

Creativity: Study Approach and Concept

Rozin Vadim Markovich*

Professor, Chief Researcher at the Institute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia

***Corresponding Author:** Rozin Vadim Markovich, Professor, Chief Researcher at the Institute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia.

Received: December 12, 2023; **Published:** January 18, 2024

Abstract

The article examines the nature of creativity. The author criticizes generalizing hypotheses of creativity that are not based on the analysis of specific different types of creativity. It is impossible, he believes, to get to the essence of this phenomenon without first analyzing specific types of creativity, of which there are quite a lot. It is emphasized that such an analysis cannot be carried out without generalizing hypotheses about the nature of creativity, of which there will also be several. But they should be understood precisely as hypotheses, and not as the already comprehended “essence-truth” of creativity. In the concept of creativity proposed by the author, two levels are distinguished and characterized: external, which is the comprehension and assessment of the creativity of a certain individual (he created the “new”, “original”, is the “initiator of discursiveness”, “predetermined the development of a whole direction”, “our everything” and etc.), and the internal plan - the actual description of the process and mechanism of creativity.

Keywords: Creativity; Thinking; Approach; Reconstruction; Essay; Understanding; Context; Individual; Personality; Implementation

Introduction

I read with interest the articles in the new, 9th issue of the yearbook “Philosophy of Creativity” [9]. I wanted to get an answer to the question, what is creativity? I realized that the authors rather pose problems and discuss how creativity can be studied, in which disciplines, with the help of which concepts. In this regard, two points caught my attention. First, most authors understand creativity as an objective and unambiguous phenomenon, something like a natural, albeit anthropological, formation. Accordingly, creativity is discussed more within the framework of a natural science approach than a humanitarian one. The second point is that, obviously, understanding philosophy as understanding the essence of a phenomenon (M. Heidegger), they characterize creativity in a general way, as the essence of any type of creativity. Obviously, the authors believe that one or another specific type of creativity can be subsumed under the essence they have identified.

I will continue the tradition and also begin with a discussion of the approach to the knowledge of creativity. For me, creativity is a phenomenon of the spirit (humanitarian approach), which does not deny its objectivity and empirical existence, this was noted by M. Bakhtin. The humanitarian nature of creativity lies, firstly, in the fact that a number of its characteristics correspond to the researcher’s a priori ideas about creativity, and secondly, in the belief that creativity is a popular (multiple) phenomenon. The a priori nature of creativity, in my opinion, is due to the historical roots of this concept - closeness to the concept of “creation of God”, conceived as creation “from nothing”, “only from the creator”. Whether we want it or not, the meaning of creativity retains this “out of nothing” and “only from the

creator”, although the latter is us ourselves, creating something new, “striving in creativity”. And how else can one, for example, understand Svetlana Neretina’s commentary on my article “Experience in the analysis of poetic creativity, artistic thinking and experience (concepts, diagrams, metaphors)”?

“You are a great constructivist! - she writes. - You construct poems and comment on them yourself, like the Holy Scriptures (Dante did this - read it in the book, but he, too, rather “wrote them down” - that’s why it required a commentary - rather than adding them up). You have the strongest material basis, but I, if I’m talking about the matter of art (out of nothing means taking matter to help, copper, for example, for a statue), then in order to embody the loose. Your flesh is original. <...> I still believe that poetry is the best, the highest; a tense word passes through a person like electricity - you are its receiver. ...I still think that we are not the creators of the word <...> I am a person who does not believe in any religion, but is infinitely religious (religion is a re-election)” [7, p. 62]. Let us pay attention to the dilemma: am I only a “receiver”, or am I also a creator at the same time! I think the latter is both the creator and the receiver, but what? Word from God or from Culture?

“So”, thinks Yu.S. Morkina, “the subject of poetic creativity is reflexive in a special way... the object of reflection is the very relationship between the unique and the universal in the human personality... art is a form of self-knowledge of humanity with all its culture... a form of knowledge by each person of the universal human in himself” [3, p. 72-74]. It would, of course, be worth clarifying: in this case, “artistic self-knowledge”, which differs significantly from self-knowledge in philosophy or knowledge in science.

