Recall Weitz’s argument:

-- Weitz denies there is any necessary condition for being an artwork (not even artifactuality). So, obviously he denies there are jointly necessary and sufficient conditions.

-- Weitz offers an explanation for the lack of any such necessary condition. He claims that the creativity of art, its innovativeness and rebelliousness, closes off the possibility of a definition.

-- Instead, artworks are related by a “family resemblance”.

[Graduate students: Think hard about the opening line of the last full paragraph on p. 64.]

Objections…

To Weitz’s positive account:

-- But does family resemblance explain the unity of a kind? “The recognition of a resemblance among family members presupposes, and does not explain, the basis for that membership.” (65)

-- There must be an alternative account for the first artworks.

-- Readymades and conceptual art do not have a family resemblance to other art, and non-art items (e.g., other pieces of driftwood, urinals, etc.) bare a striking resemblance to readymades and conceptual art.

To Weitz’s negative project (of denying an essence):

-- Creativity can be built into the definition of art. So, a definition doesn’t necessarily limit creativity. “How could such a definition foreclose on future creativity, since it does not tell artists what to do, although it insists that, whatever they do, they do it creatively?” (66)

-- There can be creativity within rule-following.

-- Borderline cases do not establish the absence of an essence. (67)
Weitz’s “look and see” challenge supposes, perhaps falsely, that the essential properties of art would be intrinsic and perceptible.