

УДК 111.6

## The Understanding of Creativity and its Criteria in Classical and Non-Classical Philosophy

**Olga N. Tomyuk\***

*Ural Federal University named after the B. N. Yeltsin  
51 Lenin, Ekaterinburg, 620083, Russia*

Received 04.03.2014, received in revised form 12.04.2014, accepted 15.05.2014

---

*This article gives comparative analysis of approaches to understanding the creativity and its criteria in classical and non-classical philosophy. As a result of the analysis we found that rational foundations of creativity have formed classical conception of creativity, where the creativity is treated from the position of general categories and where the theory of creative being is a theory about being of the search for general, necessary and regular. Changes in the understanding of creativity phenomenon in non-classical conception are, first of all, connected with the understanding of reality in its processuality, movement and formation. Consequently, non-classical conceptions treat creativity in opposition to mechanical rationalism, where mind is replaced by will, intuition, instincts and etc. In classical tradition creativity is defined as activity, which has a feature of effective novelty. That is why novelty comes out as the main and universal criterion of creativity in classical philosophy. Non-classical philosophical conceptions take novelty as criterial characteristic of creativity in its processuality, but not as a result of activity; processuality of creativity exposes itself with the help of such concepts as duration, intersubjectivity, polyphony, diversity, interparadigmality etc. Besides, in non-classical tradition the process of creation and its results are supplemented by anthropological and social dimensions.*

*Field of results application – philosophy, section – ontology, philosophy of creativity.*

*Keywords: creativity, nature of creativity, subjects of creativity, criteria of creativity in classical philosophy, criteria of creativity in non-classical philosophy, the new, novelty, processuality of creativity, creative tendency.*

*The Research is carried out with the Financial Support of the young scientists UFU in the context of realization of UFU development program.*

---

The understanding of creativity and its criteria has a historical character and depends on dominant style of philosophical thinking. The investigation of “creativity” phenomenon in classical and non-classical philosophy, comparative analysis of different approaches to

the understanding of creativity – all this lets us overcome sketchy treatment of creativity in one certain philosophical conception.

Classical philosophy presented the concept of creativity in rational paradigm of investigation as a reasonable and strictly logical process

of finding and substantiation the new, assigned by special mode of thought. Ancient philosophy has become a methodological basis of different theoretical and philosophical conceptions of creativity. The classical tradition in creativity studies was formed under the influence of Plato's views. Plato proceeded from the logic of universal and gave an extremely abstract comprehension of creativity, expressed ideas about the nature and the sense of creativity, creativity realization mechanism, explored species and basic stages of creativity. Creative art, says Plato, is connected with a certain ability (of God, Nature, Human), which appears to be "a cause of beginning of what did not exist before"<sup>1</sup>. Investigations of creativity phenomena in classical paradigm are connected with discovering the new, substantiation and explanation of the new (its nature, truth etc.).

In the dialog "Sophist" the philosopher talks about the nature of creativity and its species: "Should we assert concerning all living creatures and plants..., and also concerning all inanimate things..., that all these, what did not exist before, begins because of someone's else – non-God – creative activity? Or we will say, following common beliefs and words... that all these nature causes by virtue of some spontaneous reason, which can produce without mind. Or, maybe, we will admit, that this reason is gifted with mind and divine knowledge, coming from god?"<sup>2</sup>. Plato distinguish two types of creativity – human (the one, which is produced by people) and divine (it is attached to nature, it is created without participation of mind, it is divine creativity). In the philosopher's opinion, as God created Being out of nothing, so a man creates its products out of nothing. Being is there and then, when human's mind acquires the character of creativity, giving senses to particular "nothings", animating them, extracting them from "nothing".

According to Plato logically organized cognitive activity in case of achieving a new

result can be called creative activity. From this creativity in classical paradigm is regarded as rational activity (logical activity, given by Logos, the power of mind) in creating (discovering) new. Creativity by nature is identically with the logic of scientific activity: scientific way of thinking, scientific picture of the world, scientific rationality, searching for new knowledge. Novelty as a criterion of creativity is a result of logical order.

Plato examines creativity in its anthropo-axiological aspect: the new does not uncover itself to everyone, only a man with good thoughts and fair means can be a creator. The sense of creativity is in achievement of good, in perfection of the universe. Plato's Love is an initial principle of birth of all the new, and a creator is a loving man. Creativity as a realization of human aspiration for creating new is identically with obsession in Plato's point of view. The philosopher thinks that "everything created by sensible man will be overshadowed by creations of frantic man"<sup>3</sup>.

