

The Demarkation of Creativity, Talent and Genius in Humans: a Systemic Aspect

Alla NERUBASSKA¹,
Borys MAKSYMCHUK²

¹ Odesa I. I. Mechnikov National University, Odesa, Ukraine, saylor03@ukr.net

² Izmail State University of Humanities, Izmail, Ukraine, 0674256781@ukr.net

Abstract: A person becomes a part of a system that can “crush” him or her emotionally, sensually, psychologically and physically. At the same time, a person is still a self-organizing system that has a high degree of adaptability. The study aims to consider creativity, talent and genius in human beings, identify their grounds for subordination and manifestation and justify the content of their demarcation in a systemic aspect. The system-parametric method developed by A. Uyemov allows revealing the nature of the creative principle of a person. The basis of this method is a dual definition of the system to which any object can be represented. When defining an object, the concept, structure and substrate are highlighted in it. This hierarchy constitutes integrity in the system under consideration. A systemic model of several objects is proposed to determine the demarcation lines in the properties of person, which are creative, talented and ingenious: a person is a biological creature; a person is a creative human being. Subsystems are distinguished: “creative and talented people”, “creative, talented and genius people”. Isolating subsystems helps to analyze demarcation lines. Using the system parameters “minimum-non-minimum” systems and “strong-weak” systems shows that the “creative person” system is minimal and strong, as well as more complex than the “human-biological being” system. The “creative person” system includes the other powerful systems listed above. The study proves that the weakest demarcation line in the system is “creative, talented and genius people” since it is difficult to imagine genius without talent.

Keywords: *concept; structure; substrate; the system-parametric method; organic creature; creative being; art.*

How to cite: Nerubasska, A., & Maksymchuk, B. (2020). The Demarkation of Creativity, Talent and Genius in Humans: a Systemic Aspect. *Postmodern Openings*, 11(2), 240-255.
<https://doi.org/10.18662/po/11.2/172>

Introduction

The emerging problems, to a new degree of their manifestation, convincingly draw attention to the fact that at different levels of upbringing and education of the modern generation, it is necessary to build strategies to overcome communicative crises. The authors of the paper believe that art can become one of such strategic foundations. Another option might be mass culture. *“Being mobile and “responsive” to the requirements of the moment, mass culture promotes the socialization and sustainability of the subject in an unreliable and unstable social and cultural environment. It can form new tastes and standards of behaviour, satisfy artistic and aesthetic needs”* (Turkina, & Antonova, 2019, p. 29).

Relevant enough is the identification of the fact that the concepts of creativity, talent and genius in a non-standard way can be included in the “person” system and consider them as human capabilities in any overcoming. It is not easy to analyze the behaviour of people in different situations, especially if these situations are complex, crisis-related, poorly predicted even by those specializing in this field. Other areas of life come to the rescue of science. Given such impact of the spheres of society on a person, art becomes a reflection of the sensual and the emotional.

Researchers who dealt with human issues in the context of the problems under study are Bartlett (1958), Berkeley (2012), Byvalkevych et al. (2020), Gerasymova et al. (2019), Guilford (1950), Jung (1996), Kant (2007), Kozlovskiy et al. (2019), Maslow (2009), Melnyk et al. (2019), Schopenhauer (2001), Sebalo & Teslenko (2020), Sheremet et al. (2019) et al.

Their works are mainly about an abstract person, without identifying his or her uniqueness as a “living” intellectual being, with all his or her qualities in the direction of creating himself or herself and his or her environment. At the same time, a person is the main element in the system of culture, namely the artificial environment that he or she created. Researchers’ preference is associated with aspects of the philosophy of art, the analysis of historical forms of art and their transformation, the correlation of art and aesthetics.

Therefore, it is possible to apply the system-parametric method at the empirical level to fulfil the goals and show the demarcation lines of “creativity, “talent” and “genius” in a person.

It is necessary to clarify and show the role of art and culture in human life, especially if moments of being are connected with crises and bifurcations, to highlight the creative principle in a modern person, to imagine a systematic study of a person considered as a biological species and a person who is a creative creature by nature and his or her creative activity

in all spheres of life helps him or her overcome crises associated with the influence of the social environment.