Now the second point is important for understanding creativity and its study. It is hardly possible to get to the essence of this phenomenon without first analyzing specific types of creativity, of which there are quite a lot. At the same time, I cannot be understood to mean that such an analysis can be carried out without generalizing hypotheses about the nature of creativity. Of course, they are necessary, but there will also be several of these hypotheses and they should be understood precisely as hypotheses, and not the “essence-truth” of creativity already comprehended by the philosopher. In an interesting article by E.I. Kochegarova’s “On the Question of Understanding Creativity in Modernity” partly implements an outwardly similar methodology, because its author proposes to generalize the concept of creativity, based on the reflection of a specific, author’s analysis of V. Nabokov’s poetic creativity. The difference, however, is significant: there is only one type of specific creativity, and not several different ones.

On the one hand, Kochegarova criticizes existing attempts to capture the essence of creativity. “Thus, an attempt to broadly read creativity as a diverse activity in which there is a place for creativity and the creation of meaning (one of the concepts of the essence of creativity. - V.R.), in essence, appears as an attempt to link together different types of activities (activity approach. - V.R.), representing already existing creative moves in their combinatorial novelty (another concept of creativity - V.R.), but without completely breaking with the tradition of the past and without offering other sources for their creative act. In a similar way, in the particular case of a creative form - in literature - this idea is formulated by V.B. Shklovsky: “In a work of art, in addition to those elements that consist of borrowings, there is also an element of creativity, the known will of the creator who builds the work, takes one piece and places it next to other pieces” [2, p. 36] (our italics - V.R.). That is, in this case, for Shklovsky, creativity is, on the one hand, “borrowing” from culture, on the other, a mysterious process of realizing the personality and will of the creator.

On the other hand, Kochegarova generalizes Nabokov’s creative process to creativity in general, which, in our opinion, is already problematic. “Thus”, she writes, “according to V.V. Nabokov, creativity (not only Nabokov, but in general. - V.R.) can be thought of as an act of creation, free from external conditions, motivated by internal confidence, requiring the unity of the aesthetic and ethical...confidence is not a substantive principle of creativity - a criminal can also act confidently, but this does not make his act either aesthetic or morally justified. However, with the correct choice/formation of a cognitive strategy, such confidence allows a person to create truly excellent work” [2, p. 372]. But you never know in the history of culture there were creators who doubted their creativity.

Based on research into specific types of creativity, I think it will be possible to build a theory of creativity. Now it's just the author's version of the "concept of creativity". Not a concept, but a concept; I will use this concept as a generalized hypothesis to analyze specific types of creativity. Let us remember what Neretina wrote.

"A concept is an objective unity of various aspects of the subject of the concept, which is created on the basis of the rules of reason or systematic knowledge. It is non-personal, directly related to the iconic and significant structures of language, which performs the functions of the formation of a certain thought, regardless of communication. This is the result, steps or moments of knowledge.

The concept is formed by speech... The "concept" is extremely individual. Changing the soul of an individual pondering a thing, in its formation it presupposes another subject (listener, reader), updating the meanings in the answers to his questions, which gives rise to a dispute. Addressing the listener always presupposed a simultaneous appeal to the transcendental source of speech - God" [4].

My experience in analyzing scientific and artistic creativity allows us to distinguish two levels in it [5]: external, so to speak, which represents the comprehension and assessment of the creativity of a certain individual (he created the "new", "original", is the "initiator of discursivity", "predetermined the development of the whole directions", "our everything" and so on), and the internal plan - the actual description of the process and mechanism of creativity. Who comprehends and evaluates the works of a person striving in creativity? Ultimately, history and culture come first to specific connoisseurs and experts. Naturally, they can make mistakes, and there have been many such cases.

Relatively recently, a similar incident occurred with the author. I wrote the above article "Experience in the analysis of poetic creativity, artistic thinking and experience (concepts, diagrams, metaphors)" and proposed it to the famous magazine "Man". Members of the magazine's editorial board (with the exception of two Westerners) rejected it on the grounds that I analyzed the composition of my own poems as an example of poetic creativity, but it was necessary to analyze the works of famous poets.

