



“NEGATIVE” AND “POSITIVE” CONCEPTIONS OF CREATIVITY: “ONTOLOGICAL MEASURES” AND INTENTIONALITY

Ganna Biłyk

Sposoby podejścia do rozumienia twórczości można podzielić ze względu „wskaźnik ontologiczny”. Ujęcie *pozytywne* mówi, że twórczość dodaje do świata pewien nowy byt. Koncepcja *negatywna* stwierdza, że jeden z elementów bytu zostaje w procesie twórczości usunięty. Analizując relację „twórca – twórczość”, w każdej koncepcji twórczości można wyodrębnić „nakierowanie” działania twórczego – albo na dodanie nowego bytu, albo na jego usunięcie. Przykładowo, twórczość *negatywna* jest możliwa tylko w ten sposób, że „twórca” usuwa pewien byt. Jako reprezentatywne przykłady zostały wybrane koncepcje Berdiajewa i Blanchota. Badania pokazują ponadto, że jest więcej złożonych podejść do rozumienia twórczości, na przykład podejście „neutralne” bądź *transformatywne*, które mówi o przekształcaniu istniejącego w świecie bytu. Antropologiczny aspekt twórczości ujawnia się w pojęciu *intencjonalności*. Pojęcie to stwarza możliwość różnych ujęć i koncepcji na polu praktyki twórczej.

Słowa kluczowe: twórczość, koncepcje „negatywne”, koncepcje „pozytywne”, intencjonalność

The scheme of creativity

Creativity is widely understood as a way of being and a means of existence. This existence presents an attitude to the world. In fact, philosophy of creativity studies connections people create or imitate in relation to the world through creativity. Problems of precedence of the source of creativity and of means and possibilities of its expression become the focus of the philosophers' research. And here two of the most fundamental questions arise: what type of background does the need to write come from, and whether creativity has to be reduced to a personality of an author: “We do not write according to what we are; we are according to what we write. But where does what is written come

from? Still from us? From a possibility in ourselves which is discovered and affirmed only through literary endeavors?"¹.

A source of creativity cannot be only reduced to the author's I. On the other hand, there are no reasons to locate creativity originally somewhere beyond the limits of the subject of creativity. It is possible to discuss and speculate about influences, feelings, reflections of the subject on the outside ideas, about the suddenness of inspiration and the artificial conditioning of inspiration by means of, for instance, external stimulants, but not about the objective existence of a reservoir of inspiration and creativity somewhere devoid of the very subject of creativity, separated from its consciousness as well as the subconscious, its psychic structure and physical body.

Relations of a subject of creativity with creativity are characterized by dependence and interdetermination (multiple causation). Creativity is a condition of its existence, its legitimation and a space of its activities at the same time. Dependence on these three components grants a subject rights, place of activities and some frames.

The very existence of a subject of creativity depends on creativity so therefore creativity provides its peculiar boundary. In creativity a subject exists and relates to it as derivative; their relations remain subordinate. Creativity is the only condition for a subject of creativity to exist: "To say that the poet only exists after the poem means that he receives his »reality« from the poem, but that he does not dispose of this reality except in order to make the poem possible. In this sense he does not survive the creation of the work. He lives by dying in it. This also means that the finished poem regards him with indifference; it does not refer to him. He is by no means entitled to be cited and glorified by the poem as its origin. For what is glorified by the work is the work, or art, which the work holds concentrated in itself. And the creator is the one who from then on is dismissed, whose name is erased and whose memory fades. This also means that the creator has no power over his work, that he is dispossessed by it, that in it he is dispossessed of himself. He does not hold its meaning, its privileged secret. It is not incumbent upon him to »read« the poem – that is, to pronounce it anew, to speak it each time as new"².

Creativity is always considered to be greater and, as a rule, original in relation to I.

¹ M. Blanchot, *The Space of Literature*, University of Nebraska Press, London 1982, p. 89.

² *Ibid.*, p. 227.

Thus, the need of creativity (which is defined as the necessity to express creation in accordance with *negative* approaches) is the *internal superior* of a creator. And not only inspiration, but also a form of correlation between inspiration and subjectivity can be named a source of creativity.

Dominance – “superiority” of creativity is demonstrated on the example of a quantitative timing indicator. Creativity deals with time in other way than a subject – creativity denies it. Creativity (and creation as an important component of creativity) exceeds a creator by scales relation to infinity. This “superiority” is expressed through lack of a creation ability to be expressed, because a finite and limited subject with disabilities of embodiment tries to give existence to something that is not subject to means of expression on the whole.

A subject of creativity brings its finiteness into infinity of a work where it preserves itself as infinity. An ontological status of a subject of creativity is précised through this place of conditional infinity, considered to be a place of creativity. The declared subjectivity in a work which can hypothetically remain in culture eternally is not infinite in itself. It only attributes to infinity as to its place of existence. The finite makes something infinite happen. In this relation, a subject comes short of quantity indicator but exceeds in an indicator of actual source of being because only through it the possible becomes real.

