Kalon as Objective Functional Fitness

A Platonic–Aristotelian Account of Harmony, Context, and Aesthetic Discovery

I. Orientation and thesis

Certain objects arrest our attention in a distinctive way. A mathematical proof, a Bach fugue, a late Mondrian composition, a scientific theory of unexpected scope: each may strike us as kalon, that Greek term variously translated as beautiful, noble, or fine. What do we recognize in such objects, and what makes that recognition warranted?

The thesis defended here is that kalon consists in objective functional fitness. Functional harmony is the ordering of constituents through which a whole realizes powers unavailable to its parts in isolation. This ordering may be assessed intrinsically, in the organization of the object, or contextually, in its fitness to an objective environment. Both are species of kalon. Beauty in the subject-relative sense, by contrast, is a third kind of fitness: the relation between an object and the particular constitution of a perceiver.

The argument has two stages. First, it specifies the metaphysical ground of objective fitness: the ordered co-functioning of parts and wholes. Second, it explains how that unity becomes intelligible to a finite mind. Explanatory compression is the apprehension of the many through their functional organization; it is a consequence and mode of discovery of harmony, not an independent value-making property. The resulting account combines Platonic unity with Aristotelian attention to form, activity, and characteristic powers, without reducing aesthetic excellence to pleasurable response. [1]

The distinction between metaphysics and epistemology is decisive. An organism does not acquire its coordination when a naturalist understands it; a proof does not acquire its inferential organization when a mathematician recognizes it. Aesthetic discovery is answerable to what is there. Yet objective fitness does not guarantee

that a particular observer will find the object beautiful, attractive, or welcome.

II. Functional harmony and intrinsic fitness

Functional harmony is not mere coexistence, symmetry, or descriptive regularity. A collection of unrelated things in a box is an aggregate; a repeating wallpaper pattern may be highly predictable without displaying an integrated functional achievement. What matters is the relation in which parts jointly realize the capacities of a whole. The Greek prefix syn (σύν), meaning together, aptly names this co-functioning. [2] Chemical isomers provide a vivid illustration. Ethanol and dimethyl ether share a molecular formula, C_2H_6O, yet differences of arrangement produce radically different chemical and physical properties. The parts' identities do not suffice to explain the compound's powers; their relations matter. Likewise, the organization of an eye makes sight possible, and the configuration of a computer makes computation possible. These are not merely regular arrangements but causally consequential unities.

This account is Aristotelian in inspiration, though it is not offered as a verbatim interpretation of Aristotle. Form explains why a composite is one organized thing and why it can act as it does. Fitness adds an evaluative dimension: how well a configuration realizes the relevant powers. This requires identifying a standard of assessment. For a knife, cutting is an evident standard; for an artwork or a proof, the standard must be defended rather than borrowed uncritically from tool-use. [3]

Functional fitness need not be understood exclusively in instrumental terms. A knife possesses an externally recognizable function—cutting—against which its organization may be assessed. But a mathematical proof or an abstract painting need not serve an analogous practical end. Their relevant powers may instead arise from their internal organization: a proof establishes a conclusion through valid inferential relations, while a painting can organize visual attention, integrate contrasts, sustain tensions, and bring apparently independent elements into a mutually supporting whole.

These capacities are not simply purposes stipulated by an observer. They are possibilities enabled or constrained by the actual relations among the parts. A proposed account of an object's functional organization must therefore identify what its arrangement makes possible, what it excludes, and how its constituent elements contribute to the realization of those capacities.

This distinction preserves the objectivity of functional fitness without requiring that every excellent object serve an external practical purpose. It also prevents internal coherence alone from becoming a sufficient condition of kalon: the organization must realize some determinate power or excellence, rather than merely exhibit consistency. [13]

Functional integration and functional excellence must also be distinguished. Parts may work together to some degree while the whole works badly. Accordingly, fitness is gradable. A modestly integrated structure may possess modest fitness; exceptionally integrated organization may possess exceptional fitness. The claim is not that every effective instrument is morally admirable or pleasant to behold. Moral value, practical desirability, and the fitness of an organized whole are distinguishable assessments.

