**PURDUE UNIVERSITY**

**REQUEST FOR ADDITION, EXPIRATION, OR REVISION OF AN UNDERGRADUATE COURSE**

**(10000-49000 LEVEL)**

**A&SCD#09-27**

**DEPARTMENT** Philosophy

**EFFECTIVE SESSION** Spring 2010

**INSTRUCTIONS:** Please check the items below which describe the purpose of this request.

- [X] New course with supporting documents
- [ ] Add existing course offered at another campus
- [ ] Expiration of a course
- [ ] Change in course number
- [ ] Change in course title
- [ ] Change in course credit/type
- [ ] Change in course attributes (department head signature only)
- [ ] Change in instructional hours
- [ ] Change in course description
- [ ] Change in course requisites/restrictions
- [ ] Change in semesters offered (department head signature only)
- [ ] Transfer from one department to another

**PROPOSED:**

- Subject Abbreviation: PHIL
- Course Number: 47160
- Long Title: Topics in Aesthetics and the Philosophy of Art
- Short Title: Aesthetics/Phil of Art

**EXISTING:**

- Subject Abbreviation
- Course Number
- Long Title
- Short Title

**TERMS OFFERED:**

- Check All That Apply:
  - [ ] Summer
  - [X] Fall
  - [X] Spring

**CAMPUS(ES) INVOLVED:**

- Calumet
- Cont Ed
- Ft. Wayne
- N. Central
- Tech Statewide
- Indianapolis
- W. Lafayette

**CREDIT TYPE:**

- [ ] Fixed Credit: Cr. Hrs.
- [3] Variable Credit Range:
- Minimum Cr. Hrs.
- (Check One) To
- Maximum Cr. Hrs.
- [ ] Equivalent Credit: Yes
- [ ] No

**COURSE ATTRIBUTES:**

- [ ] Pass/Not Pass Only
- [X] Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory Only
- [ ] Repeatable
- [X] Maximum Repeatable Credit: 12
- [ ] Credit by Examination
- [ ] Special Fees
- [ ] Registration Approval Type
- [ ] Instructor

**Schedule Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th>Recitation</th>
<th>Presentation</th>
<th>Laboratory</th>
<th>Lab Prep</th>
<th>Studio</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Clinic</th>
<th>Experiential</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Ind. Study</th>
<th>Frac/observe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minutes Per Mtg</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings Per Week</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks Offered</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Credit Allocated</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COURSE DESCRIPTION (INCLUDE REQUIREMENTS/RESTRICTIONS):**

An intensive examination of some of the characteristic questions of contemporary aesthetic theory. Variable content may include the definition of art, the ontology of art, artist-artwork-audience relations; intentions; interpretation; evaluation; aesthetic experience; and ethics and aesthetics. A transdisciplinary approach includes consideration of works of art and artist/writer/scholarly writings in addition to philosophical writings. May be repeated for credit with consent of instructor.

P. PHIL 72600 or consent of instructor.

**COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES:**

The student who will have completed the course successfully will not only have an excellent knowledge of problems in contemporary philosophy of art, will have an excellent knowledge of the relation of modern and contemporary art to philosophy of art and aesthetics throughout an exposure to each and to literature pertaining to them.

**OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR**
TOPICS IN AESTHETICS AND PHILOSOPHY OF ART

Indiana University Purdue University Fort Wayne
Spring Semester 2011
Syllabus for Philosophy of Art 471
Tuesdays and Thursdays 3:00-4:15AM  Kettler Hall G22

Jeff Strayer

Office CM 07A
Office hours: TTH 3:00-4:00 PM, and by appointment
Voice mail 481-6301; Philosophy office 481-6366
E-mail strayerj@ipfw.edu
Website: users.ipfw.edu/strayerj
Computer Help Desk 481-6030 Kettler 206
Teaching and Technical Assistant: Brian Peirce  peirbg01@students.ipfw.edu

Students are encouraged to visit the Blackboard site for this class frequently for information that pertains to the class, and to check the site for any email that pertains to the class.