Based on *the research hypothesis*, it is possible to find the demarcation boundary between the concepts of creativity, talent and genius based on systemic analysis. Art acts as a mirror of the human soul, which, at the same time, closes and opens its feelings to the world. The person's manifested reaction to what is happening may also become the way out of the crisis with a certain idealization of reality. One needs to understand where a person has a creative beginning, where his or her talent is and, finally, who is a genius? In the aspect of anthro-po-social problems, in particular, the enormous growth of scientific discoveries, this issue has sounded in a new light. There is a demarcation border: somewhere it is clear, somewhere blurred. The differences in these concepts considered in the "human" system will be seen when one builds a hierarchy of descriptors, that is, one defines the concept, structure and substrate of each of the systems.

Material and methods

"Art does not replace the surrounding life and does not duplicate the demonstrated reality. Instead, it creates an ideal idea about the proper state of life through the creative will of the artist" (Voskresenskaya, 2005). Such an idea was propagated by romanticists of the late 18th – 19th centuries (such philosophers as the Schlegel brothers, Novalis, Kant et al.; such artists as Francisco Goya, Antoine-Jean Gro, Theodore Gericault, Eugene Delacroix, Karl Bryullov et al). As noted by researchers, this was a Utopian position, however, giving hope for a better life. Indeed, how beautiful is the very idea of beauty that will save the world. In romanticism, the mission was assigned to art, that is the salvation of society. This idea was picked up by both the Symbolists and the avant-garde. However, this study will not be devoted to art as such, but to a person for whom it can be self-realization in society, salvation from society, a "cure" for the crisis, or the work of a lifetime. Whatever it is for a person, it becomes part of his or her being.

The method of this study began to develop actively in the 1960s, that is the systemic one. Bogdanov (1989), Mesarović (1972), Sadovskiy and Lekterskiy (1960), Von Bertalanffy (1969) and many others stood at the origins of this method. This study uses one of the variations of the systems approach, namely, the system-parametric approach developed by Uyemov (1978) and his followers. The five basic concepts on which the general parametric theory of systems is built are the two definitions of a system

(“dual definition”), concept, structure and substrate. The definitions of these concepts are given below.

The choice of the topic of this work and its novelty will be associated with the use of the systemic method in the study of the creative principle of a person. The main aspects of the novelty of the research approach are 1. Representing a person as a system based on the system-parametric method, highlighting the most important parameters of being and their content (concept, structure and substrate), as well as defining some parameters of the second kind (attributive); 2. Distinguishing between such systems as “person” and “creative person” through selecting one of the levels of the hierarchy of system parameters (descriptors). This difference in systems allows revealing the demarcation lines between creativity, talent and genius in a person, as well as seeing when some of these qualities become indistinguishable.

The paper proceeds from the fact that Uyemov (1978) presented the system definition in two ways. He called this definition “dual”:

1. *“Any arbitrarily taken object is a system if it is such an object on which some relation that has a fixed property is realized;*

2. *Any arbitrarily taken object will be a system if its properties are connected by a certain fixed relation”* (Uyemov, 1978, p. 98).

The mechanism of determining system descriptors (concept, structure and substrate) was described in detail by A. Uyemov’s student:

“A concept in the parametric general theory of systems is always a definite, fixed, predetermined, predetermined, assumed when constructing any system, and this “definition” depends, on the one hand, from the subject of research, and on the other, from the object. The subject’s choice in the study of the concept of the system is determined by those features of the object that somehow attract attention to this object. Roughly it looks like this. The subject cognizes an unfamiliar object. For a full study of this object, he or she builds a system. To build a system, the subject necessarily defines the concept of the system. This concept for him or her is some recognizable, recognized, well-known features of the object, for example, familiar signs of the object under study or even associations that arise when considering this object. Here, the subject chooses a concept for constructing a system based on recognition, even if this recognition takes an associative or symbolic form” (Reichert, 2013, pp. 73–74).

The paper applies the systemic method to solve the tasks.

Discussion

Art and philosophy have different approaches to the problem of person. About this writes Markov (2013). The researcher emphasizes the

difference in which art creates a portrait, a model of person, and philosophy creates the idea of a person. Art is guided by a sense of taste, and philosophy is true. Referring to the Viennese cultural expert Lismann (2009), he concludes that the modern culture is not determined by the work of art itself, but by the number of stars, ratings, gossip, scandals, presentations and all that enriches the organizers. The authors of the paper believe that this is how the crisis in this area was born. Person has ceased to “fill” himself or herself with some content.