III. Three species of fitness

Three species of fitness arise according to the terms of the relation being assessed. The underlying principle is one; the relata differ.

First, intrinsic objective fitness is the fitness of parts within an object. The limbs, sensory organs, and exoskeleton of an insect work together in locomotion and environmental responsiveness. A mathematical proof similarly displays inferential relations through which its propositions constitute an intelligible demonstration. Intrinsic fitness is observer-independent, though its recognition requires competence.

Second, objective contextual fitness is the fitness of an object relative to an environment, situation, practice, or explanatory field. An organism may be well adapted to its ecological niche; a building may answer the demands of its site; a theory may fit the phenomena it explains. The relation is contextual without being constituted by any individual's preferences. Different environments can yield different objective assessments of the same thing. Contexts must therefore be specified rather than treated as interchangeable. [4]

Third, subjective contextual fitness is the fit between an object and the particular constitution of a perceiver. Memories, needs, dispositions, tastes, and vulnerabilities

can make one work deeply resonant for one person and inert for another. This is a genuine relational fact, not mere projection, but it is partly constituted by the subject. In the present stipulative vocabulary, beauty in this subject-relative sense names this third species; kalon names the first two. This is a revisionary distinction, not a claim that ordinary language invariably separates the words in this way. [5]

A cockroach brings the distinctions into focus. Its anatomy may display remarkable intrinsic fitness; its adaptations may be highly effective in its ecological niche. Yet its presence in a kitchen may be objectively undesirable because of contamination risks, and a person may experience disgust because of learned associations or evolved sensitivities. Such aversion does not negate the animal's intrinsic coordination. Nor does the emotion itself establish that every encountered insect presents a real danger. One and the same object can be admirable under one description, unsuitable under another, and subjectively repulsive under a third. [6]

The example generalizes. A technically excellent building may fit its structural demands but clash with its surroundings; a sophisticated musical work may possess objective internal organization while failing to move a listener. Aesthetic disagreement is therefore sometimes disagreement about the object, sometimes about its context, and sometimes a difference in subject-relative fit. Distinguishing these cases does not dissolve every dispute, but it prevents them from being confused.

IV. Harmony, intelligibility, and compression

How does a finite mind recognize objective functional harmony? The key is explanatory compression: understanding a multiplicity of parts through the principle of their organization. When the parts of a system co-function, they need not be understood as an unrelated inventory. Their relations can be explained by reference to the capacities and constraints of the whole. In this explanatory sense, functional harmony necessarily admits of compression. [7]

The necessity must be stated carefully. It is not a theorem that every integrated object has a shorter lossless algorithmic encoding than its list of parts. Explanatory compression concerns the unity of an account, not simply the number of bits needed to reconstruct every detail. The organizing principle makes many relationships intelligible together. Statistical repetition, by contrast, may be compressible without constituting a power-realizing whole.

The compression relevant to aesthetic intelligibility is explanatory rather than merely descriptive. A repetitive wallpaper pattern may admit an exceptionally short description without thereby exhibiting significant functional integration. Conversely, a complex musical composition may require an extensive description while nevertheless admitting a powerful unifying explanation.

The relevant economy is therefore not simply a reduction in information but a reduction in explanatory independence. Features that initially appear to require separate explanations become intelligible through a common organizing principle. The ideal is maximal explanatory coverage with minimal independent assumptions, subject always to fidelity to the particular organization of the object.

Simplicity alone cannot establish explanatory adequacy. A short interpretation may ignore important details, impose artificial regularities, or fail to distinguish the actual configuration from plausible alternatives. A successful explanation must therefore illuminate not only why the object's features coexist, but how they constrain one another and why certain modifications would undermine the organization of the whole.

