

8-7-2012

The Expanded Cluster Account of Art

Eric Murphy

Georgia State University, murphem@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalarchive.gsu.edu/philosophy_theses

Recommended Citation

Murphy, Eric, "The Expanded Cluster Account of Art" (2012). *Philosophy Theses*. Paper 111.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Philosophy at Digital Archive @ GSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Philosophy Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Archive @ GSU. For more information, please contact digitalarchive@gsu.edu.

THE EXPANDED CLUSTER ACCOUNT OF ART

by

ERIC MURPHY

Under the Direction of Jessica Berry

ABSTRACT

I argue for the Expanded Cluster Account of art (ECA) by first inquiring as to whether “art” is best described by a cluster account and where ECA fits into the current landscape of theories of concepts. Second, I explicate the relevant aspects of Boyd’s theory of natural kinds and argue that his concepts of “disciplinary matrices” and “homeostatic property clusters” (roughly analogous to Gaut’s criterial properties for characterizing art, particularized for each individual kind) have relevant roles in a proper cluster account of art, thus explicating and expanding Gaut’s account in the process. Third, I defend the thesis that Boyd’s concept of “disciplinary matrix,” when applied to “art,” is fulfilled by George Dickie’s notion of “the Artworld.” Lastly, I consider objections to ECA and positively explain its heuristic and explanatory efficacy above and beyond other contemporary “anti-definitional” accounts.

INDEX WORDS: Art, Artworld, Cluster concept, Disciplinary matrix, Berys Gaut, Richard Boyd, George Dickie, Kinds

THE EXPANDED CLUSTER ACCOUNT OF ART

by

ERIC MURPHY

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Philosophy

In the College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

2012

Copyright by
Eric Murphy
2012

THE EXPANDED CLUSTER ACCOUNT OF ART

by

ERIC MURPHY

Committee Chair: Jessica Berry

Committee: Dan Weiskopf

Andrea Scarantino

Electronic Version Approved:

Office of Graduate Studies

College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

August 2012

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis is dedicated in loving memory to my grandmother, Joan Pieroni. Without her constant support, guidance and late-night philosophical conversations this would have never been.

My parents, Ron and Sharon Murphy, who always allowed me to create, think and experiment freely—my personality is in no small part constituted by your dedication and love.

d'Hannah Dugas, my partner and imminent 'de facto spouse,' for being my companion in all adventures big and small. You both inspire and ground me. This thesis would never have come to fruition without your love.

For Dakota, my eternal pup, who I recognize as the one and only metaphysically real immaterial soul.

To my family and friends at large for tolerating philosophy and academia, and always facilitating healthy, therapeutic escapes. And to my brother, Ryan Murphy, in particular for trying to teach me calculus and physics and whatnot.

To my friends, mentors, advisors and commenters at Georgia State University, especially Jessica Berry, Sebastian Rand, Dan Weiskopf and Andrea Scarantino, whose comments and conversations inspired, informed and honed this work. I would not be pursuing philosophy further without your words and thoughts.

To my mentors at Lake Forest College, especially Janet McCracken, Chad McCracken and the late Ron Miller, for inspiring me to philosophy in the first place.

And, lastly, to those above and everyone I had not the space to mention: thank you for this experience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. CONCEPTS.....	5
III. PROPERTY CLUSTERS AND DISCIPLINARY MATRICES.....	17
IV. THE ARTWORLD.....	23
V. ANSWERING IRRELEVANT CRITERIA.....	25
VI. WHY EXPAND?	29
VII. CONCLUSION.....	37
VIII. BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	38

I. INTRODUCTION

The central project of defining ART in philosophical aesthetics was dominated by the method of conceptual analysis widely embraced by philosophers in the English-speaking world in the early part of the twentieth century. Conceptual analysis, ideally, allows philosophers to comprehend the core properties of our most complex concepts in the form of necessary and sufficient conditions. Yet if the measure of success for a science is the attainment of the ideal prescribed by its most dominant method of inquiry (conceptual analysis), then philosophy is undoubtedly in a state of despair. Justice, free will, knowledge, and art, among other far less extraordinary examples, have failed time and again to be defined by classical standards. This failure most contentiously and famously came to a head in Stich 1993,¹ which calls for an overhaul of philosophical methodologies.

And it appears that philosophers of art are even more hesitant than other philosophers to accept that the concept ART cannot be classically defined. While ever since Morris Weitz's "The Role of Theory in Aesthetics" there has been an undercurrent of anti-definitional approaches in philosophy of art, many (Noël Carroll [1993], for instance) have maintained that anti-definitional approaches are only part of the analysis, useful for "picking out" specific objects in the extension of art, yet maintain that a classical definition of art is still the proper goal of the inquiry.

In 2000, Berys Gaut proposed an innovative cluster account of art that can be summarized in three parts, given a set of criterial properties that "count towards" an object's falling under the concept ART: (1) if an object instantiates all the properties, then the object falls under the concept ART since the criteria are jointly sufficient for the kind membership; (2) none of the properties is individually necessary for kind membership; and (3) there are disjunctively

¹ Stich argues here that conceptual analysis cannot provide a sufficiently explanatory notion of most concepts.

necessary properties for kind membership so that if an object falls under the concept ART it must have some set of the proposed properties (Gaut 2000: 33). For example, although Gaut is not committed to these criteria, Gaut considers the following set as *prima facie* plausible:

(i) possessing positive aesthetic qualities (I employ the notion of positive aesthetic qualities here in a narrow sense, comprising beauty and its subspecies); (ii) being expressive of emotion; (iii) being intellectually challenging; (iv) being formally complex and coherent; (v) having a capacity to convey complex meanings; (vi) exhibiting an individual point of view; (vii) being an exercise of creative imagination; (viii) being an artefact or performance that is the product of a high degree of skill; (ix) belonging to an established artistic form; and (x) being the product of an intention to make a work of art. (Gaut 2005: 274)

Yet, Gaut's (2000) Cluster Account of Art currently resides in a state of philosophical limbo. Nearly four years have passed since Aaron Meskin allegedly refuted the account, but Gaut has remained silent. Only Francis Longworth and Andrea Scarantino's article "The Disjunctive Theory of Art" (2010) could be considered a response to Meskin, but their defense comes at the cost of transforming Gaut's cluster account into a formalized disjunctive account of art—a measured step away from Gaut's anti-definitional approach to characterizing ART. One of the main goals of my project will be to both augment and improve Gaut's original cluster account; and for this task I turn to an area of philosophy much less under the spell of classical definitions—the philosophy of natural kinds.

Richard Boyd's homeostatic cluster property theory of natural kinds shows no affinity for classical definitions, but, like Gaut's theory, it wholeheartedly embraces the fuzziness of our concepts of natural kinds. Instead of focusing on how to fix perfectly the extension of natural

kinds, Boyd embraces the psychological and theoretical realities of our relations to natural kinds concepts and grounds his theory appropriately. The parallels between Boyd's theory and Gaut's theory are more than superficial: Boyd's homeostatic property cluster theory of natural kinds has both structural and logical similarities to Gaut's Cluster Account of Art. Boyd's theory posits, as does Gaut's, that kinds are determined by their associated cluster of properties. What is novel about Boyd's account is its appeal to a "disciplinary matrix"; the "matrix" is a complex web of practices of the social and historical bodies "governing" kinds. For Boyd, disciplinary matrices are represented in academic disciplines or organizations involved in researching some kind or other of natural objects or phenomena. I will say more about how this may usefully be integrated into a Expanded Cluster Account in a moment.

Once I have successfully argued that Boyd's disciplinary matrix may be unobtrusively incorporated into Gaut's theory to create the Expanded Cluster Account, I will argue that George Dickie's (1969) concept of the Artworld, on his own description, fills the role of the disciplinary matrix related to the concept ART. While both Boyd's concept of the disciplinary matrix and Dickie's are fairly sketchy, they share many functionally similar qualities in relation to their respective targets. Furthermore, it is possible to trace the historical development of Dickie's notion of the Artworld and consider how it has changed in conjunction with our best historical reconstructions of the concept ART. I suggest that Arthur Danto's (1964) inquiries into the "end of art" are nicely illustrative of the co-evolution of both Artworld and the concept ART; and this is exactly what we should expect from the Artworld if it functions analogously to Boyd's disciplinary matrix.