Plato pays attention to the processuality of creativity, he proves such comprehension of creativity using the categories "being" – "nothing" examining origination of being from nothing. Being – it is a dynamics, permanent passing on from "nothing" to "something". From here the creativity is a certain mechanism of being worlds formation. Plato's ideas (stated but not developed) about dynamics can be regarded as methodological prerequisites for others non-classical philosophical conceptions of creativity.

The classical approach in understanding of creativity is also typical to Aristotle. Although Aristotle has statement about his doubts about the possibility of knowledge of new, we can say that the substantial understanding of creativity prevails as a whole. Aristotle treats the creation of being in paradigm of dynamics and formation (idea of processuality of creativity) but using the category of "Prime mover". Aristotle

indicates that the starting creational impulse is initial being and all the subjects and substances of creativity are secondary in comparison with initial being. Thus, Aristotle's ideas about processuality, about dynamism of being creation can be regarded as a prerequisite of different non-classical comprehension of creativity.

The classical conception of creativity is based on understanding the world as an integral unity, which is opened for rational cognitive search; and a result of this search is new objectified knowledge.

Ancient rational base of creativity formed the classical conception of creativity, where with its gnoseological and logical traditions creativity is treated only in a rationalistic way. Classical philosophy solved the problem of creativity from the point of general categories, and the study of creative being was treated as a study of being of searching for general, necessary and regular. Creativity was considered as an activity in which the result is something new and something what can fit in scope of unified.

As it is noticed, the conception of creativity in Ancient philosophy takes a substantive position as a dominating idea, however, it also has some presentiments concerning different, particularly non-classical approach to the comprehension of creativity. Heraclitus has a new idea about being: "everything flows, everything changes", which consequently has become a base of a break with classical type of thoughts and of the formation of non-classical treating of being, which affected the understanding of creativity. At the same time with searching for beginnings classical philosophy had intuitions (dynamics, dynamism, doubt) about possibility of creativity problem investigation in sense of its transformations, which produced modern non-classical conceptions of creativity.

During the Middle Ages an arising skepticism concerning mind's omnipotence strengthened, beliefs in cognitive abilities of

mind weakened. Two opposite approaches to comprehension of creativity appeared in philosophy – theological (St. Augustine Aurelius) and logical-epistemological (R. Lully, R. Bacon). St. Augustine Aurelius treats creativity as prerogative of God: "The Will Of God, peculiar to God, outstrips any creation. Creation could not be, unless eternal will of the Creator"<sup>24</sup>. Logical-epistemological approach in understanding of creativity contains ideas about logic of arguments evaluation, about their verity and untruth (R. Lully's "logical machine"), about methods of cognition (R. Bacon's evidence and experience).

Combination of belief and mind introduced a new understanding of creativity. Creativity was regarded as an activity of pure mind which was settled in context of will, intuition, imagination, emotions. Thus, since St. Augustine Aurelius philosophical reflexion of mind has been supplemented with reflexion about plenitude of structural components of human mind. Mind knows the world by law, but belief and will are connected with selection from several variants, of which each uncover itself to man and of which we have to choose one, but not the only one. At the same time, this choice can be absolutely unreasonable, mostly irrational and even unconscious. This begs the question of the criterion of the choice. The criterion of the choice is rational and irrational, conscious in connection with unconscious.

Saint Thomas Aquinas in his "Summa Theologica" confronts the classical approach in understanding of creativity. He reckons that experience and mind can't guarantee genuine creativity, because not everything can be rationally proved. Saint Thomas Aquinas supposes that the truth open itself only to those who has both reason and belief<sup>5</sup>. Saint Thomas Aquinas pays attention to the fact that a man is not passive during the act of creation, moreover, he is active, because God

does not interfere in every certain event. Man's creative activity realizes by analogy with activity of God and, for all that, there are two separated possibilities of penetration into the essence of the phenomenon – unlike man God has knowledge of existential substance, as the possibilities of God are greater than capacities of any creation.

So, in medieval philosophy the understanding of the new consists of rationally constructed ontology (it is a dominant) and ontology of other contexts, suggesting involvement in the creative process both rational and irrational structures of mind. Preference in creative process is given to God, although we treated it as co-creation of God and man (God – co-creator). The sense of creativity is seen in achievement of virtue. In the naturalistic concept of creativity of B. Spinoza the beginning of everything is connected with nature. Preference is given to nature taken as a self-sufficient reason and a prerequisite of itself.