Explanatory compression consequently remains an epistemic achievement: it renders functional organization intelligible without constituting the functional excellence being explained. The object's organization is ontologically prior to the critic's discovery of it. [14]

Deep symmetry is one especially illuminating route to compression: knowing a part and a transformation rule may allow the rest to be inferred. But functional organization need not exhibit exact mathematical symmetry. The broader claim is that constraints and co-functioning relations make the multiplicity intelligible through a whole. Symmetry is thus a powerful example, not a necessary intermediary.

Nor is compression alone sufficient for kalon. Wallpaper is predictable, but its repetition may offer little functional integration or explanatory depth. A Bach fugue, by contrast, coordinates multiple voices through a subject and its transformations; what initially appears independent becomes intelligible as a structured musical development. The contrast is not simply between short and long descriptions but

between superficial recurrence and organized achievement.

Unexpected simplicity from substantial multiplicity often intensifies aesthetic discovery. Yet the surprise belongs to the experience of recognition, while the harmony belongs to the work. An expert who sees the principle immediately does not thereby diminish the object's objective fitness. The cone model below accordingly models discovery and experienced depth, not the metaphysical degree of kalon itself. [8]

V. Aesthetic perception as discovery

With these concepts in place, we can describe the phenomenology of aesthetic perception more precisely. The perceiver confronts an object that initially presents as multiplicity. A painting offers colors, shapes, textures, spatial relations; a proof offers definitions, lemmas, constructions; a symphony offers voices, harmonies, rhythmic patterns. At first encounter, many organizational principles appear possible. The object is alive with interpretive possibilities, each one a potential axis of intelligibility. The cognitive act distinctive of aesthetic perception is what we might call supposing unity.

The mind asks: what unity, if any, would make all of this necessary? This is not a passive reception of sensory data but an active interpretive effort. Hypotheses are generated, tested against the evidence, revised or rejected. The perceiver is trying to find a principle that would explain why the object has precisely these features in precisely these relations. Crucially, this hypothesis of unity is answerable to the object . The proposed unifying principle must actively explain all parts of the object as it appears; it cannot simply be imposed by fiat.

Failed unities collapse explanatorily, not merely psychologically. That is, a proposed principle fails not because the perceiver loses interest or changes mood, but because the object itself resists the interpretation—because features remain that the principle cannot accommodate, because tensions persist that the principle cannot

resolve. The object's resistance to interpretation constrains the hypothesis; the perceiver cannot simply will unity into existence. When a genuine unifying principle is found—one that survives the object's resistance—something characteristic happens.

The hypothesis suddenly explains much more than expected with far fewer assumptions than anticipated. What had seemed like independent, arbitrary features now appear as necessary consequences of a single governing idea. Intelligibility increases dramatically while cognitive effort drops. This is the moment of compression: the description of the object collapses from a long list of particulars to a short generative rule. Pleasure typically accompanies this insight, and the pleasure is not incidental—it signals that something cognitively significant has occurred.

But compression and pleasure are epistemic markers of the mind's successful attunement to functional unity, not the basis of that unity's reality. The functional harmony was there before it was discovered; the discovery brings the perceiver into cognitive contact with something that exists independently.

Aesthetic perception is thus abductive rather than deductive. The perceiver does not begin with a known principle from which the particulars can simply be derived; the principle must be provisionally proposed and tested. Competing hypotheses are assessed by explanatory coverage, economy, and fidelity to the work's actual features. A successful hypothesis reveals dependencies that were not initially apparent, but the discovery of unity must not be confused with its creation. The resulting pleasure belongs to the experience of recognition, whereas the functional fitness recognized belongs to the object.

VI. The cone model of aesthetic discovery

A geometric model may help to clarify the structure of aesthetic experience. Imagine a cone with its tip pointing upward. The model is epistemic rather than ontological: it captures how kalon is discovered, not what kalon is. But it also serves as a criterion for distinguishing kalon-type compressibility from mere pattern. The base of the cone represents the apparent multiplicity with which perception begins. Here we find the perceptual features of the object, the artistic choices that seem to have been made, the structural tensions that demand resolution, the alternative explanations

that compete for uptake.