Once I identify the value of incorporating Dickie's Artworld into Boyd's disciplinary matrix, to function as the disciplinary matrix for the concept ART, I will use the Expanded

Cluster Account to argue that, once a cluster account incorporates a reliable mechanism for choosing the relevant criteria for instantiating the concept ART, Meskin's (2007) "irrelevant criteria" objection is dispelled. Since Meskin provides the only major unanswered criticism to Gaut's Cluster Account of Art, I will argue the Expanded Cluster Account's answer to Meskin is demonstrative of the efficacy of the Expanded Cluster Account.

Even with the Expanded Cluster Account defended against Meskin's irrelevant criteria objection, it is still crucial that I distinguish my view from Longworth and Scarantino's Disjunctive Theory. Since Longworth and Scarantino's Disjunctive Theory moves a step away from Gaut's original anti-definitional position to a fully formalized disjunctive definition (one that, contra Meskin, excises the possibility of irrelevant criteria), I argue that my approach expands on Gaut's theory in a much more fruitful manner. The Disjunctive Theory of Art can best be characterized as a *defensive* posturing against Meskin's irrelevant criteria objection, but the Expanded Cluster Account is a more comprehensive and overall *positive* addendum to Gaut's position—it not only defends against Meskin's criticisms, but *adds* to the explanatory efficacy of the account. I will argue for the explanatory and heuristic supremacy of the Expanded Cluster Account of Art first by echoing many of Gaut's (2000) comments, but primarily on the grounds on which any proper theory should be tested: by determining the theory's explanatory relevance to historical data and by arguing for the ways in which the inherent structural features of the account will support future predictions and accommodate novel instances of art objects.

The goals of this project are fivefold:

1. To show that an inherently *pluralistic* approach to art as a concept will provide the best account.

2. To show that Boyd's and Gaut's theories have enough affinity to be successfully integrated into an Expand Cluster Account of Art.
3. To show that, for ART, Dickie's concept of the Artworld is an analog to Boyd's disciplinary matrix.
4. To show the Expanded Cluster Account of Art is sufficient to defend against Meskin's (2007) criticisms.
5. To show that the Expanded Cluster Account of Art is more explanatorily and heuristically effective than competing anti-definitional approaches to art.

If I argue successfully for the five theses I have stated above, I believe the cumulative effect should make for a very convincing argument for the Expanded Cluster Account as a tenable and attractive candidate for defining art today.

II. CONCEPTS

I will meet my first goal for this project by first establishing a survey of the relevant theories of concepts available (closely following Laurence and Margolis 1999). Based on this survey, I will argue that, based on both philosophical and psychological considerations, a pluralistic approach to concepts is the most tenable available theory. Departing slightly from Weiskopf 2009, I find that the structure of Gaut's cluster account most closely resembles a pluralistic theory of the concept ART, which suggests that a cluster structure of the concept ART is the most tenable. Based on all of the psychological and philosophical data available today, a pluralistic, cluster structure of the concept ART is simply the most inclusive and explanatorily valuable. Before we begin, let me briefly note that some may wonder why someone interested in the anti-definitional project of art would start with a survey of theories of concepts. Because a

word expresses a special type of concept, a lexicalized concept, understanding the concept is equivalent to understanding the meaning of the word (Laurence and Margolis 1999: 4). Let us then consider the historical theories of concepts in (roughly) chronological order.

The most historically dominant theory of concepts is appropriately called the classical theory of concepts. Laurence and Margolis define the Classical Theory thusly: “Most concepts (especially lexical concepts) are structured mental representations that encode a set of necessary and sufficient conditions for their application” (1999: 10). The Classical Theory, owing to its historical predominance, is the most robust and well motivated—it has unified explanations of all the major components necessary for a complete theory of concepts (1999: 10). Given its long philosophical existence, like all philosophical theories, the Classical Theory has provoked plenty of worrying critiques. The philosophical and scientific landscapes are generally fuzzier and much more complex than in the time of the Classical Theory’s ubiquity, a fact which has proved the most problematic for the theory. The most apt criticisms object to the Classical Theory based primarily on its inability to account for recent data and phenomena. For instance, modern psychological research shows little evidence that lexical concepts have a definitional structure, and they lack psychological evidence of typicality effects. Multiple studies, most prominently performed by Kintsch (1974) have demonstrated that there is no correlation between a lexical concept’s definitional complexity and its psychological complexity (Laurence and Margolis 1999: 17).

Kintsch (1974) demonstrated the lack of definitional structure in lexical concepts by measuring phoneme recognition after a given word. If definitional structure were psychologically relevant, one would suppose that more definitionally complex words would require a greater processing load, and thus phoneme recognition after a more complex lexical concept would be

slower than phoneme recognition after a simpler lexical concept, but this is not the case (Laurence and Margolis 1999: 17-18). Further psychological research suggests that concepts display a typicality structure—a structure that seems incommensurate with the definitional structure of the Classical Theory. That is to say, if objects in the world meet the necessary and sufficient conditions for falling under a concept, then it is strange that people would consistently rate a set of objects all of which seem to fall under a given concept as more or less typical than others (1999: 24). For instance, people are much more likely to rate an apple than a pomegranate as a “typical” fruit. Rosch (1973) and others have replicated the typicality effect in lexical concepts many times over. Given the Classical Theory’s inability to account for effects demonstrated by Kintsch’s and Rosch’s experiments, it appears that Classical Theory does not seem very psychologically realistic. Furthermore, not only in the philosophy of art, but also historically, there simply are very few actual examples (and even fewer *interesting* examples) of concepts for which we have discovered clear necessary and sufficient conditions. This may be a problem closely related to another charge often waged against the Classical Theory: it seems to have difficulty dealing with conceptual fuzziness. Since most concept theorists accept that at least some concepts are naturally fuzzy, it is worrying that the definitional structure of the Classical Theory may not be adequate for capturing this fuzziness. This is an explanation for the Classical Theory’s lack of success—it simply cannot capture the fuzziness inherent in concepts such as ART.

While few consider any one of the above pieces of evidence to be decisive against the Classical Theory, taken as a whole they suggest a considerable amount of doubt in regard to the possibility of concepts having the definitional structure described by the Classical Theory. And if our concept ART does not even seem to have a definitional structure, it seems counterproductive

to assume that, in principle, there may still exist necessary and sufficient conditions for defining art. That is to say, if the concept ART cannot be represented in our minds as having a definitional structure, why should we suppose we could construct necessary and sufficient conditions for picking out art objects in the world? Let us now consider some problems with other non-classical theories of concepts.

Inspired by Rosch's infamous experiments revealing the typicality effect in lexical concepts, critics of the Classical Theory began to posit various Prototype Theories of concepts. Laurence and Margolis characterize Prototype Theory as positing that "most concepts (especially lexical concepts) are structured mental representations that encode the properties that objects in their extension *tend* [my italics] to possess" (1973: 31). For example, if the concept MUSIC is composed of features like 'is listened to', 'is harmonic', 'is rhythmic', and 'is emotionally salient' then the Rolling Stones' "Wild Horses" falls under the concept MUSIC because it has all of these features. On the other hand, an almost completely atonal work like Keith Fullerton Whitman's "Lisbon" also falls under the concept, despite its lacking harmonies and consistent rhythm, because it is still both listened to and emotionally salient. For our purposes, there are a couple of importantly differentiable versions of Prototype Theory. One version of Prototype theory takes there to be a set properties, extrapolated from studies of the properties the folk find most typical, which are statistically weighted to indicate what is more or less typical of the objects in the extension of the concept (Dean 2003: 30). A proposed second version of Prototype Theory follows a radial structure that could be construed as an updated theory of Wittgenstein's family resemblance theory. A radially-structured Prototype Theory is one in which:

There is central case or cases (such cases could be prototypes, but they could also be stereotypes, ideals, exemplars, etc.) upon which conventionalized variations

are based, but that are not generated from, and cannot be predicted by, general rules; variations on the central case must be learned individually. (Dean 2004: 31)

Prototype Theories share among them the same benefits and problems.