Being, as Kochegarova would say, confident in the quality of my work, I sent the article to another magazine, "Cognition and Experience", where it was immediately accepted, giving me the words of the editor-in-chief: "Vladimir Aleksandrovich, he himself was very surprised by the work and realized how it is unique - this is a rare case when the author's own personality becomes an instrument of knowledge and understanding". I am a philosopher, not a poet, but, nevertheless, I am really confident in my creativity, even poetic. Since I am not a poet and I understand that the assessment of creativity is competitive in culture and often requires a certain time, I am largely indifferent to what assessment history will make of my poetic creativity. In addition, I note that these poems served as material for the philosophical understanding of artistic creativity, perhaps this is where the novelty lies.

Now an analysis of the process and mechanism of creativity. It can be very different: from a simple reflection by the author of his own creative process (as, for example, we see this in G. Helmholtz or A. Poincaré) and its generalization to any creativity to a very sophisticated scientific and interdisciplinary research. Here, for example, is how Helmholtz realizes his work: "These happy inspirations often invade the head so quietly that you do not immediately notice their meaning, sometimes only chance will indicate later when and under what circumstances they came: a thought appears in the head, and from where she - you don't know yourself. But in other cases, a thought strikes us suddenly, without effort, like inspiration. As far as I can judge from personal experience, it is never born in a tired brain and never at a desk. Each time, I first had to turn my problem around in every possible way, so that all its twists and tangles would lie firmly in my head and could be learned again by heart, without the help of writing. It is usually impossible to get to this point without continuous work. Then, when the fatigue passed, an hour of complete bodily freshness and a feeling of calm well-being was required - and only then did good ideas come. Often... they appeared in the morning, upon awakening, as Gauss also noticed. They came especially willingly... during the hours of a leisurely climb through the wooded mountains, on a sunny day. The slightest amount of alcohol seemed to scare them away" [1].

But the author's analysis of the process and mechanism of composing the first of the poems mentioned here included: a reflexive description of the situation that provoked the composition, the choice of the general theme of the future poem, the search for the concept of the poem, the creation of diagrams and metaphors that reveal the plot and specific themes of the poem, work on coordination and mutual support of expressive means, polishing poetic reality [7]. In addition, in this article I discussed what a scheme, metaphor, concept, means of expression, artistic reality are, why it is better to analyze one's own creativity, and finally, I outlined some features of poetic creativity. That is, it was a complex, interdisciplinary philosophical study.

Here a natural question arises: why was I sure that I was describing creativity? Firstly, because I analyzed how I created and created this poem. Secondly, because I relate the plans and concepts of my activity in creating a poem listed here to the realization of personality, with their help I comprehend and model this realization. Who creates a new work, isn't it a person (individual)? Personality in symbiosis with culture. Therefore, I had to consider the means that I borrowed from culture in the course of writing (Immanuel Swedenborg's idea of man, the scenario of a meeting of a deceased soul with God, the activity of a guardian angel, etc.).

The next question: the process and mechanism of creativity can be described in different ways, with varying degrees of depth, the question is, what does this depend on? First of all, it depends on the nature of the problem that the researcher undertakes to solve. For example, when I analyzed the process of composing the poem presented above, I was interested in the nature of artistic creativity, and within the framework of the methodological approach, the latter set a specific level of analysis of creativity. But after reading Natalya Smirnova's article "Imaginative schemes in the structure of creative meaning-making" in the 9th issue, I formulated a new task for myself - to understand the role in the creative process of not only intellectual structures (for example, diagrams and metaphors), but also bodily (somatic). Marina Tsvetaeva writes that it is not she who composes, but Poetry, and her role is not to get tired of waiting for the right word to come. Similarly, my teacher G.P. Shchedrovitsky argued that it is not he who thinks, but thinking, understood as a social whole, and he himself is just a substrate of thinking.