In Platonic language, these are the shadows on the cave wall—the manifold appearances that await unification. The wider the base, the greater the initial multiplicity, the more the object presents as a genuine manifold demanding explanation. Crucially, the width of the base should be understood modally—as the range of live possibilities ruled out—rather than merely materially. The tip of the cone represents the unifying form. Here we find the functional necessity that governs the whole, the single principle or rule that generates the multiplicity below, the internal harmony that makes each part intelligible in light of every other.

In Platonic language, this is the real object casting the shadows. The narrower the tip, the simpler the governing principle, the more the whole is unified by a single idea. The height of the cone represents the resistance to premature closure—how long the multiplicity remains live before the unity snaps into place. A shallow cone means the unity is immediately obvious; the pattern is evident at a glance. A tall cone means the perceiver must work for the discovery, sustaining interpretive engagement before the unifying principle reveals itself.

Height is not fully independent of base-width: a genuinely wide base naturally resists quick unification. But height captures something additional—the temporal or inferential dimension of the discovery, the duration of productive uncertainty. The most striking discoveries of kalon, on this model, involve a wide base (genuine multiplicity, high apparent complexity), a narrow tip (simple governing form, maximal unity), and nontrivial height (earned intelligibility, discovery that requires engagement). When these conditions are met, the compression ratio is maximal: an enormous explanatory payoff achieved from minimal theoretical resources, but only after real cognitive work.

This helps explain why the discovery of kalon can produce distinctive pleasure: the payoff is proportional to the initial investment, and the discovery feels like genuine

insight rather than trivial recognition.

VII. Artistic production and retrospective necessity

The structure of aesthetic perception illuminates artistic creation, but the two activities must not be identified. Consider a painter confronting a blank canvas. The first stroke admits innumerable possible continuations. The second stroke, however, must stand in some relation to the first, and each subsequent decision introduces further constraints upon the developing composition. As the work proceeds, its elements acquire increasingly determinate significance through their relations to the emerging whole.

Later decisions may also transform the significance of earlier ones. A mark that initially appeared arbitrary can become indispensable to the completed composition. This does not mean that the artist was logically compelled to make precisely those choices. The necessity is conditional and retrospective: given the organization that has emerged, certain elements can now be understood as performing functions that alternative arrangements would not preserve.

The process is therefore one of progressive determination rather than strict deduction. Artistic production establishes, discovers, and revises relations among elements until they form an organization capable of sustaining the work's characteristic powers. Aesthetic interpretation proceeds differently. Whereas the artist moves from an open field of possibilities toward a completed configuration, the critic begins with that configuration and attempts to reconstruct the principles that explain its organization. The critic need not reproduce the artist's actual creative process or conscious intentions. What matters is whether the proposed principles illuminate the functional relationships exhibited by the finished work. [15]

Art criticism as explanatory inquiry

If aesthetic appreciation involves the discovery of functional harmony, art criticism may be understood as its disciplined explanatory articulation. The critic confronts a completed work and asks what hypothetical unity would render its particular features maximally intelligible.

Why does this passage occur here? Why is this color repeated? Why does the composition resolve in this manner rather than another? Why does an apparent irregularity contribute to the whole instead of disrupting it?

The critic proposes organizing principles capable of answering such questions. These hypotheses are assessed according to three criteria: explanatory coverage, economy, and fidelity. A successful interpretation explains a substantial range of the work's particular features through relatively few independent assumptions, while remaining answerable to the details and constraints of the work itself.

Such an interpretation does more than identify recurring patterns. It reveals how the parts support, constrain, and sometimes transform one another. It also illuminates counterfactual relationships: how altering or removing an element might weaken the organization that gives the work its distinctive character.