The boon of Prototype Theory is that it addresses both the issues of psychological reality and fuzziness that plagued the Classical Theory. Prototype Theory can account for the predicted results of Rosch's typicality effect and does not posit a definitional structure disputed by Kintsch's findings. Furthermore, it seems to be much more successful in characterizing generally a lot of concepts and their extensions. However, as the first real contender to Classical Theory, Prototype Theory has plenty of problems to face. Several good reasons to believe that Prototype Theory cannot generally account for concepts include: the lack of prototypes for some concepts, the inability to account for the typicality effect, and the failure of prototype structures to account for atypical cases.

Perhaps the most worrisome evidence against a general Prototype Theory of concepts is that there are undoubtedly concepts that do not have a clear prototype. For example, consider the concept MUSIC MASTERED IN STUDIOS IN THE MIDWEST. For one thing, the concept of music mastered in studios in the Midwest seems too specific for an average person to have enough knowledgeable interaction to develop a prototype. We should also consider that since music mastered in studios in the Midwest is such a broad extension, it would be difficult for a prototype to typify the extension by any reasonable standard. Straightforwardly, the existence of specific and complex concepts that do not lend themselves to prototypical structure seems to undermine any claim to full generality of the Prototype Theory.

Furthermore, while some concepts may not have prototypes, even some concepts that uncontroversially do have prototypes do not seem to account for atypical cases in their extension.

GRANDMOTHER is a concept that has a clear prototype: old, gray hair, glasses, and kind to children, and so on. However, there are plenty of grandmothers who may not meet any of these properties at all, including atypically young grandmothers (Laurence and Margolis 1999: 34). On the other hand, the prototype of GRANDMOTHER may pick out a large number of the females at a retirement home, including plenty who do not actually have any grandchildren. Prototype Theory is an imperfect guide to picking out objects in a concept's extension in many cases.

Lastly, despite its having been originally motivated by the discovery of the typicality effect in Rosch 1973, a prototype structure of concepts may not actually be suggested by the data. In order to prove this, Armstrong et al. (1983) tested well-defined concepts, such as even numbers, to see if they also demonstrated the typicality effect. Armstrong et al. did, in fact, find that even well-defined concepts, which subjects even acknowledged as binary categories (either a number is or is not even), were rated by subjects oddly; for instance, 8 was rated as more typically even than 34 (Laurence and Margolis 1999: 32). This would seem to suggest that even for concepts that may very well display a definitional structure as posited in the Classical Theory, subjects in psychological studies are more than willing to give typicality ratings for members of the extension. It is unsettled whether Armstrong et al.'s findings are conclusive evidence against the Prototype Theory, but such findings at least raise suspicion as to the universality of the Prototype Theory of concepts.²

A more recent response to both the Classical and Prototype Theories of concepts has been to modify an idea based on models of scientific reasoning: the Theory-Theory of concepts.

Theory-Theory posits that "concepts are representations whose structure consists in their

² Prototype theory's inability to account for reverse compositionality is often cited as a major flaw (see Fodor and Lepore 1996). I do not discuss it here because I believe it is a mistaken criticism (as argued in Robbins 2005).

relations to other concepts as specified by a mental theory” (Laurence and Margolis 1999: 47). The advantages of Theory-Theory revolve around theorist’s ability to apply the same cognitive mechanisms of theory change used in scientific development to all realms of cognition. That is to say, in Theory-Theory there is already a significant literature about the development of scientific theories and the mechanisms that govern these changes; therefore, if Theory-Theory holds, all of these tools should be immediately at the explanatory disposal of those explaining the development of concepts generally. The supposed advantages of Theory-Theory, however, generate their own set of problems, including the apparent independence of concepts from their enmeshed mental theory and the problems with extrapolating mechanisms of scientific theory development to concepts generally, since the mechanisms are relatively poorly understood. Let us consider these general critiques of Theory-Theory.

The objection concerning the independence of concepts from their enmeshed mental theory is actually two-fold; there are the cases in which people are able appropriately to determine the extension of their concept despite an inadequate or incorrect associated mental theory, and there is the case of how concepts seem stable or invariant despite sometimes radical changes in the associated mental theory. Consider the case of the average person’s concept of a slow loris. There is little evidence that most people have slow loris-theories robust enough to determine the extension of the concept. Perhaps they have a vague notion of genetic endowment as content for the concept, but this highly unspecified intuition of genetic endowment seems to pick out slow lorises no more uniquely than it would pick out the content of people’s concepts of platypuses or bald eagles. That is to say, most folk would not be able to specify *how* a theory of genetic endowment distinguishes, say, a tortoise from a lemur. And if people’s conceptual content is merely a vague notion of essence or genetic endowment, then what allows them to

determine the different concept's respective extensions? (Laurence and Margolis 1999: 47) A related problem is the stability of concepts across time and changes in theory. By hypothesis, Theory-Theory should hold that, due to the close relationship between a concept and its place in a mental theory, differences or changes in a mental theory should produce changes in the content of its embedded concepts. However, there is good evidence that there can be substantial changes or differences among mental theories that produce relatively stable conceptual content. Consider Laurence and Margolis' example:

Suppose, for instance, that your theory of animals says that animals are entirely physical entities while your friend's theory of animals says that some animals (perhaps humans) have nonphysical souls. This might mean that you don't both possess the same concept animal. Still, by hypothesis, you both possess concepts with similar contents, and though strictly speaking they aren't the same, they are similar enough to say that they are both animal-concepts. (1999: 49)

This is problematic in the sense that it seems to suggest that, in fact, our concepts are not sensitive to the beliefs or theories in which they are embedded.

A second worry stems from the motivational force behind the Theory-Theory of concepts. Some claim that one of the advantages of Theory-Theory is that, if it holds, it allows us access to the history of research in studying the mechanisms of scientific development for explanatory use. However, it remains an open question just how useful the studied mechanisms of scientific development might be if they themselves are quite vague. It is not clear that there is a robust and uncontroversial account of the mechanisms that engender scientific theory changes, for instance. In the theories of scientific development alone, however, there is much work to be done to find any full notion of mechanisms that would be explanatorily helpful if they could be

extrapolated to concepts in general. Given the still nascent theories of scientific development, specifically of the mechanisms involved therein, it can be construed, at best, as disingenuous to consider this an advantage for Theory-Theory, and, at worst, as an objection to any true motivational force behind a Theory-Theory of concepts (Laurence and Margolis 1999: 51).

Following Laurence and Margolis' survey of canonical theories of concepts, I wish also to consider the heterogeneous group of Neoclassical theories of concepts here. While anything resembling the Classical Theory is considered archaic by most psychologists (it is generally considered incompatible with psychological research), other researchers conversant with cognitive science, particularly linguists, find Neoclassical theories useful. The Neoclassical Theory posits that "most concepts (esp. lexical concepts) are structured mental representations that encode partial definitions, i.e., necessary conditions for their application" (Laurence and Margolis 1999: 54). While Laurence and Margolis review several points of critique for the Neoclassical Theory, due to space and relevance, I will note only one critique here: what Laurence and Margolis call the "Problem of Completers" (Laurence and Margolis 1999: 59).

The primary issue with Neoclassical theories from our standpoint is that the concepts they posit encode only partial definitions. However, for those of us interested in the nature of concepts, it is unclear how Neoclassical theorists suppose concepts apply to their instances—if a concept encodes only the necessary conditions for application, then it cannot alone adjudicate between instances that have all the necessary features and fall under the concept and instances that have all of the necessary features yet still do not fall under the concept. If Neoclassical theorists posited that concepts also encoded sufficient conditions, the problem of application would be solved, but then the Neoclassical Theory seems to encounter all of the same problems as the Classical Theory outlined previously (Laurence and Margolis 1999: 55). Therefore, the

Neoclassical Theory seems to exist as a paradox for those who have interests outside of linguistics and natural language: either the theory remains as is but provides no explanation for how concepts pick out their extension correctly or the theory is “completed” by adding sufficient conditions, in which case it basically becomes a permutation of the Classical Theory.