COURSE OBJECTIVES:

Art and philosophy came increasingly closer together in the 20th century. A number of things that artists did challenged how art was thought about philosophically. Many avant-garde artworks challenged philosophical thinking about the relation of artistic intention to artistic identity and interpretation; audience comprehension and reception of artistic identity and interpretation; prevailing notions of the aesthetic and aesthetic experience; the relation of art and the aesthetic, and the possible irrelevance of the latter to the former in some works; the notion of the art object and its possible dispensability in some works; the use of language in certain works of visual art; the notion of artists’ and observers’ actions in relation to artistic identity, and the possible completion of the work through acts of observers; the supremacy of the perceptual over the conceptual; the definition of art; and the ontology of art. In addition, many artists were philosophically literate, particularly in analytic philosophy and phenomenology, and were influenced by philosophy in what they did.

This course will consider the philosophical issues mentioned above by focusing primarily on a single problem in art and philosophy of art. In fact, it proves to be true that the most subtle and profound philosophical and artistic questions about art can be raised by focusing on this problem - a problem that can be put in the form of one simple question: Does Abstract art have a limit? Because any answer to this question will have an aesthetic dimension the query is pertinent to aesthetics, thought of both artistically and philosophically. This question is not one that is relevant just to philosophy. It is also of interest and importance to art, and any answer to it will have to consider art and its history in addition to difficult philosophical questions. To that end the course is interdisciplinary, and readings for the course reflect that interdisciplinary nature. In addition, many slides will be shown and discussed in relation to the preceding and following issues and questions, and segments of films will be reviewed when appropriate.

The foregoing course objectives, and the course requirements and method listed below, pertain to basic learning objectives as they form part of a general education. These include: being familiar with important modes of human thought that are the foundations of science, philosophy, art, and social behavior; being able to read, write, and speak with comprehension, clarity, and precision as these things pertain to human knowledge and its problems; being able to reason quantitatively (as means of
gaining and creating knowledge and drawing reliable conclusions); being able to think critically and to solve problems; demonstrating the ability to evaluate ideas based upon disciplined reasoning; and understanding the traditions that have formed one’s own and other cultures as one is prepared to view them critically and objectively.

Although the question of Abstract art’s limits is simple to raise, it is not simple to answer, and any attempt to answer it will have to involve consideration of a number of complex and interrelated things. These include the following general questions:

1. What do we mean by Abstraction in art, and what do we mean by abstraction in general?
2. How does Abstraction develop in art history to reach a stage at which the philosophical question with which we are concerned can be raised?
3. Is there a single limit to Abstraction, or might it have several different limits which can be artistically identified in different ways?
4. What would attempting to identify the limit(s) of Abstract art artistically presuppose philosophically?
5. If Abstract art has more than one limit, then can we or should we speak of different kinds and/or levels of Abstraction?
6. What is the different relation of philosophy and art to the question of the limit(s) of Abstraction in art?
7. What is the relation of the artistic pursuit of the limit(s) of artistic Abstraction not only to the history of art, but to such things as Cubism, Dadaism, Minimalism, Conceptual art, Performance art, Body art, and Modernism as espoused particularly in the critical thinking of Clement Greenberg and Michael Fried? Is any identification of Abstract art’s limits Postmodern, or might it even be Post-postmodern?
8. If Abstract art has a limit(s), and that/those limit(s) can be identified, then does this entail that art has come to an end? If so, then what is the relation of the identification of this end(s) to Arthur Danto’s ‘end of art’ thesis?
9. What is meant by ‘Essentialism,” and why is that term used in relation to the inquiry into the limit(s) of Abstraction in art?
10. What are the principal art historical precedents of Essentialist Abstraction? Why?

Philosophical examination of our main question shows that the identity of every artwork depends on a public perceptual object on which that identity is in some way dependent. This recognition provokes the following queries:

1. How is the conceptual division between those things that are artworks and those that are not to be effected in relation to the question of the limit(s) of Abstraction in art?
2. What do is meant by a ‘public’ perceptual object? That is, what is the criterion or criteria of publicity? Correlatively, what is a ‘private’ phenomenal object, and why are privacy and publicity only predicated of phenomenal objects?
3. What do is meant by ‘object,” what is its range of application, its ontological associations, and how does it relate to the central question of the limit(s) of Abstraction in art?
4. What do is meant by speaking of the ‘identity’ of an artwork, and how does this notion pertain to the issue of artistic Abstraction?
5. What is meant by the concept artifact, and what is ‘the artifactuality condition?’
6. Is an artifact required to reach the limit(s) of Abstraction in art? If so what is its nature, or must it have a particular nature?
7. How must an artifact be related to the artist whose artwork the artifact pertains to?
8. How must someone be related to the artifact that pertains to the identity of a particular artwork in order to apprehend that particular identity?
9. What are the different ways in which artworks can be produced?
10. How do these methods of production pertain to the issue of art’s Abstract limit(s)?
11. What is meant by speaking of the ‘medium’ or ‘media’ of an artwork? How does Strayer’s notion of medium differ from George Dickie’s, and why does Strayer think that his notion must be recognized? How does the notion of medium pertain to the basic ways in which artworks can be produced?
12. What is the difference between existential and non-existental objects, and how is each kind of object related to the issue of Abstraction?
13. Why do we need to speak of reaching the limit(s) of Abstraction at this time in history rather than ahistorically, or apart from the context of art making and art theory provided by the artworld?
14. What is meant by ‘the artworld,’ and of what importance or relevance is it to the determination of the limit(s) of Abstraction in art?

The philosophy of our central question shows that the identity of every artwork is dependent on a subject who produces and is so responsible for that identity, and on subjects who can apprehend that identity. In addition, in order to determine the limit(s) of Abstraction in art within the art historical context of today’s artworld and culture means that at least some of the subjects who would apprehend the identity of any artwork in which a/the limit of Abstraction in art is exhibited must be members of the artworld. Given the preceding points we can ask the following:

1. What is a subject?
2. What properties of a subject are minimally required to make a work of art?
3. What properties of a subject are minimally required to apprehend a work of art?
4. What must the artist’s relation to the original perceptual object on which the identity of her artwork is dependent be?
5. What must the artist’s relation to her artwork be?
6. Why could questions 4 and 5 concern either the same or a different object?
7. What relation or relations must hold between any subject apprehending the original, public, perceptual object on which the identity of a particular artwork is dependent and that original object?
8. What relation or relations must hold between any subject apprehending the identity of an artwork and the identity apprehended?
9. What are the general kinds and characteristics of consciousness?
10. Why are these generally relevant to making and apprehending works of art, and why are they more particularly relevant to the issue of the limit(s) of Abstraction in art?
11. What is meant by the terms ‘phenomenal’ and ‘noumenal,’ and how are they relevant to artistic Abstraction and its limit(s).
12. What is meant by a subject’s ‘history of awareness?’ His ‘history of agency?’ How and why are each relevant to determining the limit(s) of Abstraction in art?

When a subject perceives and attends to the original perceptual object on which the identity of a particular artwork is dependent, an ‘artistic complex’ exists of which the conscious subject, the
original object, and the relation of awareness uniting them in the complex are each constituents. The
determination of the limit(s) of Abstraction in art must be based on elements that are ineliminable from
any such context. It is the job of philosophy to identify these elements in order that creative
investigations of Abstraction’s limit(s) can proceed. This philosophical identification will involve the
following questions:

1. What is the causal relation of the artist to the original object on which the identity of a
   particular artwork is dependent? What are the different ways in which this causal relation can be
effected?

2. What is the causal relation of a subject apprehending the original object on which the
   identity of a particular artwork is dependent to that object? What is the causal relation of the object to
   the subject?

3. What are the three basic kinds of causal relation that can hold between subjects and objects?

4. What is an ‘indexical,’ which indexicals are relevant to artistic complexes, and what is their
   relevance to the limit(s) of Abstraction in art?

5. What are the three key epistemological relations of a subject to the original perceptual
   object on which the identity of a particular artwork is dependent?

6. How do these relations pertain to the identity of the artwork itself if it is separate from the
   original perceptual object on which it is dependent?

7. How are phenomenality and noumenality relevant to the issue of Abstraction, and what is
   the relation of each to an artistic complex?

8. How is a subject’s history of awareness pertinent to a particular artistic complex of which
   the subject is a constituent, and how is it relevant to the identity of an artwork?