Interpretations may nevertheless remain plural. Different explanatory principles can illuminate different real relations within the same object, and no single interpretation need exhaust its intelligibility. The ideal is not the imposition of a uniquely simple description, but the progressive discovery of the work's actual functional organization.

Art criticism is thus neither the unrestricted projection of meaning nor the mere recovery of authorial intention. It is a form of abductive inquiry whose hypotheses are constrained by the object they seek to explain. Its achievement consists in making objective functional harmony intelligible, not in constituting that harmony through interpretation.

VIII. Domains of kalon

The account developed here applies across multiple domains. In each case, kalon appears when functional harmony renders multiplicity intelligible—when a wide base resolves into a narrow tip, when unexpected simplicity emerges from genuine complexity.

Visual Art

Consider Mondrian's late compositions. The initial impression is of arbitrary asymmetry: rectangles of various sizes filled with primary colors, black lines of varying thickness, white spaces distributed without obvious pattern. The base is wide—there appears to be no rule governing the distribution.

But sustained attention reveals otherwise. The compositions are generated by a strict grammar: constraints on adjacency, proportion, color distribution, and edge treatment that, once grasped, render the whole intelligible. The tip is narrow. The symmetry lies not in mirroring but in constraint—in the fact that knowing the grammar plus some of the elements allows one to see why the rest must be as they are.

Music

A Bach fugue exemplifies the same structure in a temporal medium. Multiple independent voices weave together, each pursuing its own melodic line while harmonizing with the others.

The initial impression is of astonishing complexity—a wide base. How can so many things happen simultaneously without collision or chaos? But the answer lies in the fugue subject—a single melodic idea that governs all the transformations. The voices are not independent after all; they are variations on a theme, permutations of a

single generative cell. Once the subject is grasped, large stretches of the fugue become predictable. One subject governs manifold voices: wide base, narrow tip.

Mathematics

Euclid's Elements offers a paradigm of mathematical kalon .

The work begins with a handful of definitions, postulates, and common notions—an almost absurdly minimal foundation (narrow tip). From this foundation, an enormous structure is erected: propositions about triangles, circles, proportions, primes, solids (wide base, considered as the domain of truths requiring explanation). The diversity of the results far exceeds what the axioms seem to promise. Yet each proposition follows necessarily from what precedes it. Minimal axioms explain maximal structure.

Natural Science

Newtonian mechanics achieves something analogous in
the empirical domain.

The phenomena are staggeringly diverse: falling apples, planetary orbits, tidal patterns, the behavior of springs, the trajectories of projectiles. Before Newton, these seemed like separate problems requiring separate explanations—a wide base of apparently independent facts. Newton's laws unify them under a single framework: three laws of motion plus universal gravitation (narrow tip). Few laws unify vast phenomena. The world becomes compressible without becoming simple.

Ordinary Artifacts

The same structure appears in well-designed tools.

A good knife, a well-made chair, a properly balanced hammer—each exhibits parts arranged so that each explains the others' presence, the whole doing what a thing of that kind should do. The kalon of ordinary artifacts is no different in kind from the kalon of high art or abstract mathematics; it differs only in the width of the base and the visibility of the unifying principle.

IX. Platonic and Aristotelian framings

The account developed here synthesizes Platonic and Aristotelian themes while modifying both. From Plato we take the emphasis on unity behind appearances, on form as explanatory source, on intelligibility as a mark of the real. The cone model, with its opposition between the multiplicity at the base and the unity at the tip, is recognizably Platonic in structure—a geometricized allegory of the cave. From Aristotle we take the emphasis on functional necessity, on form as that which makes a thing do its work well. The σύν that grounds functional harmony is Aristotelian through and through: it is the togetherness of parts in a compound that enables the compound to realize its powers.