The shift towards anthropocentrism is typical for Renaissance. Creativity is treated as an utmost dignity of man, neither God nor nature are treated as subject of creative activity but human. The "limitation" of human's capabilities is taken away. Revival understands creativity, primarily as a work of art, as a creative contemplation; hence the cult of genius as a medium of creativity, interest in the personality of the artist (Leonardo da Vinci is painter and inventor, Michelangelo is painter and poet, etc.).

In rationalistic conceptions of R. Descartes and B. Spinoza the Plato's classical model of creativity continues its development. As part of the classical tradition creativity is defined as the activity, which is characterized by feature of effective novelty. Creativity in classical philosophy is a special human form of activity, what is determined by reflexive attitude of man towards to the world, which is expressed in the creation of a new.

The novelty in classical philosophy is the basic criterion of creativity. The German philosopher I. Kant characterizes the creativity as an ability to do something without imitation, to create something new and previously unknown (for example, the works of Homer, Shakespeare, and others). O. Spengler in his work "The Decline of the West" writes that the creativity – is, of course, the introduction of a new, but the new is not a consequence of old reasons. The philosopher believes that from this point of view we can explore all cultures and, as a result, to get an affirmation of the state, that the younger, later cultures are not a direct continuation of the old, early cultures. For N. A. Berdyaev the creativity is "the growth, the addition, the creation of a new, what haven't been in the world"<sup>6</sup>.

An interesting point of view has D. V. Pivovarov. In the article "Three religious and philosophical models of creativity" the philosopher analyzes the three formulas of creativity as a "creation of the new", originating from such religious traditions as pantheism, panentheism, and monotheism: the new is a repetition of the old; new is an unique combination of old forms; new is something that came from nothing<sup>7</sup>. Pantheism, says the philosopher, explains features of scientific and theoretical activities mostly, the result of which is not invention but a discovery of the laws of nature, the identification of objective, significant, recurring relationships. Panenteistic model "generated" the theory of human creativity, where the creativity is treated as a free designing, process of invention. In the monotheistic model of creativity is associated with a miracle, an insight<sup>8</sup>.

The concept of novelty as the criterial features of the phenomenon of creativity has never been in question until the XX century, and the creativity as a process hasn't changed its criterial orientation – movement to a new. In

XX century a different, non-classical tradition of conceptualization of creativity appeared, the characteristic features of which were criticisms of “pure reason” and designation of a new way of thinking about the world.

N. V. Bryanik, investigating classical and non-classical science, concludes that non-classical science, finally formed in the XIX–XX centuries, intended to examine the nature and opening the essence of the studied objects in opposition to mechanism<sup>9</sup>. In the article “Features of knowledge of non-classical science” she writes: “Working with the material leads us to the recognition that in the science of a certain period, researchers are guided primarily by identifying the specific and nature of studied object. It would seem, there is nothing special in these features – science is basically connected with the disclosure of the essences and specifics. But it was not always so. Classical science arose with the intention not to open the hidden essence and foundations, searching for which is fraught with metaphysical speculations, but only to describe the regularities and steadily recurring dependings”<sup>10</sup>. For evidence N. V. Bryanik cites a statement of K. G. Jung about psychoanalysis as a non-classical theory: “What we were most impressed, being young psychiatrists, was not a proposed method or theory, which appeared to be highly controversial, but the fact that someone even dared to study the foundations. As a result, we discovered the way to understanding the internal pictures of the formation of hallucinations and phantasmagoria in case of schizophrenia, which were so far described only as an aggregate of their external manifestations”<sup>11</sup>.

N. V. Bryanik’s researches not only justify the difference between classical and non-classical types of rationality, but also serve as a methodological basis of a different, non-classical understanding of creativity. Changes in the

understanding of the phenomenon of creativity in non-classical conception are mostly connected with a sphere of the constructing of reality and the role of man as the subject of this constructing. There is a departure from the centring role of any substance to the understanding of reality in its processuality, movement, becoming.

In this regard, the question arises: If everything is in a state of permanent changing, everything is constantly appears as different, new, is it possible to speak of novelty as the criteria of creativity? In our view, in modern non-classical philosophy reality is ontologically represented by innovation. The current understanding of reality as a reality of constant change and continuous innovations becomes the basis of a different understanding of the phenomenon of creativity, the desire to break out of the paradigm of classical philosophizing.