Relations of interdependence, belonging and “giving” being are characteristic of connections of a subject of creativity in a space of its existence. To define these connections and their specifics the researcher uses the “creation > creator” scheme where a creator transmits creations, a creation exceeds a creator, and its complete expression is impossible. This expressed disability is a result and attribute of the whole scheme, a consequence of non-correspondence of means with that is expressed, incompleteness of means of embodiment that comes, first of all, from incompleteness of the main “instrument” of embodiment, a subject of creativity. The main questions can be set out in all these connections.

The question of creativity is formulated towards the research field. Talking about the ontology of creativity, we can formulate the question in the following way: “What characteristic aspects has the being of creativity got towards the being of a human?” First of all, I am interested in the process of creativity, which can be understood within anthropology because it cannot be separated from a human being. We can agree that creativity is an anthropologic action, a process. I suggest that we should study the ontological aspect of this process. How does being a human happen in this process?

To study these problems, we ought to take different world outlook conceptions of creativity and study them through the metaphor of "addition" and "subtraction" of the being as an "ontological measure".

Conventional separation of approaches to understanding creativity in its most simple scheme is reduced to either addition of the being (through inclusion into the "greater" being) or its subtraction. Within an operational fiction I divide approaches into "*positive*" and "*negative*" where *positive* ones are based on addition of the being to the world through the process of creativity, on the increase of the being through an act of creativity. *Negative* ones are based on the subtraction of the being from the being of the Creator which is not full (and *negative* are depleted in their ultimate variant). This basis, an original premise is an ontological intention that is the necessary condition of creativity. And according to this original setting, creativity can happen. This *intentionality* will be studied further. And it is important to note that this division is a new approach to the philosophic reflection on creativity.

This division is possible due to the basic scheme of creativity. This "creator – creation" scheme is understood as a reflection of the process and a model of relations which happen. In this scheme, creation is a general understanding of what a creator tries to embody, what can be a conception, an image of a piece of work, an idea. A creator is a subject of creativity, a carrier of an idea who turns this idea into reality/practice. And most conceptions admit the advantages of a creation over a creator both in quantity and being. Schematically, this model of relations can be defined as "creation > creator". "Inspiration is not the gift of the poem to someone existing already, but the gift of existence to someone who does not yet exist³".

This phrase of Blanchot reflects the above-mentioned idea, expresses the possibility for a subject of creativity to exist through creation. But the conception which is the foundation of this phrase is based not on the addition of the being to a creating person but on the subtraction. Differences between the conceptions can be shown on the basis of the "creation – creator" scheme. I suggest that we should focus on the understanding of these relations through the metaphor of "addition" and "subtraction".

³ *Ibid.*

Positive approaches to the understanding of creativity

"*Positive*" relations mean non-negation of one component of the system as well as existence of an additional (positive) result, as a rule, a piece of art. Often this "positivity" is understood as enrichment of culture and as improvement of the world; often, it is understood as an esthetic relation, too. Though, in general, our division does not concern the moral and ethical or evaluating aspect of problematics.

An example of *positive* conception can be the Neo-thomist approach to the understanding of creativity. The original premise of this approach may be summarized as follows: desirability of talent, strategy of enrichment of the world and the advantage of that a creator tries to express over that s/he can express (and over its means). Best of all these theses are shown in the text of thinker Karol Wojtyła (John Paul II): "All artists experience the unbridgeable gap which lies between the work of their hands, however successful it may be, and the dazzling perfection of the beauty glimpsed in the ardour of the creative moment: what they manage to express in their painting, their sculpting, their creating is no more than a glimmer of the splendour which flared for a moment before the eyes of their spirit⁴"; "Obviously, this is a sharing which leaves intact the infinite distance between the Creator and the creature"⁵.

In these fragments the distance between what is really done and what it stands for, that is the basis of this, is obviously articulated. It is an idea that relates to the greater being. In fact, through the "connection" to this being not only the process of creativity but also a new being as well as the "connection" of a creating person to the greater more perfect being are performed. That is, there is a positive result and positivity in the process.

Separation of this basis happens as simplification of the system of creativity which is more complicated than any speaking about it. When we separate the most basic scheme it appears that absolutely different world outlook systems have (just in this aspect) similar basis. For example, we can consider Marxist interpretation of creative activities to be a *positive* conception. In this interpretation a component of activities is important because properly directed activities are a social good and a step to the evolutionary changes of society. Creative activities are only a partial display of generally possible and generally useful activities and

⁴ Pope John Paul II, *Letter of his holiness to artists*, From the Vatican, Easter Sunday, April 4th, 1999.

⁵ *Ibid.*

therefore art should be *positive*. An addition of new sense and material is the next stage of social development.