In his work “Siate iniperosy: the poetics of the inaction of Giorgio Agamben”, Prozumentik (2018) analyzes Agamben’s book “Man without Content” (Agamben, 1970), which put the split between genius and taste, creator and critic, art and aesthetics at the centre of their ideas. The author cites the term “death of art”, the meaning and reason of which lies in the crisis of human “doing”. *“If originality and authenticity are made an imperative for works of art, then reproducibility is a criterion for technical products”* (Prozumentik, 2018, p. 7).

Today there is a hybridization of these species, i.e. works of art and technical products. Thus, the paper simplifies the internal in a person.

The paper by Blackburn (2019) “On Reading Scruton: Art, Truth, and Temperament” describes the connection of art, truth and human nature. In the “passion of presentation”, he sees an opportunity to relax with the help of art. Art is a way to hide from everyday life, neighbours, fuss, social rules, standards. In art alone, passions are justified by the notion *“in other places our passions are conditioned and embarrassed”* (Blackburn, 2019, p. 367). Representations and passions are discussed by another author Soyarslan (2019), moreover in the concept of “a free person” by Spinoza (Curley, 2016). Criticizing and not agreeing with Stephen Nadler’s (1999) interpretation of Spinoza’s concept of human passions, which a person always supposedly controls in any actions, Soyarslan (2019) argues that *“becoming a wise person is not to overcome human slavery, but to understand oneself as the ultimate expression of God power”* (Soyarslan, 2019, p. 357).

Continuing the traditions of Schelling (1987) and others, Khrenov (2016) makes an attempt to determine the concept of the philosophy of art, which in modern times should be reoriented by value, updated. Further, the author tries to express the position of the transition of the epochs of modernity into postmodernity and leaves the possibility of a new definition of the next stage, which is not identical to “post-culture”, but already not quite postmodern. An even more acute question is being raised, the question of whether art is capable of creating alternative ideas about the future in globalization destructive processes. In the inevitable turn to posthuman

aesthetics, the conclusion is fixed that the desire to fully understand a person is completely wrong. A revision of the concepts of “person”, “subject”, “life” is needed (Oancea, 2018).

According to Skorkin (2014), the artistic language changes from century to century. *“If the previous century was saturated with a change in the directions of the avant-garde, a kind of fashion (impressionism, post-impressionism, cubism, primitivism, Fauvism, futurism, Suprematism, Orphism, expressionism), today there is no dominant trend in painting at all. Modern painting accepts all the previous directions and their combinations, the natural slogan is “Let all the flowers bloom”, the matter is not in shape”* (Skorkin, 2014, pp. 15–38).

This reminds of the position of the famous post-positivist Feyerabend (1975), who proposed anarchism in science. Skorkin (2014) comes to disappointing conclusions about contemporary art. The dominant principle of the time was the “buy-sell” principle, which is why visual art, using modern means of communication, obeyed the electronic culture, in which masterpieces cannot appear. Moreover, as the authors of the paper noted at the beginning of the paper, even interpersonal communication suffers, and dialogue with oneself can also be pessimistic and sad, even depressing.

One of the recent works that appeared in the public domain is a monograph by Kleiberg (2016) “Creative deviantology”. This monograph raises related issues with the theme of this study. The author focuses on the fact that his research concerns the sections of psychology. At the same time, he calls on researchers in sociology, philosophy, and other areas of humanitarian knowledge to unite and develop this topic. Kleiberg (2016) claims that our whole life has a deviantological basis. One of the positive ways out of social instability, conflicts, dissatisfaction is creativity, alcoholism, drug addiction, “hippieism” become a negative vector. The author considers the psychological nature of creativity, creativity as a manifestation of deviance, motivational conflict, creative disorder, shocking and manipulation in art, brutality in art, etc. relationships, traditions, culture and to oneself. *“And if this attitude was the result of socially significant self-awareness in this world and the world (things, actions, relationships) in itself, then we are dealing with purposeful, creative work of a person over himself, with persistent socio-psychological immunity to negative social deviations”* (Kleiberg, 2016, p. 5).

This study presents a person as a system and, therefore, will compare systems where a person will be considered as a biological species, creation of nature. The second system is a creative person. Such an approach will allow one to more clearly distinguish between creativity, talent and genius in a person, or, conversely, to show their interconnection and identity.

Specific attention should be paid to the first system, that is a person as a biological species. Its descriptors should be defined. The most important existential aspects of measuring a “living personality” are intelligence, will, faith, doubt, fear, hope, love, despair, hatred, hunger, thirst, solidarity. All of them are “*connected with the deep structures of the human body*” (Punchenko & Doroshenko, 2004, p. 31). Following the Spanish philosopher Ortega y Gasset (2000), life is chosen as an integrating existential. In the author’s system, life, as a central, integrating existential aspect of human existence, will be the concept of the “person as a biological being” system. However, this being was understood differently in the history of philosophical anthropology.