This Aristotelian emphasis prevents the Platonic framework from becoming too ethereal, too detached from the specific ways in which parts serve wholes and wholes govern parts. We might also note the Aristotelian concept of megethos —magnitude or scale—which appears in the Poetics as a condition for tragic excellence. On the present account, megethos is not size as such but the width of the cone's base—the genuine multiplicity that makes compression possible and discovery meaningful. Scale often helps because larger works can accommodate more complexity, more potential disorder, more interpretive possibilities.

But the relevant factor is not physical size but the extent to which the object presents a real manifold demanding unification.

X. Integrated definition and conclusion

The proposal can now be stated concisely. Kalon is objective functional fitness: either the intrinsic fitness of an organized whole or its objective fitness relative to a specified context. Subject-relative beauty is the fitness of an object to a particular perceiver. All three are forms of functional harmony, distinguished by the terms of their relations.

Where harmony exists, the multiplicity of parts admits an explanation through their

functional unity. That is the necessary connection to explanatory compression. The pleasure of insight, the experience of unexpected simplicity, and the dramatic movement from multiplicity to unity are features of aesthetic discovery. They do not create the organization discovered.

This account remains open to an important objection: why identify objective functional fitness with kalon, rather than regard it as one source of aesthetic value among others? The answer offered is that functional fitness explains the intelligible excellence shared by otherwise heterogeneous cases: biological organization, proofs, music, artifacts, and the appropriate coordination of action with circumstance. The claim is most compelling where a governing organization genuinely explains why the parts are as they are. Further work must test its reach against noble action, noninstrumental art, and forms of aesthetic experience that resist functional description. [12]

The philosophical ambition is therefore both realist and explanatory. What strikes us as fine is not merely whatever pleases us; nor is it a bare pattern. It is an order of parts and relations that can be understood as a functional whole. The many become intelligible through the one, and a finite mind can take pleasure in discovering what was already there.

Notes

1. Compare Plato, Philebus 64c–65a and Symposium 210e–211b, on beauty, measure, and unity; Aristotle, Metaphysics Z.17 and H.6, on form and composite unity. These are philosophical sources for the synthesis, not assertions that either author states the present threefold taxonomy.

2. Aristotle, Metaphysics H.6, 1045a8–35, treats the unity of matter and form through potentiality and actuality. The use of syn (σύν) as a label for functional co-organization is a constructive proposal rather than a technical Aristotelian doctrine.

3. See Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics I.7, 1097b22–1098a20, on characteristic activity and excellence; Robert Cummins, “Functional Analysis,” Journal of Philosophy 72 (1975): 741–765, for an influential analysis of function in terms of systemic capacities. Different accounts of biological and artifact function need not coincide.

4. Kendall L. Walton, “Categories of Art,” Philosophical Review 79 (1970): 334–367, demonstrates how appropriate categories affect aesthetic perception. Objective contextual fitness here extends beyond artistic categories to environmental and practical relations.

5. David Hume, “Of the Standard of Taste” (1757), and Frank Sibley, “Aesthetic Concepts,” Philosophical Review 68 (1959): 421–450, offer distinct resources for understanding judgment and perceptual discrimination. The present division between kalon

and subject-relative beauty is stipulative and must not be mistaken for ordinary-language consensus.

6. The cockroach example separates biological coordination, ecological adaptation, domestic suitability, and subjective aversion. Disease risk is context-dependent; disgust is not a reliable proof of contamination. The point is logical separation, not a general biological claim about every cockroach.

7. Michael Friedman, “Explanation and Scientific Understanding,” Journal of Philosophy 71 (1974): 5–19; Philip Kitcher, “Explanatory Unification,” in Scientific Explanation, ed. Philip Kitcher and Wesley Salmon (1989), 410–505. These approaches illuminate unification without establishing the stronger claim that all functional systems are algorithmically compressible.

8. George D. Birkhoff, Aesthetic Measure (1933), and Jürgen Schmidhuber, “Low-Complexity Art,” Leonardo 30 (1997): 97–103, illustrate mathematically inspired aesthetic approaches. The present account rejects descriptive economy as a sufficient ground of objective aesthetic fitness.