Correspondingly, a creator performs as a mechanism that puts this social good in life. S/he is a function, a medium of articulating a proper idea according to the right method. The correspondence with the proper idea is important in relations of a creating person and creation / creativity / work. Here an idea takes the role of creativity and is one of conditions of creativity and, imaginatively, has a greater measure of being. Exactly in this understanding the whole complexity of the problem displays: this positivity is only *intentional* but not necessarily positive in its embodiment or perceiving. Creativity is *positive* in its modality.

In practice, creativity which vacates a place for it in social cultural space (that often can negate the value of other creativity) can be only transformation of the existing being and no more. So, to take place it should vacate for it a place which is already occupied. Here we should stop and outline other format of "ontological measure" which is situated in "transforming" conceptions. There is a possible understanding of creativity not as addition but as transformation of existing and stable being in the world. "*Transforming*" creativity is neither "*positive*" nor "*negative*" categorically and demands to be studied separately. We will not study it in this text, however, but note the complexity of this approach which displays in cases when creativity is understood as *positive* imaginatively and intentionally but in practice, in its embodiment it is *transforming*.

Psychologists of creativity work out *positive* conceptions of creativity. L. Levchuk, researcher of science heritage of famous Soviet psychologist V. Roments, notices that according to Roments creativity is a struggle against everything sickly; it is the mental clearing, a form of catharsis. V. Roments conceptualizes the ethic and esthetic aspects of creative activity from the positions of creativity. Bulgarian psychologist M. Arnaudov has a similar opinion: "In his interesting work Bulgarian scientist M. Arnaudov emphasizes that position that "creativity is health, creativity is a struggle against everything sickly, creativity is the mental clearing, catharsis. Every great artistic creativity transfers not only the game of imagination but also the maximum of mental power to fix a work which appears in accordance with all intuitively perceived laws of art. How could an artist interpret thoughts and desires of his contemporaries if he hadn't goes over all inside shortfalls and everything chaotic in himself [...] Not relationship with different psychoses but absolute aspiration for order and achieving harmony of conscious and uncon-

cious facts should be emphasized as a principle of mental organization of an artist"⁶.

It is interesting that one of post-structuralists, namely, Deleuze considers literature to be health and offers a "diagnostic" approach, making thereby similar conclusions: "[...] the writer as such is not a patient but rather a physician of himself and the world. The world is the set of symptoms whose illness merges with man. Literature then appears as an enterprise of health... [...] he possesses an irresistible and delicate health that stems from what he has seen and heard of things too big for him, too strong for him, suffocating things whose passage exhausts him, while nonetheless giving him the becomings that a dominant and substantial health would render impossible"⁷.

For *positive* conceptions common is teleologism, direction to the future and, as a rule, connection with ethic postulates. In both these cases creation has the fullness of the being (in a format of an idea). But a creating person through the process of belonging approximates the fullness of being. These concepts can be named "participation in the fullness of being". The basis of these concepts is grounded in the idea of existence through inclusion into the higher principle. Of course, the question relates to the issue of existence as an existence of the subject of creativity.

Negative approaches to the understanding of creativity

Now I'd like to study "*negative*" conceptions. *Negative* conceptions are based on the negation of one of the components of the "creation > creator" system. This negation can be logic, ethic or axiological. The negating happens in the process of creativity and is necessary for its happening.

We can meet axiological, ethical and "quantity" negation of the "creator" component in antiquity when the gift of creativity was understood as a gift of gods but a gift which was close to damnation or a curse. The anticipatory conclusion concerning the ancient understanding of creativity can be an "insufficiency" of a person that is marked with a gift of creativity: "[...] the Muse loved above all other men, and gave him both good and evil; of his sight she deprived him, but gave him the gift of sweet song"⁸.

⁶ L. Levchuk, *To create the world from your own depth...*, [in:] V. Romenets, *Psychology of creation*, Lybid, Kyiv 2001, p. 21.

⁷ G. Deleuze, *Essays Critical and Clinical*, Verso, London–New York 1998, p. 3.

⁸ Homer, *The Odyssey*, Harvard University Press, William Heinemann Ltd, Cambridge–London 1919, book 8, lines 46–82.

A gift of creativity is not an additional skill, an over-facility, but it replaces another function of organism or personality, which could amount to deficiency or some sort, making it a physiologic norm.

Such thinkers as Democritus, Plato, Horatius, Cicero consider that a true poet (creator) can be only a mad person because an ancient poet is a medium of the divine: "And for this reason God takes away the mind of these men and uses them as his ministers, just as he does soothsayers and godly seers, in order that we who hear them may know that it is not they who utter these words of great price, when they are out of their wits, but that it is God himself who speaks and addresses us through them"⁹.

So, creativity is understood as a kind of religious ecstasy.