A person has two natures: biological and social. According to the biological theory of Charles Darwin, which is backed up by vast amounts of empirical facts, humans and anthropoids originated from a common ancestor. According Plessner (2004), “*a person lives only when leading a life*” (Plessner, 2004, p. 268). Thus, the importance of the artificially created environment and the formation of culture are emphasized. The concept of “leading a life” has as its basic activity, moreover, creative activity in its various manifestations. Gelen (1988) believes that a person is the least adapted form to natural conditions. He reduces the natural in person to the concept of an “underdeveloped” species. The representative of philosophical anthropology emphasizes how much a person, by his or her biological, natural characteristics, is not able to defend himself or herself from nature itself. All that animals possess is “*elementary movements consisting of moving, searching for food, shelter, take a complete look in all animals extremely early, ranging from several hours to several weeks ... Human movements are subject to a completely different pattern. Two conditions can be noticed right away: the movement must have a completely exclusive, non-animal, non-specialized richness of combinations precisely to correspond to the unlimited variety of circumstances and situations that a person is provided with and which he or she must master. Thus, they should not be adapted to certain circumstances, have a special fixed form: further, they must not be “born”, because special combinations of movements are always born. But in a positive sense, this means that a person develops them and develops them through experience ...*” (Gelen, 1988, pp. 151–201).

Human inferiority minimizes the “natural” parameter in this concept. Thus, a person is included in nature, which he or she begins to transform and to which he or she simply needs to adapt, as part of it. Gelen (1988) writes that a person “*is drawn beyond the mere biological minimum of needs*” (Gelen, 1988, p. 198). Even Darwin (1871) emphasized the importance of the biosocial connection in a person. “*Having spread the main principles of*

evolutionary theory to humans in the book “The Descent of Person, and Selection in Relation to Sex”, Darwin paid tribute to the specifics of the biosocial nature of person, describing in detail the limitations in the action of biological laws that are imposed by the social institutions of person that have developed and are developing in anthropogenesis” (Buzhilova & Haritonov, 2009, p. 16).

Having decided on the concept of the “human-biological creature” system, this study proceeds to consider and search for the remaining elements of this system.

In the system “a person as a biological being” one way or another, one will not be able to abstract from the environment, and this environment is not only nature but its transformation into the culture to satisfy needs. The structure, as an element in the definition of the system under consideration, will be represented by interaction, mutual influence, the interconnectedness of the biological and social in a person.

The substrate will be an active person and his or her needs. Moreover, only those needs Maslow (2009) placed at the base of his pyramid (physiological: hunger, thirst, sex drive, etc.).

The paper also considers the second system, that is a creative person. In the spiritual plane, creativity caused by activity is inexhaustible, although, in the physical, some burning out can occur (Roerich, 2018). Creativity can be treated. In the 20th century, medicine developed the concept of therapy with creative expression.

“At present, in the Odesa regional branch of the scientific and methodological centre of Therapy with creative self-expression (with its leader E. A. Poklitar), the issue of forming an independent discipline in the development of the concept of therapy with creative self-expression is being considered, humanitarian and cultural studies aimed at deciding based on the clinical approach preventive, pedagogical, cultural and sociological tasks through the use of an arsenal of modern medical, psychological, pedagogical and means of spiritual culture” (Burno, 2004, p. 31).

The author of the technique developed it in Odesa, using knowledge and experience in pedagogy and medicine.

The central nervous system and the human brain are the material basis for developing the creative processes of the individual. *“The human brain, like a vessel, can contain various contents. It all depends on what is the environment that surrounds the individual and is reflected in his or her brain”* (Punchenko & Doroshenko, 2004, p. 26).

However, Maslow (2009) focused the attention of theoretical scientists on the fact that the influence of the environment should not be exaggerated. *“One should not go to extremes, one should not exaggerate the role of the environment and see in the body only one of the objects of the environment ... and the target*

object, and the barrier, standing on the path to it, are generated not only by the environment, but are also created by the individual himself, and they need to be discussed in terms that take into account both influences ” (Maslow, 2009, p. 41).