While the “Problem of Completers” may seem fatal for the Neoclassical Theory, I believe it is actually a false dichotomy; there is the option, one that has been taken with all of these theories at some point, to hybridize. One option in hybridization is to propose a Dual Theory of concepts. The primary motivation behind a Dual Theory is to pick from the available theories both in order to account for the “conceptual core” (usually given by Classical Theory) to provide a mechanism for “picking out” instances of the concept (most often borrowed from Prototype Theory). In fact, at the end of their survey, even Laurence and Margolis propose their own idiosyncratic formulation of a hybrid theory. However, hybrid theories seem simply to repeat the mistake that bedevils “simple” theories: Dual Theories argue that all concepts share the same mental structure, even if concept structure is a more complex structure than non-hybrid theories. Weiskopf (2009) provides the best and most concise discussion of the problem of assuming a generalizable mental structure across all concepts and argues positively for a pluralistic theory of concepts. All of the theories of concepts surveyed above have both advantages and shortcomings, however, it should be noted that most critiques of the above theories stem from their generalizability. For instance, the Classical Theory excels in its clarity and robust explanatory power of the mechanisms of concepts, but falters in its ability to be generalized to fuzzy and complex concepts. The Prototype Theory, likewise, has advantages in explaining certain psychological realities and dealing with fuzzy cases, but falters when we attempt to impose its structure on very specific concepts such as MUSIC MASTERED IN A STUDIO IN

THE MIDWEST. Theory-Theory has the advantage of bridging the mechanisms of scientific conceptual development and the concepts of the folk, but often finds problematic instances in the most basic concepts such as ANIMAL. Lastly, Neoclassical Theories have the advantage of being explanatorily consistent with linguistic account of verbs, for instance, but they ultimately face the same generalizability problems as the Classical Theory of concepts (or, rather, are just incomplete and barely generalizable at all).

A pluralistic account of concepts denies the assumption that forces these theories into a dire stalemate: pluralism denies the assumption that all concepts share the same representational structure (Weiskopf 2009: 7). Pluralism also posits that (1) the representational kinds of concepts are heterogeneous, (2) the representational kind of the concept used is occasionally determined by context, and (3) that what in classic theories would be considered a single concept may now be represented by several distinct mental representations with similar or equivalent extensions. While Weiskopf suggests a number of representational kinds specific to his psychological concerns, there is no reason not to consider the possibility that all of the general theories surveyed are suitable candidates for the functional role of mentally representing concepts. In fact, the ubiquity and genuine explanatory power of all of the theories surveyed above make the case that there are multiple representational kinds of concepts—none of the theories above is fully sufficient or thoroughly deficient. And since the assumption that concepts are all of one representational kind seems ungrounded,³ why not simply jettison the assumption?

Returning from our survey of theories of concepts to our primary discussion about art, we must consider the implications of endorsing the most reasonable theory, pluralism about concepts. Many theories of art could be picked out as correlates to the theories of concepts

³ See Weiskopf (2009) for a strong argument on why endorsing pluralism does not lead to eliminativism about concepts.

presented above. Formalism, for instance, compares to the (Neo)Classical Theory of concepts: both attempt to provide necessary and sufficient conditions for ART. And Jeffrey Dean (2003) argues for a prototype theory of art based on the Prototype Theory of concepts. However, the only current theory of art that can be reasonably considered pluralistic is Gaut's Cluster Account of Art.

Gaut's Cluster Account of Art is pluralistic in the sense that it provides the logical structure to count various sets of properties as properly instantiating ART. However, the philosophical project of defining art differs fundamentally from the psychological project of cataloging the representational structure of concepts. While the psychological project seeks answers about the representational structures of concepts to better understand our psychology, the philosophical project seeks to capture the extension of the lexical term "art." Hence, it would be mistaken to consider the pluralism of the Cluster Account of Art to be same in *kind* as Weiskopf's pluralism. Rather, Weiskopf's conceptual pluralism is similar in structure to the Cluster Account. Weiskopf's theory of concepts is pluralistic inasmuch as there are several different representational structures that may happen to instantiate different concepts (psychologically speaking) that happen to share the same lexical term. Similarly, Gaut's Cluster Account is pluralistic inasmuch it allows for multitudinous sets of criteria to count towards instantiating a single lexical term. Both Weiskopf's and Gaut's pluralism share a structure of capturing seemingly disparate entities under a single lexical term, namely, "art." And it is this sense that the Cluster Account of Art (and by extension the Extended Cluster Account of Art), may be appropriately understood as pluralistic in a way similar to our best current understanding of concepts in psychology.

III. PROPERTY CLUSTERS AND DISCIPLINARY MATRICES

The argument for my second goal, that Boyd's disciplinary matrix can be fruitfully integrated into Gaut's Cluster Account of Art will be an argument by analogy; I begin by showing the functional similarities between Gaut's account of the concept ART and Boyd's theory of natural kinds. To wit, Boyd's and Gaut's theories both use the structure of the cluster to describe their target concepts. One important difference between Boyd's and Gaut's theories, however, is that Boyd has identified a framing mechanism for how natural kinds come to be defined by their general cluster, the "disciplinary matrix." One of the areas in which Gaut's theory may be improved is precisely in that it posits no mechanism for determining the actual criteria of the concept ART's cluster, which is precisely the function of Boyd's disciplinary matrix for natural kinds.

Prima facie, Boyd and Gaut may appear to be addressing two different questions. Boyd is hoping to answer questions regarding the metaphysics of natural kinds and the nature of reference for kind terms, with the aim of picking out kinds useful for reliable inductive generalizations, relative to a specific domain (or discipline) of inquiry (2007, p. 147). Gaut explores the way in which the term "art" is used in language in hopes of providing a sensible way of determining the concept's extension, in an attempt to account for the relevant properties of a specific kind—namely the kind "art"—that facilitate reliable inductive generalizations, such as the type of brushstrokes one may expect to find in an Impressionist painting. Boyd's view relies on two major theses: (1) what he calls the *homeostatic property cluster* (HPC) thesis and (2) the *accommodation* thesis. Since the HPC thesis closely approximates the structure of Gaut's Cluster Account of Art, I argue that is both possible and beneficial to integrate the accommodation thesis into an expanded cluster account of art.

Boyd's theory of an HPC kind may be characterized as a contingent, "naturally occurring clustering of properties with the consequence that (1) it lacks precisely defined membership conditions and, sometimes (2) the properties in the defining cluster vary over time and/or space" (2010: 216). Insofar as conditions (1) and (2) apply to a HPC kind on Boyd's formulation, Boyd suggests that there must be an underlying "homeostatic mechanism" that allows for the natural variance of properties between individual kind members and for the drift of properties over time while retaining a stable kind-term categorization (1999: 143-4). And insofar as HPC kinds are regulated by an underlying "homeostatic mechanism," Boyd asserts such kind terms are fitting to the natural "contours" of the world's causal structure, thereby making inductive generalizations about HPC kinds generally reliable (1999: 143-4).

In this respect, Boyd's HPC account shares a close structural and logical affinity with Gaut's Cluster Account of Art.⁴ Gaut is not concerned with defending any particular set of criterial properties; indeed, he argues that one of the virtues of the cluster account is that its proponents can, in the face of counterexamples, "respond by modifying the content of the account, rather than its form" (2000: 33). And Gaut believes not only that this is a successful strategy, but also that it can account for changes in the notion ART throughout history (2000: 32).

If one sets aside the terminological differences between Gaut's and Boyd's accounts, several structural similarities emerge, including that: (1) a kind (i.e., Gaut's "art" kind or one of Boyd's HPC kinds) is *not* determined by an eternal and immutable set of properties, but (2) by a general set of properties, which are *only jointly sufficient*, but which (3) have *multiple sufficient subsets*, and (4) this set of determining properties may vary over time and space, while the

⁴ See page 1-2 above for the logical structure of Gaut's account.

intension of the kind term remains consistent. Boyd is committed to (1), (2) and (3) in virtue of his beliefs that HPC kinds have natural variances between members at any given time and that there is still a specific (i.e. homeostatic) *cluster* of properties that determine an object's kind membership. Thus, if "having a trunk" is a relevant property of the homeostatic cluster for elephants, even the trunkless kin of elephants would still be considered elephants—the trunkless elephant still instantiates enough (*a sufficient subset*) of the properties of the homeostatic cluster (such as "having elephant parents" and "having gray skin") to qualify as a member of the elephant kind. With respect to (4), Boyd is expressly committed to the idea that the "property cluster is individuated like a historical object or process: certain changes over time (or space) in the property cluster or in the underlying homeostatic mechanisms preserve the identity of the defining cluster" (1999: 144). Condition (4) of Boyd's HPC theory is intended to account for cases of natural microevolutionary changes in a species, for example. Gaut is expressly committed in the conditions of the logical form of the cluster account (as summarized above) to at least (1), (2) and (3). But Gaut is also committed to (4) insofar as he believes that this is one of the primary virtues of the cluster account: that it is malleable enough to respond to developments in the artworld while preserving a stable notion of art (2000: 32-33).