The vector of critical understanding of rationality was given in philosophical works of F. Nietzsche and S. Kierkegaard, where an irrational aspect of cognition is updated. In the anti-rational philosophy a critical review of the status and possibilities of the mind was made: the will moved ahead instead of mind (A. Schopenhauer, F. Nietzsche), intuition (A. Bergson), instincts (Z. Freud), etc. In non-classical conception creativity is regarded as the opposition to mechanical rationalism. Existentialism, for example, highlights the spiritual and personal nature of creativity. An expanded conception of art is represented in the works of Henri Bergson.

A. Bergson in his work “creative Evolution” (1907) creativity is treated as a continuous birth of a new: in nature – in the form of production processes, processes of growth, ripening, in the mind – in the form of new images and experiences<sup>12</sup>. Thus, for example, in inorganic nature – the essence of creativity in the renewal and change, the transition from

chaos to order, from living things the creativity appears in the form of their adaptation to a changing environment. The very process of creating different things is similar, according to Bergson, to the processes of perfection in the nature.

A. Bergson describes the world, not as a complete reality, but as a reality of becoming, using the category of duration. According to him, the whole universe “lasts”, but this duration is not extensive, duration is an expression of the temporal and continuously becoming world<sup>13</sup>. Bergson treats the reality not as a logically ordered diversity, but as the grip, the intertwining of all things. According to A. Bergson only through intuition, not reason, it is possible to capture the dynamism, qualitative heterogeneity, “a moving continuity” of reality. Intuition updates perception, feelings, the unconscious, the physiological component of the subject of creativity – human – in creativity act. Creativity is interpreted as the capture duration, instability and variability of life. A. Bergson introduces the theoretical construct of «creative evolution» to prove that it is impossible to justify, to grasp the reality only by the means of positive science, only on the basis of rationality. Creative evolution involves the gradual emancipation of the mind of man from banality, algorithmization of mind. Human’s consciousness is able to discover the world thoroughly, fully and completely, rather than only to penetrate the essence and identify patterns, what is usually attributed to the mind. Intelligence, its development is only one of the vectors of creative evolution. In this vector of creative evolution, says the philosopher, intuition appears, which gives a person the opportunity to catch the processuality of reality. Philosopher does not think human creativity without intuition, which allows to get in unavailable for the intelligence aspects of being.

The “suspicion of reason” was expressed by P. Ricoeur, who thought that mind is not the only factor in human identification, moreover, we should move away from any identification of a person through entity. This approach of Paul Ricoeur has allowed an exploration of creativity as an ontological characteristic, the way of man’s life.

Psychological component in explaining creativity came from Z. Freud’s studies of unconscious as the structure of human consciousness, which was the basis for the consideration of creativity not only in conjunction with the mind, but also with the psyche as a whole. The rejection of mind as a single substance of creation defined new approaches to its understanding. Z. Freud regarded the unconscious as a major part of the psyche, responsible for creativity. The leading role of the unconscious in the creative process is also recognized by Carl Jung. However, he doesn’t speak about the personal unconscious, he speaks about the collective unconscious as nobody’s, as a heritage, a voice of the tribe.

Non-classical philosophy, rejecting the logical relationships in nature, its integrity and regularity, criticizes Hegel’s dialectic and the idea of development. The basic idea of the non-classical philosophy is that the world is fragmented chaos, has no integrity, no internal laws, the laws of development, it is not under control of the mind, it obeys to different driving forces, such as affect, volition. Non-classical philosophy (existentialism, hermeneutics, psychoanalysis, philosophy of life, other direction) in contrast to the classical conceptions regards creativity in relation to the will, intuition, faith, feelings.

In existentialism the personality, understood as the existence, carries creativity. Personality as a kind of irrational provides an outlet beyond the natural and social, brings the new in the world. N. A. Berdyaev in his work “the Meaning of

creativity” expands this thought: creative ecstasy is an adequate form of existence. The philosophy of life and existentialism indicate that intuition and ecstasy are the essential characteristics of creativity.

Creativity as an invention, as an intellectual form of human activity appears in the philosophy of pragmatism and instrumentalism. For example, in the work of John Dewey “How we think” creative is interpreted as ingenuity of the mind, ability to solve all sorts of problems, both practical and theoretical.

Non-classical philosophical concepts treat the novelty as a criterion characteristic of creativity not as a result of activity, but in processuality of creativity, disclosed by such concepts as duration, intersubjectivity, polyphony, diversity, interparadigmality, etc.