A. Arnoldov (1993), Davydov (1968) and Kagan (1996) point out to the creative transformative activity and its connection with the development of personality. If one keeps in mind musical abilities, he or she can also appeal to works by Vygotsky (1956), Leontev (1960) et al. In the contemporary works of psychologists, even systematic gender studies of the musical abilities of adolescents have been proposed (Mishchenko, 2015).

By analogy with the first system, the concept of the second system is life, only defining it with a property, i.e. a concept is a life with creative expression. The life of a modern person is filled with creativity so that he or she does not do whatever he or she is interested in. The concept is complicated with the “creative” attribute. This concept is not as simple as it might seem. Creativity itself is multifaceted, especially when it comes to spiritual creativity. This, for example, is painting. *“Anyone who despises painting despises the philosophical and refined contemplation of the world, for painting is a legitimate daughter or, rather, a granddaughter of nature ...” said Leonardo da Vinci (Roerich, 2018, p. 304).*

Great genius exalts creativity to the divine, saying that painting is “a relative of God.”

The structure in a creative person will be not just interactions, interconnectedness and mutual influence, but the whole dialectic of the biological and social, the dialectic of the natural essence, inclinations, talent, genius, giftedness, as well as the relationship of the Self and the Other.

The substrate of the system is an individual with a developing variety of vital needs (including the need for creativity), activities and public interests. Here is a list of all the needs from level to level according to A. Maslow (2009): needs for security, love, respect, cognitive abilities, aesthetic needs, needs for self-actualization.

Modern scholars, for example, note that *“the specific features of the subject of creativity are based on dynamic brain structures that fix the properties of those social conditions that surround the subject in its ontogenetic development ... diverse activities in a complex environment create diverse relationships, the mental content of which is determined by the content of the subject’s activity, and not the individual biological characteristics of the brain ... the psychological properties of the individual are formed under the influence of the social environment and social basic content domestic environment it as the subject creativity” (Punchenko & Doroshenko, 2004, p. 29).*

The “creative person” system is immersed in a creative, cultural, artificially created environment that at the same time has its laws for the very

foundations of creativity and its expression as a result. Based on these statements, the following systems can be distinguished from the second system: 1) a person who is creative and talented; 2) a person who is creative, talented, and genius. They should be analyzed.

In the structure where the makings of a person were laid, there may be differences. A creative person can be just creative, i.e. *“the main components and factors of the development of the subject’s creative potential are grouped around two “principles” of his biological and social nature”* (Punchenko & Doroshenko, 2004, p. 26).

However, a person can be creative and talented. Creativity, *“as a complex, determining, non-linear system, is characterized by some statistical stable formations, namely attractors, and one of these is talent”* (Vidmenko, 2013, p. 26).

Thus, a person can draw and sing. Therefore, he or she is no longer just creative, but creative and talented. The third option lies in the fact that a person can be creative, talented and brilliant. At the same time, genius is considered a very rare property. *“Genius is the ability to show universalism in every crucial creative moment, to direct all creative potential in a single direction at the right time”* (Punchenko & Doroshenko, 2004, p. 30).

Anyone interested in art can admire brilliant creations, but only a specialist can understand them. An art critic will be able to answer questions about the style, method, ownership of works of art, even without special talent, not to mention genius. It is enough to be a creative person who has received special education.

The problem of defining art itself has long been an object of research. There is an opinion that it is possible to distinguish some “forms of art” from other “forms of art” necessary for a better understanding of art. *“The latter corresponds to what we usually call art, such as painting, singing. The first corresponds to the form from which they acquire form, movement, speech. Given this difference, it becomes clearer that art and aesthetics are rooted in the properties of the “thing”, such as colour, shape and texture, and not in the product of the creation itself. Thus, the future of art will bring a new aesthetics in which these properties will be recognized by art, and as such will be the aesthetics of everyday life”* (Isrow, 2017, pp. 84–94).

One may agree with this, one may disagree. The paper introduces the idea that a work of art will be recognized as such if social conditions are taken into account and known. The author of the paper is trying to find a definition of art in the new realities of the modern world. She concludes that the form of art is not important at all, the future lies with the very forms of art. The aesthetic shift in art is aimed at understanding life, without any aesthetic fillers. In a word: life is beautiful in itself as the highest value, as a concept of person. Perhaps she is right since art follows the path of its

simplification, whereas the use of modern computer technologies turn art into replication, copies.