9. More specifically, why are apprehension, reapprehension, retention, protention, similarity, and
   recognition of similarity relevant to an artistic complex involving an original object in which a
   limit of Abstraction could be meant to be exhibited?

10. What is the relevance of space and time to any artistic complex?

11. What is meant by ‘becoming,’ and why is becoming of ineliminable relevance to any
    artistic complex?

12. What is a ‘Cambridge change,’ and what is the relevance of this most minimal kind of
    change to any artistic complex?

Both the original, public, perceptual object on which the identity of a particular artwork is
dependent, and the object with which the artwork is meant to be identified, will be constrained by
certain laws that I refer to as ‘the laws of objects.’ These points raise the following questions:

1. What are the laws of objects?
2. What is their ontological status?
3. What are the three foundational concepts of our, and any, conceptual system?
4. How are these basic concepts of relevance to the issue of Abstraction?
5. What is meant by an ‘impossible object?’ What is its relevance to Essentialist Abstraction?
6. How are the laws of objects preserved in relation to impossible objects?
7. What is logical space?
8. What is a logical distinction, why is it required of the laws of objects, and why does it need
   to be recognized by Essentialism?
9. What is the relation of meaning to the language of specification? Why is the meaning of an
original specification a constituent of an artistic complex as much as is a subject who apprehends that
specification?

10. What is a ‘concipient?’ Why is it necessary to recognize a concipient, and what is the
relation of a concipient to a specification?

Given the preceding considerations, concluding questions include:

1. What single thing is philosophically fundamental in making a work of art?
2. How does this single thing figure in Essentialism in relation to the artist who would produce
a work in which a/the limit of Abstraction is exhibited?
3. How does this single thing figure in Essentialism in relation to a subject apprehending a
work in which a/the limit of Abstraction is exhibited? That is, how is this single thing related to
apprehending, appreciating, or responding to an artwork in any way?
4. How is this single thing to be utilized by Essentialism?
5. How does an object with which all or part of a particular artwork is meant to be identified
relate to those things that lack the identity of that particular object?
6. How does an object with which all or part of a particular artwork is meant to be identified
relate to a subject apprehending that identity?
7. What is the question for Essentialism given the philosophical identification of the
ineliminable elements of any artistic complex?

COURSE REQUIREMENTS:

The course will consist of an oral component and a written component. Each component in
turn has two parts.

1. ORAL COMPONENT.

The oral component consists of a presentation aspect and a discussion aspect.

1.1. Presentation.

Each student will present a summary of an assigned reading at least once during the semester,
and probably more than once. The assigned reading should be summarized in a series of statements of
the main points of that reading. Main points may be supplemented by additional points that comment
on them, in the manner of an outline. The summary should be typed, double-spaced, and copies of it
are to be distributed to the class on the day of the presentation by the student responsible for the
presentation. The length of the summary will depend on the length and complexity of the assigned
material, but in most cases a single page should suffice. The presenter may bring the original copy of
his or her summary to the philosophy department to be copied if desired.

The presenter will read his or her summary to the class. At the end of the reading, the points
will be considered in order by those members not presenting on that day. Each student not presenting
on a particular day should be prepared as if it were his or her turn to present, and so should be prepared
to ask the presenter questions. Students not presenting should also be prepared to identify salient
points of the assigned reading not identified by the presenter. Presentations should be designed to take 15 to 20 minutes to complete.

For assigned readings that are either longer, more complex, or both, two students will be responsible for presenting a summary of the assigned material to the class. Each student will be one of two people responsible for the assigned reading a least once during the semester, and probably more than once. In cases of co-presentation, the two students co-presenting may either work together or independently. If they choose to work together, then they may present their summary jointly by alternately reading the points of their summary, and they may field questions together from the class. If they choose to work individually, then each student will summarize the reading independently of the other, and each will take class questions separately.