In the non-classical tradition the creative process and its results are complemented by anthropological and social dimensions. In the collective work “Creativity as a principle anthropogenes” the problem of creativity is solved on an interdisciplinary level for the first time, at the intersection of philosophical anthropology, psychology, philosophy, culture, pedagogy, aesthetics, etc<sup>14</sup>. Thus, V. I. Samohvalova believes that not every new is a manifestation and the result of creativity. In the article “Art as antropocultural phenomenon” researcher itemizes criterias of creativity:

- constructive (not destructive, destroying) nature of the process of creation, and its result; creativity is only the productive change;
- value creation;

- act of giving (transfer to the addressee), when creator gives his creation to people, to the world;
- inclusion the creation into the system of links, where the meaning of a creation appears;
- self-realization of the creator as a duel with creator’s personal demon (S. Zweig), who inspires the creator with the spirit of quest, anxiety; demand for creative person<sup>15</sup>.

Peter V. A., Ogniov A. S. treat creativity as a form of self-motion of the individuality as a transcendental subject of activity<sup>16</sup>. Researchers examine creativity in terms of the genesis of subject, where creativity is a phenomenon of the active non-adaptability, a form of self-sufficient human activity, generation and reproducing themselves as the subjects of new formation, as a process of development of human personality<sup>17</sup>. Creativity in the eyes of the subject makes sense only when in the act of creation he is free from schemes, when he can introduce himself in the world, to form his new image through the self-denial, self-development, self-realization. A man-creator, who has realized the creativity as a value and an internal necessity, is characterized as a creative directed. Creative aspiration is realized not only through the novelty-seeking, or through a desire to resolve the contradictions, but also through a desire for creativity for the sake of self-transcendence.

Thus, in XXI century, thanks to the achievements of Sciences and Humanities, we go on discovering new opportunities of investigating and understanding the creativity.

<sup>1</sup> Plato. Sofist. Sochineniia v chetyrekh tomakh. St. Petersburg, Izdatel’stvo Olega Abyshko, 2007. T. 2, pp. 406.

<sup>2</sup> Plato. Sofist. Sochineniia v chetyrekh tomakh. St. Petersburg, Izdatel’stvo Olega Abyshko, 2007. T. 2, pp. 406–407.

<sup>3</sup> Plato. Fedr. Izbrannye dialogi. Moscow, Khudozhestvennaia literature, 1965, pp. 208.

<sup>4</sup> Avgustin Avrelii. Ispoved’; Istoriia moikh bedstvii. Moscow, Respublika, 1992, pp. 50.

<sup>5</sup> Akvinskii F. Summa teologii. Mir filosofii: Kniga dlia chteniia. V dvukh chastiakh. Moscow, Politizdat, 1991, pp. 15.

<sup>6</sup> Berdiaev N. A. Smysl tvorchestva. Filosofiiia svobody. Smysl tvorchestva. Moscow, Pravda, 1989, pp. 234–235.

<sup>7</sup> Pivovarov D. V. (2012). Tri religiozno-filosofskikh modeli tvorchestva. Obrazovanie i nayka. V. 7, pp. 54–66.

<sup>8</sup> Pivovarov D. V. (2012). Tri religiozno-filosofskikh modeli tvorchestva. Obrazovanie i nayka. V. 7, pp. 54–66.

- <sup>9</sup> Brianik N. V. (2012). Osobennosti znaniia neklassicheskoi nauki. Nauchnyi ezhegodnik Instituta filosofii i prava Ural'skogo otdeleniia Rossiiskoi akademii nauk. V. 12, pp. 86–97.
- <sup>10</sup> Brianik N. V. (2012). Osobennosti znaniia neklassicheskoi nauki. Nauchnyi ezhegodnik Instituta filosofii i prava Ural'skogo otdeleniia Rossiiskoi akademii nauk. V. 12, pp. 92.
- <sup>11</sup> Lung K. G. Sobranie sochinenii: v 19 t. Moscow, Renessans, 1992. T. 15, pp. 72.
- <sup>12</sup> Bergson A. Tvorcheskaia evoliutsiia. Moscow, Kanon-press, Kuchkovo pole, 1998, 384 p.
- <sup>13</sup> Bergson A. Tvorcheskaia evoliutsiia. Moscow, Kanon-press, Kuchkovo pole, 1998, pp. 47.
- <sup>14</sup> Kiiashchenko N. I. Printsipy I kriterii tvorchestva – formy ikh vzaimodeistviia. Tvorchestvo kak printsip antropogeneza. Moscow, Akademiia gumanitarnykh issledovani, 2006, pp. 20–82.
- <sup>15</sup> Samokhvalova V. I. Tvorchestvo kak antropokul'turnyi fenomen. Tvorchestvo kak printsip antropogeneza. Moscow, Akademiia gumanitarnykh issledovani, 2006, pp. 162–228.
- <sup>16</sup> Ognev A. C. Psikhologiiia sub“ektogeneza lichnosti. Moscow, Izdatel'stvo MGGU, 2009, 137 p.
- <sup>17</sup> Ognev A. C. Psikhologiiia sub“ektogeneza lichnosti. Moscow, Izdatel'stvo MGGU, 2009, 137 p.