Using some attributive parameters of the parametric general theory of systems, one can characterize the considered subsystems as “minimal” (Uyemov et al., 2001). When one removes at least one of the elements, such systems are destroyed. If one removes genius from the system “a creative, talented and brilliant person”, one receives a completely different system: “a creative and talented person”. Removing the talented property from the system “a creative and talented person”, one sees the system “a creative person”. All these systems are “strong” (Uyemov et al., 2001), that is, not allowing any other elements to be included in their composition, without changing the entire system.

This part of the study should end with a very deep appeal by Berdyaev (1936), “*The doctrine of person as a creator is a creative task of modern thought*” (Berdyaev, 1936, p. 26).

Conclusions

In the real world of modern personality, there are always bifurcation points and various kinds of crises. The paper focuses on the fact that art and creativity are the mechanisms which can help overcome crises. It can be proved by medical methods related to creative therapy. Moreover, alcoholism, drug addiction and hippieism become negative drivers of exit from the bifurcation point. Creativity is a vector of positive exits from social instability, conflicts and dissatisfaction.

Having built system models based on Uyemov’s, the author of the paper determines some of their systemic parameters. Using systemic parameters, one can describe the systems under study. The paper presents the system models “a person as a biological species” and “a person as a creative being”, highlighting several sub-systems based on differences in understanding of creativity, talent and genius. Using systemic parameters “minimal-non-minimal” and “strong-weak”, it has become possible to notice that the “creative person” system is minimal and strong, as well as more complex than the “human-biological creature” system. The “creative person” system includes other powerful systems.

References

- Agamben, G. (2018). *Chelovek bez soderzhaniya* [Man without content]. New Literary Review.

- Arnoldov, A. I. (1993). *Vvedenie v kulturologiiu* [Introduction to culturology]. The National Academy of Culture.
- Bartlett, F. (1958). *Thinking: An experimental and social study*. Basic Books.
- Berdyaev, N. (1936). The problem of person (towards the construction of a Christian anthropology).
http://www.berdyaev.com/berdiaev/berd_lib/1936_408.html
- Berkeley, J. (2012). About spiritual attachment. *Historical and Philosophical Alpersonac*, 4, 123–125.
- Blackburn, S. (2019). On reading Scruton: Art, truth, and temperament. *Philosophy*, 94(3), 367–381. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0031819119000251>
- Bogdanov, A. A. (1989). *Tektologija: (Vseobshchaia organizatsionnaia nauka)* [Tectology as a general organizational science]. Economics.
- Burno, L. I. (2004). O razvitiu koncepcii tvorcheskim samovyrazheniem [On developing the concept of creative expression]. *Advances in Science and Technology*, 4(23), 31.
- Buzhilova, A. P., & Haritonov, A. V. (2009). Perechityvaya Charlza Darvina “Proishozhdenie cheloveka i polovoj otbor”. Darwin kak antropolog [Rereading Charles Darwin’s “The descent of person, and selection in relation to sex” (Darwin as an anthropologist)]. *Journal of Moscow University. Anthropology*, XXIII(4), 15–24.
<https://cyberleninka.ru/article/v/perechityvaya-charlza-darvina-proishozhdenie-cheloveka-i-polovoy-otbor-darvin-kak-antropolog>
- Byvalkevych, L., Yefremova, O., & Hryshchenko, S. (2020). Developing technical creativity in future engineering educators. *Revista Romaneasca pentru Educatie Multidimensionala*, 12(1), 162–175. <https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/206>
- Curley, E. (2016). *The collected works of Spinoza*. Princeton University Press.
- Darwin, C. (1871). *The descent of person, and selection in relation to sex*. John Murray.
- Davydov, Y. N. (1968). *Iskusstvo kak sotsiologicheskii fenomen. K kharakteristike estetiko-politicheskikh vzgliadov Platona i Aristotelia* [Art as a sociological phenomenon. On the description of aesthetic and political views of Plato and Aristotle]. Science.
- Feyerabend, P. K. (1975). *Against method. Outline of an anarchistic theory of knowledge*. New Left Books.
- Gelen, A. O. (1988). *O sistematike antropologii. Problema cheloveka v zapadnoj filosofii* [On the systematicity of anthropology].
<http://filosof.historic.ru/books/item/f00/s00/z0000341/index.shtml>
- Gerasymova, I., Maksymchuk, B., Bilozerovala, M., Chernetska, Y., Matviichuk, T., Solovyov, V., & Maksymchuk, I. (2019). Forming professional mobility in future agricultural specialists: the sociohistorical context. *Revista Romaneasca*