It turns out that the source of creativity is located outside of man. On the contrary, according to J. Lakoff and M. Johnson, the source of creativity is threefold and purely anthropological: in our experience, physicality and intellect. "As we now understand", Smirnova outlines the approach of these thinkers, "cognition is not a "purely rational" activity (Kant comes to mind - V.R.), but a bodily-embodied process of human meaning-making, through which we give meaning to our experience... J Lakoff and M. Johnson postulate that all meanings, processes of thinking and symbolic manifestation are rooted in patterns of sensory perception and bodily movement" [8, pp. 197-198].

In my research, I came to a completely different relationship between intellect and corporeality: firstly, this relationship is mediated by semiotics (signs and patterns), and secondly, it is semiotics, behind which sociality stands, that forms corporeality and sensuality. To clarify what has been said, I will consider a case - one of Carl Jung's teenage memories. On a beautiful summer day in 1887, Jung thought: "The world is beautiful and the church is beautiful, and God, who created all this, sits far, far away in the blue sky on a golden throne and... Here my thoughts stopped and I felt suffocated. I was numb and remembered only one thing: Don't think now! Something terrible is coming.

(After three days and sleepless nights, difficult from internal struggle and experiences, Jung still allowed himself to finish the thought he had begun and such a seemingly harmless thought).

I gathered all my courage, as if I had suddenly decided to immediately jump into the fires of hell, and gave the thought the opportunity to appear. I saw the cathedral in front of me, the blue sky. God sits on his golden throne, high above the world - and from under the throne a piece of feces falls onto the sparkling new roof of the cathedral, breaks through it, everything collapses, the walls of the cathedral are broken into pieces.

That's it! I felt an incredible relief. Instead of the expected curse, grace descended on me, and with it an inexpressible bliss that I had

never known... I understood many things that I did not understand before, I understood what my father never understood - the will of God... Father accepted the biblical commandments as a guide, he believed in God as the Bible prescribed and as his father taught him. But he did not know the living God, who stands, free and omnipotent, above the Bible and above the Church, who calls people to become just as free. God, for the sake of fulfilling His Will, can force the father to abandon all his views and beliefs. Testing human courage, God forces one to abandon traditions, no matter how sacred they may be" [10, p. 46, 50].

Before us is a complex scheme and a new vision of reality, which Jung spent three days trying to achieve. It sets not only a new understanding of God, but also an attitude toward practical new action—a break with the church and the creator: "In this religion", Jung writes after his first communion, "I no longer found God. I knew that I would never be able to take part in this ceremony again. Church is a place where I will never go again. Everything is dead there, there is no life there. I was overcome with pity for my father. I realized the tragedy of his profession and life. He struggled with death, an existence he could not acknowledge. An abyss opened between him and me, it was limitless, and I did not see the possibility of ever overcoming it" [10, p. 64].

In the book "Introduction to Schematics" I show that schematics allow one to resolve "problem situations", allow one to understand what is happening, since they set a new reality and create conditions for new action. What was the problematic situation for Jung? He was occupied with two existential problems. First. Relationship with father, hereditary clergyman. According to Jung, the father dogmatically fulfilled his duty: having religious doubts, he did not try to resolve them, and in general was not free in relation to the Christian Faith and God. The second problem is building your own relationship with God, clarifying your relationship to the Church. Knowing what Jung then did, radically breaking with his father and the church, we can assume that even before his first communion he wanted to break off this relationship, but could not admit it to himself, since such an act would look in the eyes of believers (and Jung, of course, belonged to them) blasphemous.

It is interesting that the decision for Jung is first taken by his psyche, which, under the pressure of the desire to resolve the problematic situation, produced an amazing hallucination-fantasy that frightened him as a believer. For three days Jung lived with this hint and involuntarily looked for a way to justify it, since this was exactly the turn of events that he, without admitting it, wanted. The obstacle to recognizing the possibility of breaking with his father and the church was precisely faith, the fear that God would punish him. What God? The one that my father and the church talked about. What if, somewhere in the background of consciousness, Jung suggested, God was completely different, more like a revolutionary. Such a God suited Jung very well; he could give permission to break with his father and the church. But how can such a God be brought to light (into consciousness)? By constructing a schema where God was already different. In this new reality, the "free and omnipotent" God "stands above the Bible and above the Church", "calls people to become just as free", He "can force a father to abandon all his views and beliefs", "forces one to abandon traditions, no matter how they were not sacred".