With the structural and logical affinities of Gaut's and Boyd's cluster accounts outlined, let us now approach the second aspect of Boyd's theory of kinds, his *accommodation thesis*:

The basic lesson here is that the epistemic reliability of scientific practices in a disciplinary matrix (when and to the extent they are reliable) depends on many dimensions of accommodation between (on the one hand) conceptual features of practice in that matrix like its theories, concepts, classificatory practices, inferential standards of

experimental design, etc., and (on the other hand) the causal powers of the phenomena under study. (Boyd 1999: 217)

This is to say, insofar as one wants to be able to make sustainable, true claims about the members of a given kind (including its nature, causal powers, and properties), there must be a *disciplinary matrix* that determines the kind *by* its use in those very types of judgments. A *disciplinary matrix* is “a family of inductive and inferential practices united by common conceptual resources, whether or not these correspond to academic or practical disciplines otherwise understood” (1999: 148). A community that uses the kind-concept and -term for theoretical and practical purposes comprises a *disciplinary matrix* for a kind. Academic research (sub-)fields as ecology, organic chemistry, and particle physics are instances of such communities. However, it would be wrong to think that academic research fields outside of the exact sciences fail to create disciplinary matrices. Comparative psychology, for instance, employs kind terms from a common conceptual set that are used in theoretical and inductive practices. In comparative psychology there is a kind term for “lateral inhibition” that allows psychologists to explain and infer certain patterns of behavior and processing.

Moreover, by the accommodation thesis, disciplinary matrices and kind terms are relative to each other. For example, the kind term “water” has very different theoretical and inductive uses in ecology than in chemistry, and thus will emphasize a different set of relevant properties in the total cluster. For ecology, the relevant properties of water are its life-sustaining features and the dynamics of its flow, since it is used in explanations and inferences about environmental niches and adaptability. In chemistry, the relevant properties of water are its chemical structure and composition, since it is used in explanations and inferences about solubility and phase

change. Of course, not every kind term will be useful or relevant to every disciplinary matrix—for example, the economic kind term “demand” is irrelevant to particle physics.

Does the kind term “art” relate to a specific disciplinary matrix? Can we say that ART is related to a recognized discipline in such a way as to create or identify a matrix for it that will allow us to treat it like Boyd treats HPC kind terms? After all, ART appears to be much more nebulous than the kinds determined by the exact sciences. Nevertheless, ART *does* meet all the criteria for kindhood as proposed by Boyd above. Artworks share a set of causal powers of interest to a community that uses the concept in theorizing, classification schema, and inferential judgments. For example, one candidate for a causal power of artworks is *to command appreciation*. Why would we for so long have tried to unite artworks under a single definition if they did not have causal powers worthy of our attention? In many ways, the search for these causal powers is the search for a definition of art—what makes art unique? The ability to command aesthetic appreciation is a causal power that distinguishes unorganized noise from music, a child’s finger-painting from a Rothko. Consider again the kind term “water” and its relation to chemistry. The history of water from the perspective of chemistry has been a history of identifying its causal powers relevant to chemistry itself. “Art” is a term that is useful for making reliable generalizations about a given object. To deem an object a work of art implies that it has the properties of being the product of a human action and being something intended for an audience, for instance. And as the classifications of a kind term become more specific, more generalizable properties become apparent; there are more interesting generalizations we can make about a specific group of artworks, such as “impressionist paintings,” than about the more general concept ART. Third, “art” plays a pivotal role in the theorizing, inferential structures, and classificatory practices of at least a handful of disciplines. “Art” is a kind term by

which some disciplines such as aesthetics and art history demarcate their proper objects of study. Kind terms such as “green” or “symmetrical” or “lyrical” will be necessary for disciplines such as art criticism and studio art. As we saw in the case of the kind term “water” above, “art” is a kind term not specific to one discipline; it may occur, but play a decidedly different role, in disciplines such as sociology and anthropology. It appears then, that by Boyd’s definition of HPC kinds, “art” is a proper kind term that relates to a variety of disciplinary matrices.

When we integrate Boyd’s accommodation thesis and disciplinary matrices into Gaut’s Cluster Account of Art, some important consequences follow. Most importantly, there are the structural consequences of the theory to consider. In Gaut’s account, there is no mechanism for generating the relevant properties of the cluster. Gaut proposes ten criteria he believes are good candidates, but these are simply criteria gleaned from other definitions of art and from his own intuitions—Gaut does not argue for his proposed criteria, but only for the logic of his account. But using an expanded cluster account of art, anyone may argue that she has chosen the correct set of properties of the cluster for ART (relative to a disciplinary matrix) because there is a historical community, creators and keepers of the corresponding disciplinary matrix, that agrees on the relevant set of properties that determine whether an object falls under the concept ART.

While it may seem subtle, the incorporation of a disciplinary matrix into the expanded cluster account makes it significantly different from Gaut’s account of art. On Gaut’s account, a philosopher may propose a certain set of criteria for the determination of artworks, which she believes to be correct, and she may provide compelling reasons why her criteria are appropriate. This way of determining a set of criterial properties is explanatorily *ahistorical*. The criterial set is proposed from a contemporary perspective and projected on to historical artifacts, like American Indian and ancient pottery. The disciplinary matrix, on the contrary, provides an

essentially *historical* manner of determining the criteria, in which the proposed criteria are based on real historical and circumstantial usage. On the expanded cluster account, the set of properties in the cluster for ART is determined by the related communities in which the concept is used, with the community and concept co-evolving over time and space, and, importantly, without changing the intension. That is to say, the ahistorical model looks at the usage of the concept in its current form and then imposes its modern standpoint onto history. On the other hand, a historical approach investigates the usage of the concept as an evolving phenomenon, researching both the concept's usage and corresponding disciplinary and historical circumstances that develop *through* time to arrive at a theory. The historical approach is much more likely to produce good inferences and theories about both the contemporary concept the historical concept ART, rather than clumsily attempting to infer backwards from a modern standpoint. And it is precisely this important shift in epistemological authority that I believe answers Meskin's concerns, as I will argue shortly.

IV. THE ARTWORLD

Having established the logical and structural viability of conceiving of ART as a Boydian HPC kind, there remains the question of identifying its relevant disciplinary matrix. I have already named some academic disciplines whose matrices employ the kind "art," but if we were to *only* consider these disciplines, we would determine a much more idiosyncratic notion of "art" than the folk employ. Indeed, it seems presumptuous to assume that art historians, sociologists, and trained studio artists share the same concept ART as the folk (or even as each other). If academic fields are too idiosyncratic in their concept ART, might we then turn to a more intellectually diverse institution? I maintain that the disciplinary matrix that corresponds with the

common usage of “art” is the “family of inductive and inferential practices united by common conceptual resources” (1999: 148) that emerges from what George Dickie has previously called the “artworld.”

