and makes negative findings useful rather than inconvenient exceptions.

The framework is not a universal rating system. The relation between juxtaposition and curatorial authority may be valued differently across communities, and public documentation may itself violate privacy or cultural protocol. The inquiry must permit restricted evidence, collective understanding, and refusal, even when those choices limit external verification. Accountability sometimes depends on respecting a boundary rather than making every process transparent.

The next stage should be processed. A project can implement the proposed recommendation, record selections

through wall order, spacing, scale, sightlines, captions, installation revisions, and visitor movement between paired works, and invite stakeholders to define what successful the alignment between juxtaposition and curatorial authority would mean from their positions. Following the work after public presentation would show whether the intervention creates durable capacity or only a temporary ap-

pearance of responsiveness.

The larger implication concerns how evidence enters public judgment. When pathways from observation to selection remain open to view, audiences can disagree with a conclusion without having to reject the entire project. That possibility strengthens rather than weakens interpretation because it gives correction

a place to begin.

The central concept remains useful only because the study also identifies its failure conditions. The position between images is productive when arrangement creates friction without claiming to reconcile it. Curatorial reasoning occurs in the interval where one image changes the question carried into the next.

Copyright © 2026 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).