Let us now see how Jung created a new God. It is forced, of course, but Jung begins with the old reality, borrowing from it the figure of God. Further, he attributes to Him the hypostasis of a revolutionary, therefore, he is forced to omit (forget) other characteristics of the Creator that contradict the new hypostasis. As a revolutionary, the new God can start a revolution, destroy something and create something. So, Jung organizes this revolution, in which God indecently destroys the church and gives the sanction for the break that Jung needs. It is worth paying attention: Jung not only introduces a new objectivity - the revolutionary God, but also prescribes Him in the new world, while at the same time equipping this world. The new world is the world of the revolutionary God, the world of revolutionary events initiated by the new God. It is not enough to create one or several new objects (characters), you need to build a new reality in which you can live in a new way.

Does Jung realize that he found himself in a new reality, in a new world (by the way, which he himself built)? I think that partly yes, he realizes: this is evidenced by his phrase: "instead of the expected curse, grace descended on me, and with it an inexpressible bliss that I had never known... I understood a lot that I did not understand before, I understood what my father never understood was the will of

God". I think the role of awareness of the new reality (world), as different from other realities, is very important here, without this it is impossible to change both consciousness and behavior.

Conclusion

What does the case discussed here show? The initial reaction of the body, i.e. a complex bodily, somatic process (the vision of God destroying the church, fear and other experiences) was determined by the intersubjective problematic situation in which Jung found himself immersed. As I show in my work, this reaction can be interpreted as a "daydream". The next somatic reaction (the perception of God as a revolutionary) was determined by the scheme constructed by Jung. Both responses represent a contextual response of physicality. Just as in response to our desire (attitude) to actualize (remember) something, memory provides us with what we expected; in this case, the problematic situation and the scheme constructed by Jung inclined (determined) the psyche to first launch a waking dream, and then program the perception of God in the necessary way.

It is important for me to note that the transition to the level of analysis of corporeality and the explanation of the somatic reaction presented here, with which one can agree or not, were due to the change in task that occurred after reading Smirnova's article, as well as my ideas about personality and creativity. Generalizing this example, it can be argued that the level of analysis and specification of creativity, as a rule, correlates with the type of problem that the researcher undertakes to solve, and no less with his concept of creativity and man.

Bibliography

1. Hadamard J. "Study of the psychology of the invention process in the field of mathematics". M (1970): 146-147.
2. Kochegarova EI. "On the question of understanding the creativity of our time". *Philosophy of Creativity Yearbook/RAS, Institute of Philosophy. M.*, 9 (2023): 361-375.
3. Morkina Yu S. "The subject of poetic creativity: personal as universal". *Ibid*: 67-76.
4. Neretina SS. *Concept. Concepts and categories*.
5. Rozin VM. "Artistic creativity through the prism of the author's personality (based on the reconstruction of Ivan Bunin's famous short story "Easy Breathing")". *Philosophy of Creativity* 9 (2023).
6. Rozin VM. "Introduction to circuitry: circuits in philosophy, culture, science, design". M: URSS (2011): 255.
7. Rozin VM. "Experience in the analysis of poetic creativity, artistic thinking and experience (concepts, diagrams, metaphors)". *Cognition and Experience* 3.4 (2022): 49-63.
8. Smirnova NM. "Figurative schemes in the structure of creative meaning". *Philosophy of Creativity* 9 (2023): 181-221.
9. *Philosophy of creativity. Yearbook/RAS, Institute of Philosophy. M*, 9 (2023).
10. Jung K. "Memories, dreams, reflections". Kiev, Air Land (1994): 405.

Volume 13 Issue 2 February 2024

©All rights reserved by Rozin Vadim Markovich.