Following Arthur Danto (1964), George Dickie defines the artworld as the totality of artworld systems that are “framework[s] for the presentation of a work of art by an artist to the artworld public” (Dickie 2000: 101); so, for example, art galleries (and their patrons, curators, owners, critics, etc.), theaters (and their patrons, curators, owners, critics, etc.), and museums (and their patrons, curators, owners, critics, etc.). While Dickie and I recognize his definition is circular, he is right in insisting that the “artworld” is a commonsense notion with which Westerners are familiar by a young age. Dickie considers “art gallery entrepreneurs, museum curators, art critics, art theorists, philosophers of art, and others” all examples of players in the modern-day artworld (2000: 102). Dickie’s artworld is a good candidate for the role of that community that supports the disciplinary matrix corresponding to the concept ART. Philosophers of art, art theorists, and other members of the artworld incorporate ART into their inductive, classificatory, and theoretical practices; yet the generality introduced by including museum curators and the artworld public into the definition saves the artworld from being too esoteric a community to determine the common usage of “art.” Furthermore, Dickie recognizes the malleable and historical nature of the artworld *qua* actual institution. Dickie posits that the artworld has “occurred [in] many different times in many different cultures” and suggests it began as very socially primitive and has developed to the social complexity of the modern Western artworld (2000: 102). The practices of Dickie’s artworld meet all of the criteria of the “disciplinary matrix” as defined by Boyd above and, *prima facie*, they do so more comprehensively than any other candidate.

One may object to using Dickie's artworld as the disciplinary matrix for ART on purely definitional grounds—most of Dickie's opponents have focused on the aforementioned circularity in his theory, as well as its lack of necessary and sufficient conditions for ART. For our purposes, however, these common charges against Dickie are not important. My goal here is to pick out the institutions in the real world whose practices constitute the disciplinary matrix for ART. Boyd has already provided an adequate definition of a disciplinary matrix, so the artworld merely acts as content in this particular case. Because the content of disciplinary matrices (e.g., the academic discipline of chemistry) is naturally fuzzy, the artworld needs to be defined only strictly enough for us (1) to recognize it as a possible candidate for "disciplinary matrix" and (2) to pick out the correct institution in the real world. And, indeed, it is hard to deny that Dickie is broadly characterizing an institution with which any acculturated Westerner is familiar.

V. ANSWERING IRRELEVANT CRITERIA

Having argued for a theory of how to determine "art" as a kind and what institutions' practices determine that kind, we are now ready to consider how the expanded cluster account handles Meskin's primary objection to Gaut. In his article, "The Cluster Account of Art Reconsidered," Meskin advances what he calls the *problem of irrelevant criteria*. He shows that because Gaut's account allows there to be sufficient subsets of criteria, but contains the caveat that the criteria are disjunctively necessary once a sufficient subset is instantiated, any other random criterion that the object of inquiry satisfies may be "tacked on"—they can be added to the list as disjunctively necessary without violating the logical form of the account. Thus, criteria such as "having been made on a Thursday" or "being made out of chocolate" could "count towards" an object's falling under the concept ART (2007: 391-2). But while irrelevant criteria

may not violate the logical form of Gaut's account, "in no plausible sense does being made by a person whose name begins with the letter 'B' count as a matter of conceptual necessity toward the instantiation of the concept ART" (Meskin 2007: 392). The problem for Gaut, then, is that, based purely on the logical form of his account, there is no clear way to distinguish between relevant and irrelevant criteria.

Based on his response to earlier critics, it appears Gaut may be willing simply to bite the bullet in the face of Meskin's criticisms. In response to Stephen Davies (2004), who argues that the Cluster Account of Art is actually a disjunctive definition, Gaut implies that his account may entail having a substantial list of criteria, and that it may be the case that some of them end up never actually being instantiated (in which case they should eventually be stricken from the set of properties), but this does not directly address Meskin's problem (Gaut 2005: 286). The challenge of Meskin's proposal is that, contrary to Gaut's presupposition in his response to Davies, the seemingly irrelevant properties *are* instantiated at least occasionally, and so it is not clear why they do not "count towards" an object's falling under the concept ART on Gaut's account. Meskin proposes several possible avenues of response, all dealing with modifications of the logical form of the cluster account. I, however, would like to explore a different avenue with my expanded cluster account. I have chosen not to modify the logical form of Gaut's account; instead, I incorporate the epistemic mechanism (disciplinary matrices) that governs the common usage of the concept ART—for that common usage, Gaut, channeling Wittgenstein, says, "Don't think, but look!" (Gaut 2000: 28).

The problem with Gaut's account is that it does not have a proper source of authority for generating a set of criteria. The method for criteria selection would presumably be something similar to *reflective equilibrium*. On Gaut's view, criterial selection will proceed approximately

as follows: philosophers and other theorists posit a certain set of criteria, another philosopher raises an objection or counterexample to the first formulation, another philosopher comes along and reformulates the view, and this dialectic continues into the foreseeable future. The problem is that Meskin's critique threatens to undermine *any* set of criteria proposed within the framework of the *reflective equilibrium* methodology. That is to say, given any set of artworks, with any set of proposed criteria, Meskin can construct a counterexample by appeal to any odd property that all the objects instantiate, but which would only ludicrously be deemed something that should "count towards" those objects' falling under the concept ART. This irrelevant criterion could be something as innocuous as "constructed on Earth," which would certainly apply to any example given, but which does not seem like a necessary or relevant property to "counting towards" an object falling under the concept of ART. While this could be considered a failure of the logical form of Gaut's account, I have chosen to approach Meskin's challenge otherwise, because I understand the problem differently. As I intimated previously, the problem is that Gaut's account designates no authority or methodology for criterial property selection. Meskin is correct in pointing out that, using *reflective equilibrium*, it is not feasible simply to understand the concept ART as it is commonly used; the result will not be a stable and objective set of criteria. And this is precisely why relativizing the use of the concept ART to a particular disciplinary matrix helps us avoid Meskin's critique.

By relativizing the concept ART to a historical institution, *reflective equilibrium* is no longer needed for determining the relevant property cluster. Instead, an empirical historical approach should ground the property cluster for ART. The artworld itself must be examined and surveyed to understand ART. The Expanded Cluster Account designates the corresponding disciplinary matrix as the ultimate ground of the properties relevant to ART. Also, the people of

the artworld (as creators and keepers of the practices constituting the disciplinary matrix) provide a basis of authority for the criterial property set; if a criterion does not relate to how ART is *actually* determined by the disciplinary matrix, then it will fail the test of relevance. Thus, Meskin's problem can be avoided by deferring to the actual practices of the Artworld. In fact, since it is relativized to a disciplinary matrix (the Artworld), the Expanded Cluster Account *must* defer to the reality of the Artworld. The primary difference between Gaut's Cluster Account and the Expanded Cluster Account is that the latter holds a stipulation that the set of criteria for ART must "track" the reality of the Artworld. Since Gaut never stipulates an *authority* for determining the plausible criteria for ART, if Meskin attempts to tack-on the property of "being made on a Monday" to a set of criteria that instantiates ART, it does not violate any of Gaut's stipulations (in spite of the properties unanimously acknowledged irrelevance). Tacking-on an irrelevant property to a set of criteria that instantiates ART does, however, violate the stipulation of the Expanded Cluster Account that criteria may count towards an object falling under ART *only if* it tracks the reality of what is understood to be relevant to falling under the concept ART to those in the Artworld. And if it were not the case that relativizing ART to a disciplinary matrix requires said stipulation, Boyd could be presented with a similar objection to his theory of kinds. For example, one might say that the property of "being drunk by someone on a Monday" could be a tacked-on to the properties that count towards a liquid instantiating the concept WATER, but it fails because this property fails to track the realistic interests of WATER's relevant disciplinary matrix. Therefore, while the Expanded Cluster Account does not obviously alter the logical structure of Gaut's account, its inheritance from Boyd and resulting stipulation render the account immune to Meskin's objection.

VI. WHY EXPAND?

Of course, the Expanded Cluster Account must provide more than a solution to Meskin's objection, otherwise it stands only on as sure a footing as competing theories, namely Longworth and Scarantino's Disjunctive Theory of Art and Dean's Prototype Theory of Art. In short, the Expanded Cluster Account of Art must, in addition, demonstrate that it provides a more comprehensive explanation for the history of art and can accommodate future instances of artworks. Let us begin by revisiting Longworth's and Scarantino's, and Dean's theories.