### References

1. Avgustin Avrelii. Ispoved'; Istoriia moikh bedstvii. Moscow, Respublika, 1992, 332 p.
2. Akvinskiy F. Summa teologii. *Mir filosofii: Kniga dlia chteniia. V dvukh chastiakh*. Moscow, Politizdat, 1991, 672 p.
3. Bergson A. Tvorcheskaia evoliutsiia. Moscow, Kanon-press, Kuchkovo pole, 1998, 384 p.
4. Berdiaev N. A. Smysl tvorchestva. *Filosofiiia svobody. Smysl tvorchestva*. Moscow, Pravda, 1989, 607 p.
5. Brianik N. V. (2012). Osobennosti znaniia neklassicheskoi nauki. *Nauchnyi ezhegodnik Instituta filosofii i prava Ural'skogo otdeleniia Rossiiskoi akademii nauk*. V. 12, pp. 86–97.
6. Kiiashchenko N. I. Printsipy I kriterii tvorchestva – formy ikh vzaimodeistviia. *Tvorchestvo kak printsip antropogeneza*. Moscow, Akademiia gumanitarnykh issledovani, 2006, pp. 20–82.
7. Ognev A. C. Psikhologiiia sub“ektogeneza lichnosti. Moscow, Izdatel'stvo MGGU, 2009, 137 p.
8. Pivovarov D. V. (2012). Tri religiozno-filosofskikh modeli tvorchestva. *Obrazovanie i nayka*. V. 7, pp. 54–66.
9. Plato. Sofist. *Sochineniia v chetyrekh tomakh*. St. Petersburg, Izdatel'stvo Olega Abyshko, 2007. T. 2, 626 p.
10. Plato. Fedr. *Izbrannye dialogi*. Moscow, Khudozhestvennaia literature, 1965, 445 p.
11. Samokhvalova V. I. Tvorchestvo kak antropokul'turnyi fenomen. *Tvorchestvo kak printsip antropogeneza*. Moscow, Akademiia gumanitarnykh issledovani, 2006, pp. 162–228.
12. Lung K. G. Sobranie sochinenii: v 19 t. Moscow, Renessans, 1992. T. 15, 314 p.



## **Понимание творчества и его критериев в классической и неклассической философии**

**О.Н. Томюк**

*Уральский федеральный университет им. Б.Н. Ельцина  
Россия, 620083, Екатеринбург, пр. Ленина, 51*

---

*В статье дан сравнительный анализ подходов к пониманию творчества и его критериев в классической и неклассической философии. В результате анализа было выявлено, что рациональные основания творчества сформировали классическую концепцию творчества, в которой творчество трактуется с позиций всеобщих категорий, а учение о творческом бытии есть учение о бытии поисков всеобщего, необходимого и закономерного. Изменения в понимании феномена творчества в неклассической концепции связаны, прежде всего, с пониманием реальности в ее процессуальности, движении, становлении. Следовательно, творчество в неклассических концепциях трактуется как противоположность механическому рационализму, где место разума занимает воля, интуиция, инстинкты и др.*

*В рамках классической традиции творчество определено как деятельность, которой присущ признак результативной новизны, поэтому основным и универсальным критерием творчества в классической философии выступает новизна. Неклассические философские концепции творчества видят новизну как критериальную характеристику творчества не в результате деятельности, а в процессуальности творчества, раскрываемого с помощью таких понятий, как длительность, междусубъектность, полифоничность, многоплановость, межпарадигмальность и др. Кроме того, в неклассической традиции процесс творчества и его результаты дополняются антропологическим и социальным измерениями. Область применения результатов – философия, раздел – онтология; философия творчества.*

*Ключевые слова: творчество, природа творчества, субъекты творчества, критерии творчества в классической философии, критерии творчества в неклассической философии, новое, новизна, процессуальность творчества, творческая устремленность.*

*Исследование проведено при финансовой поддержке молодых ученых УрФУ в рамках реализации программы развития УрФУ.*

---