As a result, there is a situation of "either consciousness or a gift of creativity". A poetic gift is understood not as a reward but can be understood as the indication of gods' damnation, the marking of an ethically insufficient man, as Horatius tells about this in *The Art of Poetry: To the Pisos*. "If, like a fowler intent upon his game, he should fall into a well or a ditch while he belches out his fustian verses and roams about, though he should cry out for a long time, »Come to my assistance, O my countrymen;« not one would give himself the trouble of taking him up. Were any one to take pains to give him aid, and let down a rope; »How do you know, but he threw himself in hither on purpose?« I shall say: and will relate the death of the Sicilian poet. Empedocles, while he was ambitious of being esteemed an immortal god, in cold blood leaped into burning Aetna.¹ Let poets have the privilege and license to die (as they please). He who saves a man against his will, does the same with him who kills him (against his will). Neither is it the first time that he has behaved in this manner; nor, were he to be forced from his purposes, would he now become a man, and lay aside his desire of such a famous death. Neither does it appear sufficiently, why he makes verses: whether he has defiled his father's ashes, or sacrilegiously removed the sad enclosure² of the vindictive thunder: it is evident that he is mad"¹⁰.

Concerning Democritus' opinion, Horatius notices that Democritus regards a genius (as a natural gift) happier than anyone who knows art (as a learned skill) and he excludes those who think clearly from Helicon. "Because Democritus believes that genius is more successful than wretched art, and excludes from Helicon all poets who are in their

⁹ Plato, "Ion". *Plato in Twelve Volumes*, Vol. 9, Harvard University Press, William Heinemann Ltd, Cambridge-London 1925, lines 534c-534d.

¹⁰ Q. F. Horatius (Horace), *The Art of Poetry: To the Pisos*, [in:] *id.*, *The Works of Horace*, ed. by C. Smart, Th. A. Buckley, Harper & Brothers, New York 1863, lines. 453.

senses"¹¹. A conclusion about the excessiveness of creativity can be made. It cannot be a simple addition as a skill (handicraft). It pushes out a place for it. As it was understood in the ancient times, the notion of creativity does not correlate with freedom.

But we can see absolutely other forms of *negativity* in other periods. Stendhal and Nietzsche pay attention to this fact when public persons of Renaissance attribute moral negativity to themselves, for example, Benvenuto Cellini. Nietzsche thinks these gestures are an attribute of incommensurability with morality – being beyond good and evil, impossibility to measure creativity and life of personalities by these categories. This attributed negativity is a gesture, a form of theatricality, a set of special decorations for creativity. As in the ancient times the poet was placed in the frames of madness, so now an artist is placed in the frames of a crime. Attributed negativity is of moral nature, and it is accompanied with an idea of full-fledged and all-round personality. This negativity concerns affectation in moral self-perception. Here negativity is at an individual level (though it has a universe scale): it is inside/internal, self-attributed, but also outside/external at the same time as the society perceives an individual in such a way one sets himself/herself up.

Social-ethic dimension of *negativity* is also in programs of some artistic directions. An example can be decadence, Modernist direction of art and world outlook. Postulated *negativity* (in the ethic and esthetic aspect) is realized, accepted by a personality. In the ancient times this individualism was not possible. Therefore, if in modernist art *negativity* is a result of choice and esthetic position, in the ancient times creativity is a result of determinism.

Negativity of decadence consists in an answer to apocalyptic feelings which conditioned culture creativity at the end of the 19th-century. Emphasized estheticism of decadence correlates with a feeling of despair that is in itself the negation of life powers. Esthetics of creativity comes from exhaustiveness of life and the negation of positivist conceptions – so it is based on negation. The low – opposite of the cultural, as well as amoralism and the estheticization of the ugly are grounded in antagonism and negation. Furthermore, emphasized individualism comes also from the praxis of negation of general values.

Social negativity accompanied decadence art at the end of the 19th century where negativity existed as an outside factor – perceived by *socium* – and an inside one – by themes of disorder. Many art trends of the 20th century, which postulated demonstration of the *negative*, have con-

¹¹ *Ibid.*, lines 275–308.

tinued this tradition of negativity of sense, which concerns a moral aspect to a little extent and an esthetic one much more strongly. More often, however, the esthetic negativity consists in negation of life values. The *negative* is estheticized, and as a result an art activity is connected associatively with challenges, dangers, involvement in secrets and a special kind of activity, almost synonymous with cultural creativity and mysteries of the world. This is often manifested through the atmosphere and moods that a work of art evokes. Boris Pasternak wrote about the dangers of creativity – in particular, “about lines with blood”¹².

Avant-garde art trends often declare the necessity of complete renewal, not only for art as such but for the entire social order, too. To this end, they transfer their function wider beyond the usual esthetic borders (the avant-garde tests and challenges the limits of art according to its program as a conceptually new variant of a way of expression of a conceptually new reality). And this is one more example of *transformism*. This strategy is *positive* in the sense of the addition of new content but simultaneously it is not *positive* completely because for the new content it is necessary to liberate places of old art (old reality) that does not constitute addition of the being to the world; the aim of *transformism* is not the transformation of permanent quantity.