Longworth and Scarantino's (2010) project is, like the Expanded Cluster Account, motivated by Meskin's "irrelevant criteria" objection to the Cluster Account of Art, but their solution actually follows from Meskin's own suggestion of how Gaut might respond to his criticism. Setting aside concerns that Meskin (and thus Longworth and Scarantino) has misidentified the problem with Gaut's account, Longworth and Scarantino, on Meskin's suggestion, formalize a disjunctive account that systematically prescribes ambiguities in the theory, yet obviates the "irrelevant criteria" objection. Exactly how Longworth and Scarantino answer Meskin's objection is not of particular importance to us, but let us rehearse their final formalization of the Disjunctive Theory of Art:

$\exists Z \exists Y (\text{Art} \leftrightarrow (Z \vee Y))$, where (i) Z and Y are either non-empty conjunctions (e.g. P & Q & R) or non-empty disjunctions of conjunctions (e.g. (Q & R & S & T) (P & Q & W) v. . .); (ii) there is some indeterminacy over exactly which disjuncts are sufficient; (iii) Z does not entail Y and Y does not entail Z; (iv) Z does not entail Art and Y does not entail Art. (2010: 13)

The above formalization essentially captures Gaut's Cluster Account of Art by stating ART is characterized by a necessary disjunct of combined disjuncts and conjuncts that are sufficient for instantiating the concept ART. With the Disjunctive Account of Art in mind, let us consider Dean's prototype theory of art.

Unlike the Disjunctive Theory of Art, Dean's prototype theory of art is neither directly related to Gaut's Cluster Account nor motivated by Meskin's "irrelevant criteria" objections. Instead, Dean proposes his prototype theory as an alternative to and as a contender for an anti-definitional account of art. But, much like the (Expanded) Cluster Account of Art, Dean's prototype theory is motivated by developments in the theory of concepts in both the psychological and philosophical literature. Eponymously, Dean's theory suggests that art might be a prototype concept, as opposed to a cluster concept, for instance. While, as discussed previously, there are several different formulations of how a concept may be prototypically structured, Dean's particular proposal gives "an account of the psychological process of categorization in terms of 'similarity' to the set of properties that constitute the prototype. A quantitative measure of similarity is calculated based on how many properties an individual shares with the prototype, with properties usually being weighted according to typicality" (Laurence and Margolis 1999: 15). Simply put, Dean's prototype theory proposes that ART can be properly captured only by understanding the prototypical structure of the concept, that, similar to Gaut, certain sets of varying typical criteria may sufficiently determine if an object falls under the concept ART. In this case, Dean's prototype theory and a cluster account of art differ in at least two aspects: (1) Dean's theory statistically weighs the occurrence and typicality of a property to be found in artworks and (2) it suggests that the criterial properties for determining the concept ART should be extrapolated from folk conceptions of artworks. Now, with these two theories, in mind, I turn my attention to how the second difference between Dean's theory and a cluster account shows the Expanded Cluster Account of Art to be more explanatorily robust than its competitors.

The first feature of the Expanded Cluster Account I will draw attention to is that it provides a mechanism by which it is possible to determine the list of criteria of the cluster concept ART. In fact, it is this feature that inoculates it against Meskin's objection. By relativizing the concept ART to a disciplinary matrix, the Expanded Cluster Account is able to examine the actual views that emerge in the disciplinary matrix in order to determine what counts as part of the criteria for the concept ART at a given time. That is to say, the disciplinary matrix is not only available to us now for inspection, but it is also available throughout history by various investigative means. Based on the Expanded Cluster Account of Art one could not only ascertain the contemporary criteria for ART, but one could also look at anthropological and sociological evidence to ascertain the criteria of ART in Ancient Greece (which naturally also changed over time). The Artworld and criteria of ART may co-evolve throughout history, but an investigation of the relationship between the two at a given point in history can reveal the concept ART for that era.

Thus, the Expanded Cluster Account is, again, essentially *historical*—it can provide insight into ART not only in contemporary times, but, with enough work, it can provide a complete historical picture of the evolution of the concept ART. The Expanded Cluster Account makes *explicit* the relationship between society and art as well as the historical development of art. That is to say, that the Expanded Cluster Account holds that the criteria that count towards an object falling under the concept ART can only be properly determined by understanding the interplay of the Artworld, artists and art objects, thus one must look at the details of this nexus in order to develop the plausible criteria for ART. Competing theories of the Expanded Cluster Account are not relativized to a disciplinary matrix and may still adapt to changing understandings of ART over time; however, competing theories do not make *explicit* how such

changes in the plausible criteria for ART have occurred. For example, while the ECA may point to photography as a significant factor in the rise in Impressionism and other anti-realistic movements in painting, competing accounts do not have the conceptual resources to explain why a change in the plausible criteria for ART has occurred.

Insofar as the Expanded Cluster Account is explanatorily historical, it provides an explanation to that which frustrates all accounts of art: how is it that contemporary art is the same kind of thing as Renaissance art or Roman pottery? Most famously posed by Arthur Danto (1964), the question of how the development of art led to Mondrian's geometric pieces, for instance, is a question for which every account of art should have an answer. The Expanded Cluster Account, as a model for inquiry, not only proposes that it is legitimate to call our current concept ART the same concept of ART that existed in the Middle Ages, but may also provide an explanation of the historical development of ART. The Expanded Cluster Account achieves the former by explicitly showing grounding the concept ART in the historical co-evolution of its disciplinary matrix and exemplary artworks and it achieves the latter by allowing one to point to historical facts or events that caused the development of disciplinary matrix or exemplary artworks. Given what the Expanded Cluster Account *can* explain, let us consider its competitors.

Longworth and Scarantino's Disjunctive Theory of Art, like Gaut's account, explicitly does *not* attempt to determine the relevant set of criteria for ART—it merely assumes Gaut's criteria for the sake of argument (2010: 12). One may be tempted to argue here, then, that lacking a mechanism for determining the criteria of ART should not be held against the theory.

However, here I am advancing the claim that the Expanded Cluster Account is more explanatorily robust than its competitors, which can be shown precisely by revealing phenomena that require explanation and considering which of the competing theories provide the best

explanation for the phenomena in question. In this case, it is straightforwardly clear that the Expanded Cluster Account can make explicit a comprehensive explanation of the development and history of the criteria of ART where the Disjunctive Theory of Art does not even attempt to explain. The Expanded Cluster Account is more explanatorily robust than the Disjunctive Theory of Art in regard to the question at hand *simpliciter*.

Unlike Longworth and Scarantino, Dean in his prototype theory does not so easily cede its lack of a mechanism for determining the relevant properties of ART. Dean's prototype theory assumes that, if we are to understand and statistically systematize how people use the concept ART, one must actually study the typicality effects in psychological experiments (Dean 2003: 31-2). Even if Dean does not prescribe this directly, this is an implication of suggesting ART as a prototypical concept. If psychological research is required in order for the prototype theory accurately to generate a list of the prototypical properties of ART, then Dean's theory is less explanatorily robust than the Expanded Cluster Account in two ways: (1) the prototype theory is susceptible to the aforementioned objection that it cannot easily account for atypical cases of the concept and (2) it would be impossible to get an accurate historical picture of how the typical properties of art have developed over time; prototype theory cannot answer Danto's question about what makes frescoes and contemporary conceptual art the same *kind* of thing. Since there is no way to run psychological experiments on people of the past, it would be impossible to really get an accurate profile of the typical properties of ART—the best one could achieve with prototype theory is to understand the development of ART from contemporary times into the future. Similar to the Disjunctive Theory of Art, Dean never explicitly states that one of the goals of prototype theory is to explain such historical phenomena, however, for the reasons previously stated, it is relevant for adjudicating between a set of competing theories.

Having established the historical explanatory robustness of the Expanded Cluster Account, particularly in contrast to competing theories, I would like to draw attention to a second arena in which the Expanded Cluster Account is more explanatorily efficacious: assimilating new data. That is to say, the Expanded Cluster Account is responsive not only to developments in the Artworld's use of ART, but also novel instances of objects that may qualify as artworks. The Expanded Cluster Account is sensitive to future developments of ART due to its inherent structure. Because in the Expanded Cluster Account ART is co-determined by the Artworld and the actual objects (and their properties) in the world, it is necessarily responsive to novelties and changes in either category. Imagine, for example, that a well-regarded chef is opening a new restaurant that features a hitherto unconceptualized type of cuisine so marvelous nearly all of its critics and patrons think it worthy of being considered an object of ART. The Expanded Cluster Account may then properly judge that the novel cuisine is worthy of the concept ART based on both the Artworld's reception of it (e.g., it is taken up for aesthetic appreciation by art critics) and on the actual properties of the object (e.g., the object is formally beautiful, the object is emotionally forceful). Through a complex and organic co-evolution of the Artworld and novel objects, the concept ART evolves on the Expanded Cluster Account.

