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**A SPACE for DIALOGUE**

REJECTING THE DIMINUTIVE
Small-Scale Art, the Viewer, and the Art World

By contrast, very small artworks were typically looked down upon as timid and undaunted, domesticated by a size shared with doll-house miniatures, souvenirs, and precious collectibles. Ultimately, most modernists tended to view minuscule as a forfeiture of artistic authority.

—Ralph Rugoff, At the Threshold of the Visible: Minuscule and Small-Scale Art, 1964–1996

Small-scale contemporary art has often been ignored or trivialized by scholars and critics. This exhibition looks at seven works that reveal different strategies for rejecting conventional artistic standards. Some of these artists appropriate “insignificant” materials—either everyday or ephemeral in nature—while others employ a hybridized practice to break down traditional institutional boundaries between “high” and “low” art.

Despite their size, the intellectual process behind small works can be quite complex. Erica Baum’s Ribbin transforms acts of reading, seeing, and understanding of text (Goldsmith, vii), suggesting multiple ways of encountering it anew. The fold in the middle of the image does not disrupt the continuity of the text but rather adds new visual, linguistic, and auditory effects, as the printed characters meet the image does not disrupt the continuity of the text but rather adds new visual, linguistic, and auditory effects, as the printed characters meet

the wall, it acts like a painting too, and this merging of art forms “expands and explodes the definitions of sculptures, painting, and drawing” (Grynsztejn, 29). Tuttle’s work resists any association with minuscule, instead realizing a “physical proportion that is ‘just right’ insofar as it correlates precisely to the work’s intentions” (Grynsztejn, 45). Rose observed that many artists “replace content with scale” in large art (Rose, 161). Small works such as Tuttle’s, though, demonstrate that embracing smallness need not be a compromise in this regard but rather a thoughtful act to convey specific content and effect.
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