Frequently, a *negative* characteristic itself (ethically speaking) can be embodied by a critic of art. For example, Russian thinker N. Berdyaev interprets classical creativity as a form of divergence that became a norm¹³. N. Berdyaev also considers avant-garde art trends as beyond the pale of being. For example, he discusses dematerialization of painting. Such creativity is not active because a creator who adds the being to the world is active while representatives of avant-gardism do not have such a setting (not to mention, the means of implementation): “[...] they (futurists – G. B.) are seized by a process, are spinning in it with growing speed-up but they aren’t active creators. They are seized by disorder of the material world”¹⁴; “futurists would want to finish off and cinder a human image (completely) that always was fixed by an image of the material world which is apart from it”¹⁵.

But definitions of ethic negativity should not reflect the model of “subtraction” because they are based on evaluation. While ontological

¹² V. Zinchenko, *Methods of studying literature. System approach*, Flinta, Nauka, Moscow 2002, p. 42.

¹³ N. Berdyaev, *The Sense of Creativity*, Prawda, Moscow 1989, p. 347.

¹⁴ *Id.*, *The Crisis of Art*, Leman and Sakharov, Moscow 1918, p. 11.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p.10.

negativity of creativity is based on subtraction of the being, not on evaluation. These negativities present different levels of existence of creativity.

One of development lines in *negative* conceptions of creativity is psychological research which postulates a method-based negativity of creative process. Of course, not all psychological scholarship postulates such an understanding – for instance, the above-mentioned examples of "*positive*" understanding confirm the opposite.

Considering particular case studies, psychological approaches declare "*negative*" understanding when creativity is deemed as breaking a system (as a rule, it concerns not only psychological approaches but also, for example, more common attitudes to creativity). The perception of creativity as a violation and anomaly date back to the ancient times but it was formed in scientific thought and received its research confirmation in the 19th century. Cesare Lombroso posited his thesis about neuropathic peculiarities of outstandingly gifted people in his work "Genius and madness". He understood genius as a psychic anomaly. Scottish mental specialist R. D. Laing considered creativity to be a kind of going down to "that" world from this and coming back. And he considered that this process to be natural like death or childbirth. The researcher noticed this natural and unnatural non-perception of these processes in the culture contemporary to him, namely, that the contemporary world was afraid of the inside world, without realizing so¹⁶. Though nowadays psychological and psychiatric doctrines of the 19th century are often disproved, at that moment they played an important role in general perception and established "a cultural place" of creativity and creative activity in the public consciousness.

A scientific view at creativity as a kind of psychic anomaly continued a mythological line of creative madness but contradicted and clashed with an old mythological comprehensive perception of madness because it divided a man into layers – consciousness, activity, and regulated structures. And such an approach increased the yawning misunderstanding between creative and non-creative people.

To a great extent, the real perception of a creative human being as a misfit, sometimes for the sake of *épater (le bourgeois)*, which is pertinent nowadays too, comes from here. But in the liquid modernity of contemporaneity, which is characterized by total imitation of cultural examples and their blanket distribution that leads to imitation of form – of precedence of form over content, often only epatage form remains in a place of creative activity. This conditions the common psychological

¹⁶ N. Zborovska, *Psychoanalysis and Literary Criticism*, Kyiv 2003.

social perception of creativity, rather widespread when, on the one hand, a creative person is defined in accordance with the fact if s/he imitates a typical image of "a creative personality" but, on the other hand, the value of his creativity is not originally defined by his epatage. As imitation of the outside form is read only as an imitation of form and not of content.

Psychological approaches which are not either *positive* or *negative* in the whole are worth noticing. On the one hand, psychoanalysis takes out axiological dimension of creativity showing instinct and neurotic nature of creative process, which is a consequence of sublimation of the conflict between I and It in Freudianism, the conflict between symbolic and imaginary in structural psychoanalysis of J. Lacan. Famously, C. G. Jung separates creative activities by principles of expression: either individual (neurosis) or the collective unconscious (collective archetype). In the first case, creative activity is considered to be a repressive function, in other as a rescue from neurosis and an individual way of therapy.

And if psychoanalysts understand creative activity as a way to avoid neurosis, a way to solve a conflict of components of unconsciousness, general negativity of psychoanalytic understanding of creativity consists in an axiological aspect while an ontological aspect (addition or subtraction of the being) suggests either division (as in Jung's analytic psychology) or indefiniteness between addition of new being and transformation of the present one. So psychoanalytic approaches are situated between conditional division into *positive* and *negative* approaches.