- pentru Educatie Multidimensionala*, 11(4), 345–361.
<https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/195>
- Guilford, J. (1950). Creativity. *American Psychologist*, 5(9), 444–454. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0063487>
- Holton, G. (1981). *Thematische analyse der wissenschaftli* [Thematic analysis of science]. Suhrkamp.
- Isrow, Z. (2017). Defining art and its future. *Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 6(6), 84–94. <https://doi.org/10.18533/journal.v6i6.1207>
- Jung, C. (1996). *Sobranie sochinenii* [Collected edition]. Canon.
- Kagan, M. N. (1996). Postmodernism as the birth of a new type of culture. *International Yearbook of Aesthetics*, 1, 47–58.
- Kant, I. (2007). *Estetyka* [Aesthetics]. Avers.
- Khrenov, N. A. (2016). *Filosofiya iskusstva v situacii voznikoveniya koncepta kultury* [The philosophy of art in the context of emerging the concept of culture]. <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/filosofiya-iskusstva-v-situatsii-voznikoveniya-kontsepta-kultury-nachalo/viewer>
- Kleiberg, Y. A. (2016). *Kreativnaya deviantologiya* [Creative deviantology]. IIU MGOU.
- Kozlovskiy, S., Grynyuk, R., Baidala, V., Burdiak, V., & Bakun, Y. (2019). Economic security management of Ukraine in conditions of European integration. *Montenegrin Journal of Economics*, 15(3), 137–153. <https://doi.org/10.14254/1800-5845/2019.15-3.10>
- Leontev, A. N. (1960). O formirovanii sposobnosti [On the development of capabilities]. *Issues of Psychology*, 1, 7–17. <http://ebooks.grsu.by/psihologia/leontev-a-n-o-formirovanii-sposobnostej.htm>
- Lismann, K. (2009). The age of significant events. In E. Y. Rezhabecka, B. V. Markova, & Y. M. Shilkova (Eds.), *Languages of Philosophy*. Publishing House of Saint Petersburg University.
- Markov, B. V. (2013). Filosofiya i iskusstva kak praktiki obrazovaniya cheloveka [Philosophy and art as a practice of human education]. *Journal of Saint Petersburg State University. Series 17: Philosophy and Conflictology*, 1, 5–11. <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/filosofiya-i-iskusstvo-kak-praktiki-obrazovaniya-cheloveka>
- Maslow, A. (1970). *Motivation and personality*. Harper & Row.
- Melnyk, N., Bidyuk, N., Kalenskiy, A., Maksymchuk, B., Bakhmat, N., Matviienko, O., Matviichuk T., Solovyov V., Golub N., & Maksymchuk, I. (2019). Models and organizational characteristics of preschool teachers' professional training in some EU countries and Ukraine. *Zbornik: Institut za Pedagoška Istrazivanja*, 51(1), 46–93.

http://www.doiserbia.nb.rs/Article.aspx?id=0579-64311901046M#.XvHg5ZozY_4

- Mesarović, M. (1972). *Organizational structure: Cybernetic systems foundation*. Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Mishchenko, L. V. (2015). *Individualnost podrosteokov v ramkah sistemnogo issledovaniya s pozicijii pola i gender* [The individuality of adolescents in a systematic study from the perspective of sex and gender]. Direct MEDIA.
- Nadler, S. (1999). *Spinoza: A life*. Cambridge University Press.
- Oancea, R. I. (2018). Art and politics in posthuman paradigm. *Annals of the University of Bucharest. Philosophy series, LXVII(1)*, 185–204.
- Ortega y Gasset, J. (2000). *Kamen i nebo* [Stone and sky]. Grant.
- Plessner, H. (2004). Stupeni organicheskogo i chelovek: Vvedenie v filosofskuyu antropologiyu [Organic degrees and human: an introduction to philosophical anthropology]. ROSSPEN.
- Prozumentik, K. V. (2018). Siate iniperosy: Poetika bezdeystviya Dzhordzho Agambena [Siate inoperosi: The poetics of the inaction of Giorgio Agamben]. *Journal of Perm National Research Polytechnic University. Series: Culture. History. Philosophy. Law, 4*, 7–19.
<https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/siate-inoperosi-poetika-bezdeystviya-dzhordzho-agambena/viewerC/7>
- Punchenko, O., & Doroshenko, P. (2004). O estestvennykh predposylkah tvorcheskoj odarennosti lichnosti [On natural prerequisites for creative talent of personality]. *Advances in Science and Technology, 4(23)*, 26–35.
- Reichert, K. V. (2013). *Filosofsko-metodolohichni zasady dvoistobo systemno-parametrychnobo modeliuвання* [Philosophical and methodological principles of dual system-parametric modelling]. PhD Thesis. Odesa I. Mechnykov National University, Odesa. http://194.44.11.130/cgi-bin/irbis_nbu/cgiirbis_64.exe?C21COM=S&I21DBN=EC&P21DBN=EC&S21FMT=fullweb&S21ALL=%28%3C.%3EA%3D%D0%A0%D0%B0%D0%B9%D1%85%D0%B5%D1%80%D1%82%20%D0%9A%3C.%3E%29&FT_REQUEST=&FT_PREFIX=&Z21ID=&S21STN=1&S21REF=10&S21CNR=20
- Roerich, N. (2018). *Vechnaia zhizn* [Eternal life]. Alphabet.
- Sadovskiy, V. N., & Lektorskiy, V. A. (1960). O printsipakh issledovaniia sistem [On the principles of researching systems]. *Issues of Philosophy, 8*, 67–79.
- Schelling, F. V. (1966). *Filosofia iskusstva* [The philosophy of art]. Thought.
- Schopenhauer, A. (2001). *Sobranie sochinenii v shesti tomakh* [Collected works issued in six volumes]. TERRA-Book Club.

