


The Analytic Tradition: The Quest for a Criteria:

What is the set of necessary & sufficient conditions for object X?



At the beginning of 20th century the object of philosophy became the clarification of thought achieved by analysis of the logical form of philosophical propositions through the analysis of language (via formal logic). Emphasizing both natural science and rejecting metaphysics and the metaphysical quest for a unifying grand theory of explanation, a "linguistic turn" took place in the history of philosophy (including aesthetics). Therefore, having given up for the search for the essence of art, the quest for a criteria situated itself in language: **What is the set of necessary and sufficient conditions for object X?** Consider the historical debate between the two following analytic philosophers, Monroe Beardsley (1915-1985) & George Dickie (1926-): (1) Beardsley resisted an institutional definition of art vs. Dickie who stated that only the institution gives quality/value to art. (2) Beardsley proposed that aesthetic gratification was that which object X has unity and intensity whereas Dickie argued that there was no aesthetic gratification apart from recognition of institutional authority. Beardsley claimed objective experience in the subject (not the object) whereas Dickie argued for personal empirical subjectivity. Interestingly, Arthur Danto (1924-), another analytic philosopher, contends "*the artworld*" determines what is art. Danto explains that "*the artworld*" is composed of a network of social networks, institutions, curators, dealers, artists, etc; no longer a concern for experience. Thus, "*the artworld*" provides the art theories which all members of art *tacitly* assume as art; institutional authority is the locus for aesthetic value.