The same cannot be said for either the Disjunctive Theory of Art or Dean's prototype theory. The Disjunctive Theory of Art, simply enough, does not attempt to incorporate a mechanism for determining the worthiness of novel objects as artworks. While Longworth and Scarantino, like Gaut, absolutely leave open the possibility that the criteria for ART will change over time, they provide no predictive machinery and no account of how a novel object will be properly categorized as ART. Dean's prototype account will also be explanatorily deficient in regard to categorizing novel objects. In fact, as commented before, one of the primary issues

with a prototype theory of concepts is that they cannot account for how atypical objects end up still instantiating a given concept. That is to say, it is difficult for a prototype theory of the concept GRANDMOTHER to explain very young grandmothers who don't wear glasses, like children, or have gray hair. Similarly, a prototype theory of ART will find it difficult or not impossible to give an explanation of *how* one is supposed to regard novel (and thus atypical) objects as properly categorized as ART. If the chef's groundbreaking cuisine is suddenly being considered as instantiating ART, Dean's theory will have a hard time accounting for how something that would rate very low as a typical property of art (e.g., it is not a standardly recognized medium of art) could still be considered an artwork. Admittedly, a prototype theorist might argue that if one keeps checking and reevaluating the typical properties of ART, such novel objects or media would likely eventually be incorporated into the folk's concept ART. However, even if novel objects eventually assimilate into the folk concept ART, this tells only one side of the story, namely it fails to address what it was about the object in the first place that influenced developments in the folk concept ART. The Expanded Cluster Account, alas, is able to provide a more complete picture, a more robust explanation than competing theories for the developments in concept ART.

Given this discussion, I surmise that the Expanded Cluster Account is a more complete theory on two important axes: (1) it seems to explain better the historical data about the concept ART, and (2) it provides a more accurate and complete predictive mechanism for dealing with the future developments of the concept ART. Based on these two important properties of any good theory, the Expanded Cluster Account of Art should be adopted over its competing theories. However, a theory's robustness is often proportional to the objections it may raise. Let me now consider one important objection in particular.

One objection to the Expanded Cluster Account's integration of disciplinary matrices is about the vagueness of who or what comprises the disciplinary matrix, in this case, the artworld. For instance, one may object that there will *always* be competing opinions and arguments over what instantiates the concept ART and which objects then fall under that concept. How is one to mitigate this vagueness? Are some groups more privileged than others? I think the proper response to such concerns is that, naturally, it is important to consider expertise and the validity of arguments when assessing a particular group or individuals participation in the artworld—those who know more about art and are thus more capable of making intelligent arguments in regard to art *should* be privileged over the folks intuition, but there need not be any systematic rules about privilege within a disciplinary matrix. If anything, I think the issue of vagueness illustrates the explanatory power of the Expanded Cluster Account. Taking a cue from Gaut (2000), agreements and disagreements within a disciplinary matrix create a nice “map” of the sufficient sets of criteria for instantiating ART. Cases in which there is no controversy within the artworld (e.g., the *Mona Lisa*) provide clues as to what a sufficient set of criteria for instantiating ART might be, while, as we move to more and more controversial cases (e.g., the imaginary groundbreaking cuisine), the actual “borders” of certain sufficient sets of criteria become evident. At the same time, this map provides the basis for categorizing objects as ART—one might make an analogical argument for the inclusion of the imaginary breakthrough cuisine as an artwork based on another uncontroversial case that shares its criterial profile. Moreover, insofar as the Expanded Cluster Account attempts to provide a realistic account of the concept ART, charges of vagueness are not objectionable, but, in fact, necessary. Simply put, the world is fuzzy and any theory that attempts to capture this should naturally be fuzzy as well, otherwise it fails to capture the truth about how concepts operate. Both the necessity and the benefits of having

vagueness built into the Expanded Cluster Account reveal an objection based on vagueness to be an advantage.

VII. CONCLUSION

I have argued that the Expanded Cluster Account of Art is the most comprehensive and explanatory anti-definitional account of art available today. I motivate my theory from a survey of the current plausible theories of concepts, a naturalistic approach to concept analysis, and the failures of definitional enterprise in philosophy of art heretofore. My arguments center around the explanatory efficacy of Gaut's Cluster Account of Art integrated with Boyd's theory of kinds, demonstrating how such a theory not only answers Meskin's "irrelevant criteria" objection, but also convincingly explains the historical and future data—the most convincing feature of any worthwhile theory. I only hope that I have been convincing enough here for the project of the Expanded Cluster Account to be continued, as there is still much to be done. A complete account of the theory is further charged with tracking and explaining the developments of ART throughout history as well as demonstrating the theory's resilience as future controversial cases unfold. There is still much to be done, but here I have presented the necessary tools for future research into the anti-definitional approach to the concept ART.

VIII. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adajian, T. (2003). On the Cluster Account of Art. *British Journal of Aesthetics*, 43(4), 379-385.
- Armstrong, S. L., Gleitman, L. R., & Gleitman, H. (1983). What some concepts might not be. *Cognition*, 13, 263-308.
- Boyd, R. N. (1989). How to Be a Moral Realist. In G. Sayre-McCord (Ed.), *Essays on Moral Realism* (pp. 181-228): Cornell University Press.
- Boyd, R. N. (1999). Homeostasis, Species, and Higher Taxa. In R. A. Wilson (Ed.), *Species: New Interdisciplinary Essays* (pp. 141-185). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Boyd, R. N. (2010). Realism, Natural Kinds, and Philosophical Methods. In H. Beebe & N. Sabbarton-Leary (Eds.), *The Semantics and Metaphysics of Natural Kinds* (pp. 212-234). London: Routledge.
- Carroll, N. (1993). Historical Narratives and the Philosophy of Art. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 51(3), 314-326.
- Danto, A. (1964). The Artworld. *Journal of Philosophy*, 61(19), 571-584.
- Davies, S. (2004). The Cluster Theory of Art. *British Journal of Aesthetics*, 44(3), 297-300.
- Dean, J. (2003). The Nature of Concepts and the Definition of Art. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 61(1), 29-35.
- Dickie, G. (2000). The Institutional Theory of Art. In N. Carroll (Ed.), *Theories of Art Today* (pp. 93-108). Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Dickie, G. (2002). Defining Art. In S. M. Cahn (Ed.), *Philosophy for the 21st Century* (pp. 784-787). New York: Oxford University Press USA.
- Fodor, J., & Lepore, E. (1996). The red herring and the pet fish: why concepts still can't be prototypes. *Cognition*(58), 253-270.

- Gaut, B. (2000). "Art" as a Cluster Concept. In N. Carroll (Ed.), *Theories of Art Today* (pp. 25-44).
Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Gaut, B. (2005). The Cluster Account of Art Defended. *British Journal of Aesthetics*, 45(3), 273-288.
- Kintsch, W. (1974). *The Representation of Meaning and Memory*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Laurence, S., & Margolis, E. (1999). Concepts and Cognitive Science. In S. Laurence & E. Margolis (Eds.), *Concepts: Core Readings* (pp. 3-81). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Longworth, F., & Scarantino, A. (2010). The Disjunctive Theory of Art: The Cluster Account Reformulated. *British Journal of Aesthetics*, 50(2), 1-17.
- Meskin, A. (2007). The Cluster Account of Art Reconsidered. *British Journal of Aesthetics*, 47(4), 388-400.
- Robbins, P. (2005). The Myth of Reverse Compositionality. *Philosophical Studies* (125), 251-275.
- Rosch, E. (1973). Natural Categories. *Cognitive Psychology*, 4, 328-350.
- Stich, S. (1993). Moral Philosophy and Mental Representations. In M. Hetcher, L. Nadel & R. Michod (Eds.), *The Origin of Values* (pp. 215-228). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Weiskopf, D. A. (2009). The plurality of concepts. *Synthese*, 169(1), 145-173.
- Weitz, M. (1956). The Role of Theory in Aesthetics. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 15(1), 27-35.