- Sebalo, L., & Teslenko, T. (2020). Future teacher training for selfeducation activity in physical education at elementary school. *Revista Romaneasca pentru Educatie Multidimensionala*, 12(1), 105–119. <https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/202>
- Sheremet, M., Leniv, Z., Loboda, V., & Maksymchuk, B. (2019) The development level of smart information criterion for specialists' readiness for inclusion implementation in education. *Information Technologies and Learning Tools*, 72, 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.33407/itlt.v72i4.2561>
- Skorkin, O. A. (2014). Dialog hudozhnika i zritelya [A dialogue between an artist and a spectator]. *A Philosophical Thought*, 6, 15–38. https://nbpublish.com/library_read_article.php?id=12575
- Soyarslan, S. (2019). Two ethical ideals in Spinoza's ethics: The free person and the wise person. *Journal of the American Philosophical Association*, 5(3), 357–370. <https://doi.org/10.1017/apa.2019.19>
- Turkina, V. G., & Antonova, E. L. (2019). Massovaya kultura v ee sovremennyh fenomenah [Mass culture in its modern phenomena]. *Science. Culture. Art*, 3(23), 28–44. <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/massovaya-kultura-v-ee-sovremennyh-fenomenah>
- Uyemov, A. I. (1978). *Sistemnyj podhod i obshaya teoriya sistem* [A systemic approach and a general theory of systems]. Thought.
- Uyemov, A. I., Tsofnas, A., & Saraeva, I. (2001). *Obshaya teoriya sistem dlya gumanitariyev: uchebnoe posobie dlya gumanitariyev* [A general theory of systems for soft scientists]. http://www.philosof.onu.edu.ua/elb/uemov/system_general_theory_for_guperson.pdf.
- Vidmenko, M. O. (2013). Deviantnist tvorchoi osobystosti [The deviance of creative personality]. *Scientific Knowledge, Methodology and Technology*, 1(30), 25–31. http://www.irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/irbis_nbuv/cgiirbis_64.exe?I21DBN=LINK&P21DBN=UJRN&Z21ID=&S21REF=10&S21CNR=20&S21STN=1&S21FMT=ASP_meta&C21COM=S&2_S21P03=FILA=&2_S21STR=Npmt_2013_1_7
- Von Bertalanffy, L. (1969). General system theory – a critical review. In V. N. Sadoskiy & E. G. Yudin (Eds.), *Studies on general theory of systems* (pp. 23–82). Progress.
- Voskresenskaya, M. V. (2005). *Simvolizm kak mirovidenie Serebrennogo veka: sociokulturnye faktory formirovaniya obshestvennogo soznaniya rossijskoj kulturnoj elity rubezha XIX – XX vekov* [Symbolism as the worldview of the Silver Age: sociocultural factors in the development of public consciousness of the Russian cultural elite at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries]. Logos.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1956). *Problema obucheniia i umstvennogo razvitiia v shkolnom vozraste* [The problem of learning and intellectual development at school age].

<https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/problema-obucheniya-i-umstvennogo-razvitiya-v-shkolnom-vozraste/viewer>