Students will grade one another on their presentations for both single and joint presentations. Presentation grades will be due on the day following the day the presentation is given, so Tuesday presentation grades are due on Thursday, and Thursday presentation grades are due on Tuesday. The students grading will put the name of the student or students being graded with the grade assigned on a sheet of paper that should include the signature of the person assigning the grade. Grades are purely numerical, and should be from 0 to 10, with 10 being excellent, and the maximum grade possible. A fraction of one-half may be added to a whole number. Suppose that Jane is the presenter, that John is grading Jane, and that John thinks that Jane deserves an 8.5 for her presentation. In this example, Jane’s name should appear at the top of the paper with the grade given Jane by John and with John’s signature. The grades are to be submitted in confidence to the professor. That is, students will not know how they are being graded by other members of the class. The professor will also assign a score to the presenter.

A student’s presentation score will be the average of the average of the scores that students assign to one another and the score assigned by the professor. For instance, if the average of the scores assigned by a student’s fellow students is 8.5, and the score assigned by the professor is 9, then the student’s score would be 8.75.

1.2. Discussion.

A discussion of the assigned reading will follow the presentation that will occupy the remainder of the class session. The discussion will be based on the main points identified in the assigned reading, and should consider the relation of those points to the main issue of the course. Each student, including the presenter(s), is expected to contribute to the discussion, and thus each student is expected to be prepared to discuss the assigned material on each day, and whether or not the student is presenting that day. Such preparation may include your own summary of the assigned reading plus commentary on and questions concerning the material. Discussion should be informed by careful consideration of assigned readings. Accordingly, assigned readings should be read prior to discussion. It is more important to talk a little but say a lot than to talk a lot but say little.

The professor will assign participation scores to each student for the semester. Students will also grade one another at the end of the semester on how they perceive their fellow class members to have performed in dialogue throughout the semester. These scores will be given on the final day of class, they will be out of a maximum of 10 possible, and they will be confidential.

A student’s discussion score will be the average of the average of the scores that students assign to one another and the score assigned by the professor. For instance, if the average of the scores assigned by a student’s fellow students is 8.5, and the score assigned by the professor is 8, then the student’s score would be 8.25.
1.3. Attendance.

Because a student’s presentation to the class, as well as his or her participation in class discussion presupposes being there, class attendance is required. An absent student will receive a 0 for the day. An absent student can only receive credit for attendance with an excuse deemed adequate by the instructor.

For each three unexcused absences a student will be docked 10% of the final grade.

A student who arrives late is expected to enter the classroom quietly. Habitual tardiness is unacceptiable. All cell phones must be turned off during class. No talking or any disturbance of any kind during lecturing or discussion will be tolerated.

Class is not scheduled on the following dates: Tuesday, March 11, and Thursday, March 13 (Spring break).

2. WRITTEN COMPONENT.

2.1. Written summaries.

The student is expected to summarize in writing each part of the following parts of the book:

a) Part One.
b) Part Two, Divisions I and II.
c) Part Two, Divisions III and IV.
d) Part Two, Divisions V.
e) Part Three, Divisions I and II.
f) Part Three, Division III.
g) Part Three, Division IV and V.
h) Part Four.

Each written summary of a book section should be typed and double-spaced, and should include the title of the part of the book to which the summary pertains and the name of the student whose summary it is.

The length of the summary will be dictated by the length of the portion of the book being summarized, but should be at least one page and should not exceed five pages.

A student is expected to prepare his or her own summary, and should not use the applicable summary that is in the book. Neither should a student simply assemble his or her summary from material provided by presenters.

Written summaries will be due at times indicated during the semester by the professor.

2.2 Paper.

A single paper, typed, double-spaced, and about 10-15 pages in length is due by the final day of the regular semester. The paper should be a critical exposition of the principal topic with which the book is concerned. That the paper is to be concerned with the topic of the book means that it should focus on the philosophical framework within which the question of the limit(s) of Abstraction in art must be raised. In the first part of the paper, the student should state in his or her own words what the
subject matter of the book is, and why those things philosophically relevant to Essentialist Abstraction are relevant to it. That is the expository aspect.