As an example of logically *negative* conception we can take ideas of French theoretician and writer M. Blanchot whose creativity is close to existentialism. The thinker keeps the "creation > creator" line and correspondingly separates positions of components in relation to quantity measure. If a creation outshines its creator in everything the whole situation is directed at the excess. In the finite understanding a situation of creativity is directed at destruction of a creator by their creation. To simplify, we can say in the following way: a creation takes over the being of its creator. M. Blanchot understands the whole process of creativity as a traumatic opposition of "Me (author) and It (creation)", metaphorically as the permanent process of coming close to the edge – as ceaseless approaching the outer rim. "The work requires of the writer that he lose everything he might construe as his own »nature«, that he lose all character and that, ceasing to be linked to others

and to himself by the decision which makes him an »I«, he becomes the empty place where the impersonal affirmation emerges"¹⁷.

M. Blanchot analyzes a great number of evidence that European writers of the 20th century provide. In their texts (mostly in their diaries) he finds affirmation for the full exhaustiveness/exhaustion of a creator by a creation that is the dominance of a creation over a creator, understood as owning him/her and, in consequence, as depriving him/her of authorial agency. A creation is defined by M. Blanchot as It (by its essence, it is an impersonal power inseparable from a creator), which exceeds and exhausts the powers of I (a creator). In this way, the second component of the system/scheme (a creator) is denied supremacy in favor of the first (a creation). For M. Blanchot, a creation is something akin to a medium: a plan, a source of inspiration, an idea of a subject of creativity or even things expressed in a creative space in general.

At the same time, it is the thing that gives a subject a possibility to act (express oneself) and the thing s/he makes relations of interdependence and confrontation with. A subject of creativity makes *I-It relations* with a creation, where a creation is an impersonal impulsive power which seizes I, which stands behind the back of a subject of creativity and enables a subject of creativity to exist at the same time.

M. Blanchot understands an essence of a subject of expression as a creator (I), thus he refers to the author's selfness but prefers (ontologically too) a creation (It) which exceeds a creator by its being. So, this conception makes the processuality of changes and modalities of subjectivity overdue to include the sequence with which "I" loses the being. "I" comes from this system unequally incomplete. One can say that in Blanchot's view a subject of creativity is a processual subject – a subject of the confrontation between "I" and "It".

In fact "It", a Creation and Nothing are synonyms and the identifying of initial emptiness and creation plays an important role in the conception. Blanchot uses a metaphor of emptiness, initially Nothing, which a creator comes to when a creation seizes him/her. When an author "looks" at emptiness of a creation s/he "looks" at emptiness. And respectively one expresses this kind of emptiness in a process of creativity.

All creations originate from emptiness: "[...] a work says what it says by silencing something [...] Literature moreover says this by silencing itself. There is in literature an emptiness of literature that constitutes it. This lack or distance, unexpressed because covered over by expression, is that on the basis of which the work, while said one time, said perfectly

¹⁷ M. Blanchot, *The Space of Literature...*, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

and incapable of being said again, nonetheless irresistibly tends to say itself over again, requiring the infinite speech of commentary where, separated from itself through the beautiful cruelty of analysis [...] it awaits the silence that is proper to it to come to an end"¹⁸.

Thus, original negativity of a creation is its origin from shortage. This negativity of a creation forces the subject of creativity to undergo a set of repetitions, which are understood as a wandering full-circle heading for incompleteness, which is in turn understood as being unrealizable.

One of the most important moments in the conception is an idea that not inspiration is comprehensive, but a person who creates is comprehensive while inspiration does not have characteristics of finiteness when it is identified with a kind of emptiness.

Intentionality

A difference between *positive* and *negative* approaches consists in that which relations take place in the "creation > creator" system, where, firstly, a creator receives something additional (important to him, so-cium, his soul, etc.) through the addition to a creation and, secondly, a creator loses through his involvement in a creation. For the purpose of this paper, I have selected the most illustrative examples only.

We can choose positions of *positive* or *negative* creative but in any case we see a scheme where several components act and which takes place in a process of relations between these components. A position of a subject-object changes at different moments (before a creative process, during it, afterwards, etc.) but, not unlike the subjectivity of creativity, it takes place in its process (thus creativity is not a space and condition only but it creates a continuity with the subject beginning).

In fact, this "taking place" is a condition under which a subject of creativity is formed, a change of its modality of the being: either its increasing (through addition to the completeness of the being) or decreasing (exhaustiveness).

The difference between *negative* and *positive* understandings of the "creator – creation" relationship can be demonstrated on their different attitude to the same phenomena. For example, an attitude to the phenomenon of incompleteness and insufficiency, which comes from limitation and the insufficiency of the subject of utterance. This insufficiency

¹⁸ *Id.*, *The Wooden Bridge (Repetition, the Neutral)*, [in:] *id.*, *The Infinite Conversation. Theory and History of Literature*, Vol. 82, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis–London 2003, p. 390.

displays in incompleteness of a work or a feeling of its incompleteness. "Incompleteness is always a failure of an artist. An artist leaves his piece of work incomplete not intentionally and not to make a great impression but likely as a result of again and again appearing feeling that the forming hand isn't able to embody an inside plan"¹⁹.

