

## CONCLUSION

The phrase 'work of art' is used by the theories of art, as geographic words like 'Eastern', 'Northern'. Such words we use to point a general area. They change their meaning, from one context to another context, on pointing to that location, accordingly to their use of words. The common ground they share is that they are geographic words, used in such a manner for some purpose. This is the way the word 'work of art' is used. It is not the same reference, from one theory of art to another theory of art. It is the difference in the ontological status of the artwork. Level of debating on this field is based on the clarification of other fields of philosophy. (Look at the way Scruton attempts to construct his theory) Such a theory as of Collingwood survives as a contending theory. The cases that against it are not strong enough. Unaccepted or accepted of one theory of art is to be questioned, is it only the choice of taste? The difference view in this account can be traced to its epistemic bias. Even if we decide that creativity or imagination is important to both art and science, it could still be a basis for distinguishing between genuine art and mere craft.

Summary of My Argument

1. Discourse about work of art is on many levels. This word is used differently in different theories.
2. Collingwood's theory is defensible, the charges against it not being strong enough. We do not have sufficient reason to reject his notion of the work of art.
3. What was thought to be unacceptable in his theory is really an epistemological assumption. The level of real debate is on this account.
4. Creation is what is important not only in art but in other areas of inquiry such as science. There are craftsmen in every areas of inquiry, but this skill and knowledge is not enough to produce progress.
5. The works of art give us something uniquely particular. The attempt to describe and generalize from its appearance's features is not relevant to appreciation.