The paper should attend to the questions raised in the ‘course objectives’ section above, and should consider whether or not those things germane to the issue of the limit(s) of Abstraction have all been identified, and should consider too whether or not the relevance of those things identified has been properly assessed. This is the critical aspect of the paper, and in considering the interrelated points which constitute the argument of the book, it is comprehensive. As critical, this second aspect of the paper should also focus on perceived faults or merits of the work, and state the student’s reasons for those perceptions. Any disagreement with the author should be supported by argument. The expository aspect of the paper should consider the entire work, but, rather than taking the comprehensive critical approach mentioned, the critical aspect of the paper can focus in greater depth on a particular matter of relevance to the argument of the book, such as the institutional theory of art; the issue of artifacts and media; intentions and Intentionality; consciousness and objects; the metaphysics of logic; or impossible objects. However, a more specific critical focus should nevertheless tie that focus to the matter of Essentialist Abstraction.

Material from the assigned articles should be considered and used where relevant to the paper given the nature of its focus. Any use should be properly footnoted and should appear in the bibliography. Each paper should have a bibliography, and all material utilized by the paper, whether from the bibliography of the assigned text or elsewhere, should be cited.

The student is encouraged to begin work on ideas for the paper at the earliest time possible and to write more than a single draft of the paper. The professor will be happy to look at a copy of a preliminary draft as well as to discuss the student’s ideas for the paper with the student.

*The paper is due on or before the final day of class.* The paper must be submitted electronically as an attachment in the Assignments section of Blackboard. The student should keep a back-up copy on computer disk.

GRADING:

The oral portion of the course accounts for 40% of the student’s total grade. The presentation is 10% of the oral portion, and the discussion is the remaining 30% of this part of the course.

The written component accounts for 60% of the student’s grade for the course. The written summaries of the book will constitute 10% of the written component, and the paper constitutes the remaining 50% of this component.

*The paper is due on or before the final day of lectures, before final exam week.*

GRADING SCALE:

97-100 - A+
93-96  - A
90-92  - A-
80-89  - B+
83-86  - B
80-82  - B-
77-79  - C+
73-76  - C
COURSE MATERIALS:

Text:

*Subjects and Objects: Art, Essentialism, and Abstraction* - Jeffrey Strayer, Brill 2007

Articles:

Binkley, Timothy “Deciding about Art,” in Aagaard-Mogensen, p. 90-109
Brough, John “Who's Afraid of Marcel Duchamp?” in Dahlstrom, pp. 119-142
Crimp, Douglas “Opaque Surfaces,” in Meyer, (ed.)
Fried, Michael “Art and Objecthood,” in Batcock, *Minimal Art*, pp. 116-147
Houlgate, Stephen “Hegel and the 'End' of Art,” *The Owl of Minerva*, 29:1 (Fall 1997) pp. 1-
Judd, Donald “Specific Objects,” in Harrison and Wood pp. 809-813
Kosuth, Joseph “Art after Philosophy,” in Meyer, Ursula pp. 155-170
LeWitt, Sol “Paragraphs on Conceptual Art,” in Harrison and Wood pp. 834-837
LeWitt, Sol “Sentences on Conceptual Art,” in Harrison and Wood pp. 837-839
Morris, Robert “Notes on Sculpture, Parts I&II” in Battcock, Minimal Art, pp. 222-235
Morris, Robert “Notes on Sculpture, Part IV: Beyond Objects” in Harrison and Wood, pp. 868-873
Reinhardt, Ad “Writings,” in Battcock, The New Art, pp. 199-209
Reinhardt, Ad “Art as Art,” in Harrison and Wood, Art in Theory, pp. 806-809
Schmitz, Kenneth “The Bounds of Art,” in Dahlstrom, pp. 143-159
Strayer, Jeffrey “On the ‘Death of Art,’” in Butler, Clark pp. 29-34

ORDER OF READINGS:

Week 1:
Introduction; Part One, 1-2
Lippard and Chandler, “The Dematerialization of Art” (Presenter)

Week 2:
Part One, 3 and Greenberg, “Modernist Painting” (Presenter 1)
Greenberg, “After Abstract Expressionism” (Presenter 2)
Part One, 4-5 (Presenter 3)

Week 3:
Danto, “The Last Work of Art: Artworks and Real Things” (Presenter 1)
Danto, “The Artworld” (Presenter 2)
Strayer, Jeffrey “On the ‘Death of Art’” (Presenter 3)

Week 4:
Part Two Introduction and Part Two, Division I, 1 (Presenter 1)
Binkley, “Piece: Contra Aesthetics” (Co-presenters)
Brough, “Who’s Afraid of Marcel Duchamp?” (Co-presenters)
Part Two, Division I, 5-8 (Presenter 2)