In this understanding, we can see a contradiction between an inside image (creation) and a means of expressing and the prevailing of an idea over its embodiment. This reveals the idealistic basis of most understandings of creativity when a creation is something ideal and its embodiment is always its imperfect copy. In many conceptions this insufficiency, "inability to be expressed" is perceived as a norm of creative process but is explained and perceived in different ways.

Often, as the result of this basis, the whole creative process is understood as a search for a means of expression, which corresponds with the creation. And if in *positive* approaches addition of the being is in this, as, for example, perfecting of personality or improving of personality, in *negative* approaches this setting leads to notions about the failure, impossibility to express oneself and destruction of a creator, as M. Blanchot makes clear in his propositions.

It is important to notice that the suggested scheme of division of approaches to understand creativity is simplification and schematization of the grounds of conceptions, an attempt to describe its almost mythical "basis". In many conceptions of creativity "an ontological measure" is not so clear: one cannot define it as a mere "addition" or "subtraction".

This conceptual simplification is a methodological fiction directed at the finding out of grounds of notions about art. As every notion defines an action and practice, relation and result, revealing of grounds of these notions seems to be necessary. This allows to understand more clearly *how* creativity indeed *happens*.

Of course, there appears the question about correspondence of these approaches with their practice or about their correspondence with an image of reality. Most researches of creativity is based on inclination towards one of two approaches or the accepting of a creative process ambivalence. Zborovska, a researcher of the connection between creativity, art and psychoanalysis, considers that creativity is the unique psychological phenomenon of self-cognition and cognition of the world that

¹⁹ *Das Unvollendete als Künstlerische Form. Ein Symposium*, ed. by J. A. Schmoll, Francke Verlag, Bern und München 1960, p. 73.

very often appears together with general human fear of death and as a desire to overcome death.²⁰

The researcher notices that during a creation an energetic overpressure happens: a psychic energy sharply decreases in a field of consciousness but "inside energetic streams of the unconscious" are activated: "(A) fall of mythologic and archetype (initial) images and symbols fly out from the depth of a soul. Lesya Ukrainka²¹ named this creative (maniac) state »a divine madness: a case of insanity« [...] Therefore creativity can be not only good but also a catastrophe of consciousness: it can give power for mental rise or become a mental enslavement and existential death (as in case of F. Nietzsche)"²².

In accordance with this potential multi-directionality, this article studies the *intentional* base of creativity.

Every conception of creativity is a basis for creativity as for a process because it is relation, perception, defines the process. Thus, we can talk about an *intentionality*, direction of consciousness at an object. This *intentionality* is displayed in the following way: in each of the approaches, it corresponds with embodiment if it is accepted by a creator as a condition. The accepting of an original position can be conscious but not necessary. A creative person can accept the conception of creativity, dominating in culture or in its environment, and embody it unconsciously and non-reflectively. S/he also can reflect the process of creativity as his or somebody's experience, realize himself in a situation, analyze this situation or feeling. It can be described as "being programmed", conditionality of the process of creativity by the original setting of a consciously or unconsciously chosen approach, which is considered to be proper and corresponding with reality. In every case, in the course of the process of creativity that conception of creativity, which is accepted by a given subject of creativity, consciously or unconsciously, is implemented.

So, in an anthropologic perspective, the development of both *positive* and *negative* approaches is possible. The characteristic of such *intentionality* reveals the correspondence of process of creativity with a reality, which "becomes", i.e., is embodied in the process of creativity. In fact, it is not possible to answer the question "which conception corresponds with the reality?" without accepting one of the positions under consideration. Therefore, it seems that we can study the implement of different

²⁰ N. Zborovska, *Psychoanalysis and Literary Criticism*, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

²¹ Ukrainian poet, Larysa Petrivna Kosach-Kvitka (1871–1913); her pen name is Lesya Ukrainka (Lesya the Ukrainian).

²² N. Zborovska, *Psychoanalysis and Literary Criticism*, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

conceptions as a given. The influence of described *intentionality* is confirmed by both cases of the destruction of personalities of creative people and achieving a harmony with themselves and the world by themselves. Taking this into account, we cannot define correspondence of an approach with creativity and reality but only correspondence of this approach with creativity and how a creator embodies it, how s/he performs this project. At this stage, it seems that the next anthropologic research aim in this problematic field should be the research of each understanding, as both *positive* and *negative* and more complicated forms.