9. Nelson Goodman, Languages of Art (1968), provides a useful challenge to interpretations that merely project a convenient story onto a work. A successful unifying interpretation must constrain alternatives and explain features rather than simply rename them.

10. Glenn Parsons and Allen Carlson, Functional Beauty (Oxford University Press, 2008), especially chapters 3–4, is the most direct contemporary precedent for the aesthetic relevance of fitness and function. The present contribution distinguishes three relata of fitness and links their intelligibility to explanatory compression.

11. Immanuel Kant, Critique of the Power of Judgment, §§10–17, characterizes judgments of beauty through purposiveness without a determinate purpose. The present account differs by assigning objective functional organization a constitutive role in kalon, while acknowledging that not all art is straightforwardly instrumental.

12. Aristotle’s ethical kalon includes noble conduct as well as perceptually fine objects. See T. H. Irwin, “Beauty and Morality in Aristotle,” in Aristotle’s Nicomachean Ethics: A Critical Guide, ed. Jon Miller (Cambridge University Press, 2011). The proposed extension to practical action requires explaining how reason, circumstances, means, and ends can form an excellent unity without equating nobility with mere utility.

13. Compare Robert Cummins, “Functional Analysis,” Journal of Philosophy 72 (1975): 741–765, with Ruth Garrett Millikan, Language, Thought, and Other Biological Categories (MIT Press, 1984). The former concerns contributions to systemic capacities; the latter emphasizes selected effects. The present account does not require a single etiological theory of function.

14. Compare Michael Friedman, “Explanation and Scientific Understanding,” Journal of Philosophy 71 (1974): 5–19, and Philip Kitcher, “Explanatory Unification,” in Scientific Explanation (1989), 410–505. Explanatory economy is not identical with shortest possible coding length.

15. See W. K. Wimsatt and Monroe C. Beardsley, “The Intentional Fallacy,” Sewanee Review 54 (1946): 468–488; and Jerrold Levinson, “Intention and Interpretation in Literature,” in The Pleasures of Aesthetics (Cornell University Press, 1996). Intention may supply evidence without determining interpretive adequacy.

Bibliography

Aristotle. Metaphysics. Books Z–H.

Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics. Book I.

Birkhoff, George D. Aesthetic Measure. Harvard University Press, 1933.

Cummins, Robert. “Functional Analysis.” Journal of Philosophy 72 (1975): 741–765.

Friedman, Michael. “Explanation and Scientific Understanding.” Journal of Philosophy 71 (1974): 5–19.

Goodman, Nelson. Languages of Art. Bobbs-Merrill, 1968.

Hume, David. “Of the Standard of Taste.” 1757.

Irwin, T. H. “Beauty and Morality in Aristotle.” In Aristotle’s Nicomachean Ethics: A Critical Guide, edited by Jon Miller. Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Kant, Immanuel. Critique of the Power of Judgment. 1790.

Kitcher, Philip. “Explanatory Unification.” In Scientific Explanation, edited by Philip Kitcher and Wesley C. Salmon, 410–505. University of Minnesota Press, 1989.

Parsons, Glenn, and Allen Carlson. Functional Beauty. Oxford University Press, 2008.

Plato. Philebus; Symposium.

Schmidhuber, Jürgen. “Low-Complexity Art.” Leonardo 30 (1997): 97–103.

Sibley, Frank. “Aesthetic Concepts.” Philosophical Review 68 (1959): 421–450.

Walton, Kendall L. “Categories of Art.” Philosophical Review 79 (1970): 334–367.

Millikan, Ruth Garrett. Language, Thought, and Other Biological Categories. MIT Press, 1984.

Levinson, Jerrold. “Intention and Interpretation in Literature.” In The Pleasures of Aesthetics. Cornell University Press, 1996.

Wimsatt, W. K., and Monroe C. Beardsley. “The Intentional Fallacy.” Sewanee Review 54 (1946): 468–488.