

# Review of: "Why the Standard Definition of Creativity Fails to Capture the Creative Act"

Alessandro Bertinetto<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Turin

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

Anna Abraham's article critically examines the standard definition of creativity, arguing that it inadequately captures the complexity of the creative process. She proposes a new definition, emphasizing internal evaluation of creativity rather than external judgments. Abraham suggests that creativity should be defined as ideas that are both novel and personally satisfying, advocating for a balance between internal and external frames of reference in assessing creativity. This approach aims to better reflect the multifaceted nature of creative thinking across various fields.

The paper is surely interesting. However, it does indeed have the appearance of a partial survey of the literature on the topic, as noted by J.S. Awati in his comment. In this regard, it would be beneficial to provide more information on some of the mentioned theories of creativity (reasoning-based processes (Abraham, 2018), Mednick's associative theory (Mednick, 1962), Wallas' 4-stage model (Wallas, 1926), and the Geneplore model (Finke et al., 1996)) and on certain particular aspects (what are the three meanings of "surprising" according to M. Boden? The reader should acquire this information from the article).

Furthermore, aside from the issue of the necessary interdisciplinary articulation of the theme of creativity raised by Simona Beccone and the suggestion made by John Cowan to better specify the meaning of "satisfying" (my suspicion is that it can be argued that valuable and satisfying have similar semantic conditions and therefore if the notion of value is rejected in the definition of creativity, replacing it with that of "satisfying" does not seem to provide very relevant epistemic advantages), I believe that the discussion should be integrated by specifying that not only ideas can be creative, but also the products of an activity. Finally, to avoid the risk of psychologism (basing a conception of creativity on people's introspective statements seems to pose such a risk), perhaps the author could draw some ideas for the articulation of the theme of creativity from Chomsky's distinction between rule-following and rule-changing creativity, from the articles of B. Gaut (who, although he assumes a position I would say is externalist - unwelcome, it seems, to the author - considers among the conditions of creativity a very important aspect, namely that the creative item (idea or work) is not the result of chance), as well as from the suggestion, which I defended some time ago in an article (<https://philarchive.org/rec/BERPTU>), that creativity has an emergent and improvisational dimension because there is a gap between the preconditions (for example, epistemic) and the inventive result: in other words, what is creative is not plannable in advance.

Lastly, Abraham might consider demonstrating the potential advantages of her proposal over a pragmatist conception of creativity, which suggests that creativity (such as artistic creativity) is not confined to the mind but involves the interaction

between the agent(s) and artifacts, tools, and materials, and evaluation is inherent to the creative process.

## Literature

Bertinetto, A. 2012, *Performing the Unexpected. Improvisation and Artistic Creativity*, Daimon, 57: 61-79

Bertinetto, A., Martinengo, A. (eds.) 2011, *Re-thinking Creativity. Creativity between Art and Philosophy* (special issue of *Tropos*, IV, 2/2011)

Bertinetto, A., Martinengo, A. (eds.) 2012, *Rethinking Creativity. Histories and Theories* (special issue of *Tropos*, V, 1/2012).

Chomsky, N., 1964, *Current issues in linguistic theory*, The Hague, Mouton.

Gaut, B. 2009 *Creativity and Skill*, in: M. Krausz, D. Dutton & K. Bardsley (eds.): *The Idea of Creativity*, Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2009, pp. 83-103.

Gaut, B. 2012 *Philosophy of Creativity*, *Philosophy Compass*, 5/12.

Leddy, T. 1994 *A pragmatist theory of artistic creativity*, *The Journal of Value Inquiry*, 28: 169-180.

Maitland, J. 1976, *Creativity*, *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 34: 397-409

Valgenti, R.T. 2021, *Material and Improvisation in the Formative Process*, in A. Bertinetto and M. Ruta (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Philosophy and Improvisation in the Arts*, new York, Routledge, pp. 60-82.