Bibliography

- Berdyayev N., *The Crisis of Art*, Leman and Sakharov, Moscow 1918 (Бердяев Н. А. Кризис искусства (Репринтное издание) / А. Н. Бердяев. – М.: СП Интерпринт, 1990. – 48 с.).
- Berdyayev N., *The Sense of Creativity*, Prawda, Moscow 1989 (Бердяев Н. А. Смысл творчества. Опыт оправдания человека / Н. А. Бердяев. – М.: Изд-во «Правда», 1989. – 600 с.).
- Blanchot M., *The Space of Literature*, the University of Nebraska Press, London 1982.
- Blanchot M., *The Wooden Bridge (Repetition, the Neutral)*, [in:] M. Blanchot, *The Infinite Conversation. Theory and History of Literature*, Vol. 82, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis–London 2003.
- Deleuze G., *Essays Critical and Clinical*, Verso, London–New York 1998.
- Homer, *The Odyssey*, Harvard University Press, William Heinemann Ltd, Cambridge–London 1919.
- Horatius, Q. F., *The Art of Poetry: To the Pisos*, [in:] Horatius Q. F., *The Works of Horace*, ed. by C. Smart, Th. A. Buckley, Harper & Brothers, New York 1863.
- Levchuk L., «*To create the world from your own depth...*», [in:] V. Romenets. *Psychology of creation*, Lybid, Kyiv 2001 (Левчук Л. Т. «Творити світ зі своєї власної глибини...» // Роменець В. А. Психологія творчості: Навч. Посібник. 2-ге вид., доп. – К.: Либідь, 2001. – 288 с.).
- Plato, «*Ion*». *Plato in Twelve Volumes*, vol. 9, Harvard University Press; William Heinemann Ltd, Cambridge–London 1925.
- Pope John Paul II, *Letter of his holiness to artists*, From the Vatican, Eastern Sunday, April 4th, 1999.
- Das Unvollendete als Künstlerische Form. Ein Symposium*, ed. by J. A. Schmoll, Francke Verlag, Bern und München 1960.

- Zborovska N., *Psychoanalysis and Literary Criticism*, Kyiv 2003 (Зборовська Н. В. Психологія і літературознавство: Посібник. – К.: Академвидав, 2003. – 392 с. – (Альма-матер).
- Zinchenko V., *Methods of studying literature. System approach*, Flinta: Nauka, Moscow 2002 (Зинченко В. Г., Зусман В. Г., Кирнозе З. И. Методы изучения литературы. Системный подход: Учеб. пособие. – М.: Флинта: Наука, 2002. – 200 с.).

Summary

Approaches to the understanding of creativity are divided in relation to the "ontological measure". Accordingly, the positive approach involves the addition of a new Being to the world through creativity; the negative approach involves the subtraction of the Being from one of the components of the creative process, for the possibility of creativity. It is possible to allocate "the direction" of creativity, in relation to the addition or subtraction through the study of "creator – creation" relations in every conception of creativity. For example, negative creativity is possible only through subtraction of the Being from the position "creator". The conceptions of Berdyaev and Blanchot are chosen as representative approaches. In addition, the researcher notes that there are more complicated approaches to the understanding of creativity, for example, "neutral" or transformative ones, which are based on the transformation of the existing Being in the world. The anthropological aspect of creativity is revealed through the notion of intentionality. This concept shows equal opportunities of different approaches and concepts in the field of practice of creativity.

Keywords: creativity, "negative" approach, "positive" approach, intentionality

Zusammenfassung

„Negative“ und „positive“ Konzepte des künstlerischen Schaffens: „ontologisches Kennzeichen“ und Intentionalität

Die Herangehensweisen zum Verständnis der künstlerischen Tätigkeit kann man aufgrund des „ontologischen Kennzeichens“ aufteilen. Der *positive* Ansatz besagt, dass das künstlerische Schaffen ein neues Sein der Welt hinzufügt. Der *negative* Ansatz stellt fest, dass ein Element des Seins im Schaffensprozess entfernt wird. Bei der Analyse der Relation „Schöpfer – Schaffen“ kann man in jedem Schaffenskonzept eine „Ausrichtung“ der künstlerischen Tätigkeit unterscheiden - entweder auf die Hinzufügung eines neuen Seins oder auf seine Entfernung. Beispielsweise ist das *negative* Schaffen nur auf solche Weise möglich, dass der Schöpfer ein Sein entfernt. Als repräsentative Beispiele wurden Konzepte von Berdjaew und Blanchot ausgewählt. Die Untersuchungen zeigen überdies, dass es mehr komplizierte Herangehensweisen zum Problem des Schaffens gibt, z. B.

eine „neutrale“ oder eine *transformative*, die von der Transformation eines in der Welt existierenden Seins spricht. Der anthropologische Aspekt des Schaffens zeigt sich im Begriff der Intentionalität. Dieser Begriff ermöglicht unterschiedliche Ansätze und Konzepte im Bereich der künstlerischen Praxis.

Schlüsselworte: künstlerisches Schaffen, „negative“ Herangehensweisen, „positive“ Herangehensweisen, Intentionalität

GANNA BILYK: Ph.D., Kharkiv Karazin National University, Ukraine. E-mail: anna.a.bilyk@gmail.com.