Week 5:
Part Two, Division II, 1-5 (Presenter)
Tormey, "Indeterminacy and Identity in Art" (Co-presenters)
Binkley, "Deciding about Art" (Co-presenters)

Week 6:

Goldsmith, "The Readymades of Marcel Duchamp: The Ambiguities of an Aesthetic Revolution" (Co-presenters)
Part Two, Division III, 1-4 (Co-presenters)

Week 7:

Part Two, Division III, 5-7 (Co-presenters)
Part Two, Division III, 8-11 (Co-presenters)

Week 8:

Part Two, Division IV, 1-8 (Co-presenters)
Reinhardt, "Writings" and Reinhardt, "Art as Art" (Presenter)
Judd, Donald "Specific Objects" (Presenter)
Meyer, Ursula "Introduction" to Conceptual Art (Presenter)

Week 9:

Kosuth, "Art after Philosophy" (Presenter)
Dickie, "The Institutional Theory of Art" (Co-presenters)
Part Two, Division V
Fried, "Art and Objecthood" (Co-presenters)
Lippard, "New York Letter 1965: Reinhardt, Duchamp, Morris" (Presenter)

Week 10:

Part Three, Division I (Co-presenters)
Wollheim, "Minimal Art" (Co-presenters)
Part Three, Division II §1.1-§1.3 (Co-presenters)

Week 11:

Burgin, "Situational Aesthetics" (Presenter)
Part Three, Division II (Co-presenters)

Week 12:

Part Three, Division III, 1-8 (Presenter)
LeWitt, "Paragraphs on Conceptual Art" and LeWitt, "Sentences on Conceptual Art" (Presenter)
Part Three, Division III, 9-16 (Co-presenters)
Week 13:

Morris, “Notes on Sculpture, Parts I&II” and Morris, “Notes on Sculpture, Part IV: Beyond Objects” (Co-presenters)
Part Three, Division IV, 1-3 (Co-presenters)

Week 14:

Part Three, Division IV, 4-8 (Co-presenters)
Part Three, Division IV, 9-13, Division V (Co-presenters)

Week 15:

Lippard, Lucy “Escape Attempts” (Presenter)
Part Four, 1-4 (Co-presenters)
Part Four, 5-7 (Presenter)

The paper is due on or before the final day of class.

Although a final exam will not be given as part of this course, the instructor reserves the right to have the class meet on the scheduled day of the final, should that prove to be necessary.

The professor also reserves the right to change any aspect of this syllabus should he consider that to be required. Students will of course be apprised of any changes made.

POLICY REGARDING ACADEMIC DISHONESTY:

Academic honesty is expected of all students. Students are responsible for knowing how to maintain academic honesty and for abstaining from cheating, the appearance of cheating, and permitting or assisting in another’s cheating. Instructors are responsible for fostering the intellectual honesty and development of students, and for applying methods of teaching, examination, and assignments that discourage student dishonesty.

University policies that pertain to academic dishonesty can be found in the Bulletin as “Academic Regulations, part 7.9 (Academic Honesty).” They are also available online at http://www.ipfw.edu/academics/regulations/honesty.shtml and are supplemented by part II.A (Academic Misconduct) of the “Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct” as it can be found in the Bulletin and in the Student Handbook Planner. The policies on academic dishonesty of the IPFW Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies compliment IPFW’s policies on academic dishonesty. The interested student may contact the department for a copy.

DISABILITIES STATEMENT:

If you have a disability and need assistance, special arrangements can be made to accommodate most needs. Contact the Director of Services for Students with Disabilities (Walb, room 113,
telephone number 481-6658), as soon as possible to work out the details. Once the Director has provided you with a letter attesting to your needs for modification, bring the letter to me. For more information, please visit the web site for SSD at http://www.ipfw.edu/ssd/.

Eric Wagenfeld, MA, LLPC, NCC
Director, Services for Students With Disabilities & ADA Coordinator
113 Walb Student Union
Indiana University-Purdue University Ft. Wayne

(260) 481-6658 email: wagenfee@ipfw.edu