

The Autonomous Existence of Speech in the Dialogical Creative Act

Boyana Rumenova

MA, Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski” Faculty of Philosophy, Department of Cultural Studies

ABSTRACT:

There is no equality between the creator and his creation. It represents his ideas and feelings, his thoughts, and experiences, but once on the page or canvas, it ceases to be his. The only connection between them are the meaning-filled words which, combined with the moment's atmosphere and mood, represent the trace of the past and the frozenness of the moment.

Creativity is a self-absorption; it is always a coming out of oneself, because coming out is freedom. The relationship between the creator and creation takes place only at the level of dialogue.

KEYWORDS: Creativity, Consciousness, Autor, Reflection, Dialogue

INTRODUCTION

It is in its own dialogicity that culture realizes itself as an understanding, accessible and penetrating medium. Cultural processes become so by virtue of their reciprocity towards someone or something, by their referential orientation. The creative atmosphere creates the possibility of the birth of two new cultural phenomena – the work and the creator, and within this birth a new dialogicity takes place – the one between the creator and his work. The dialogue with the work is a dialogue with culture and its essential manifestations in the word, because it is not in the storylines themselves or in the rhymes and stanzas, but the dialogue takes place on another level – the one defining the correlation author-text. The latter is transformed into text-man, and even later – into cultural medium-man. In fact, culture is a kind of text that is written by the man-artist, but to be understood, he must enter into dialogue with it, and for this to happen, he must escape from his own creation in order to feel its beauty, its flesh. For culture to come alive, the demiurge must breathe life into it, and this will only happen if he frees it from its own shackles and prejudices, from its own prohibitions and inhibitions. Otherwise everything will be a repetition, a recreation of what has already happened, and the new will lose its meaning, and that would mean the death of culture. It turns out that it is not possible to live inside the cultural environment, but on the contrary – for it to be real and essential – distance is necessary, because, no matter how abstract and already rather worn out the concept of culture may be, it is its consideration from the outside that makes it alive and necessary to exist. Its life is so necessary for man that he could not imagine his existence without it, because it is a dialogue, and it is man's relationship with people, with the world and with himself.

CREATOR AND CREATION

The creation of the word – poetic, prosaic, literary – can be realized on the only possible re-creation of the world. In it lies the creator's escape from reality, but also his true perception of that reality. Language

is the relation of the birth of the idea to the discovery of its meaning in the emergence of the new reflection of the created. The essence of the creative act is not in the word itself, nor in the process, but in the artifact, i.e. in the co-experience of the birth and in the relation of the creator to the created.

The author's child is his own flesh, voice, and thoughts, but as it falls into the world of living opinions and messy systems of concepts and mistakes, it acquires its own flesh, different from the original, its own voice and ideas. In fact, the creator does not re-create himself (there is no point in that), but in creating a new world, he alienates himself from it in order to make it real and to enter into dialogue with it. The process of creation does not coincide with what is received, nor is it necessary, because the essence is in overcoming one's own limitation, breaking it, and discovering all that could be or that is to come – that which is always more than reality, but which can in no way escape it. The creator does not recreate himself. He always creates something different – better or worse, but always different. There is no equality between the creator and his creation. It represents his ideas and feelings, his thoughts, and experiences, but once on the page or canvas, it ceases to be his. They are now a new life ready to live outside the womb of the creator. The only connection between them are the meaning-filled words which, combined with the moment's atmosphere and mood, represent the trace of the past and the frozenness of the moment. All of this is just a second and a pathos, which in themselves mean nothing, but thanks to which the birth of the work takes place. When it has occurred and when the creation has taken shape as independent and alive, then the poet or the artist steps back to see not himself but a new and different flesh. The touch of the artist to it is the touch of man to culture, and therein lies its meaning – in the contact with the living flesh of creation, in its understanding and comprehension. This dialogue then turns into a search for lost meanings and their revival, because the text or the picture are nothing but messy meanings. The text is content and nothing else. The word itself does not exist. Only its content exists. Words are not words for themselves – they are meanings. It would be wrong and nonsensical to look for the internal logic of language and to claim that "all philosophy is a critique of language." (Wittgenstein, 1988)

This means that the subject does not belong to the world, but is its boundary through the language it alone understands. The impossibility of this theory lies in its univocity. The word does not live for itself alone. It does not exist as such at all. The author deals with the meanings of words, not with words as such. He does not think of the words and with the words, but of their meaning, and through it – he creates the new world. The author's dialogue is not a dialogue with the word, but with the world it depicts. The contrary is unthinkable. The existence of language as such is meaningless and that is not its purpose. "The word lives outside itself, in its living orientation to the object: if we were to detach ourselves completely from this orientation, we would be left with the stripped corpse of the word in our hands, from which we would be unable to learn anything either about its social situation or about its life destiny" (Bakhtin, 1983). Language can by no means be an end, it is only a means to create the creation itself. It is the material with which living flesh is built and nothing more. Everything else is an illusion. The word must cease to be felt as word, for thus a false boundary is created between signifier and signified. Thus, the image cannot be freely penetrated and its meaning becomes meaningless. Therefore, language must be overcome as a barrier, one must look beyond its form in order to give birth to reality, otherwise the relationship between the author and his creation, and therefore the dialogue in culture, cannot take place. It is not possible for creative consciousness to coincide with linguistic consciousness. This linguistic consciousness is only an instant phenomenon within the subjective consciousness as a whole, a material governed by a purely artistic task. It is just a tool to express and unify the creative act but not an overall description of the creator's mind because as Nikolov says: "The very circle of the human experience, where the philosophy

extrapolates, inevitably as well comprises phenomena, which could have been understood by themselves only in their relation to the subjective consciousness” (Nikolov{2};2024) The creative act itself is an immanent overcoming of the material, i.e. of language. Dialogic culture excludes this material so that only the living reality depicted in the created remains. Creation is the escape from form and its projection into the life-giving power of creation. Creation, as a cultural process, is a relation to the world, to the knowledge of it, to the knowledge of the other. For it is in relation that understanding lies, and it is the ultimate goal of cultural social consciousness. Language is a means of knowing, but having being only as knowledge concerning an object. This presupposes its relativity to the world, to the other, which is the carrier of the premise for the realization of cultural relationship. "Apart from our creative or creational consciousness, we have to feel vividly the “*other consciousness*” to which our creative activity is directed precisely as to another. It is not possible to refer the form to itself; by referring it to ourselves, we become other to ourselves, i.e. we cease to be ourselves ourselves, to live from ourselves, we become encompassed" (Bakhtin{5}, 1996).

Creativity is not simply the creation of cultural artifacts for culture, but the shaking of the whole human being in its orientation to another life, another being, and communication in and with it. Creativity is the opposite of egocentrism. It is to be a part of an entire thought-system which borrows from each set member and it gives back to all other members but with an element of reflection as Nikolov says: “In connection with the point previously mentioned, each informationally based system, claiming for self-sufficiency, could not exist if it misses the element of self-reflection. The latest assures the proactivity in the world-observing situation as well as the opportunity for a successful probable forecasting of relevant being-oriented scenarios” (Nikolov{1};2024) On the contrary, it is forgetfulness of self and striving toward that which is higher than the creator. The creative experience cannot be a reflection on our own imperfection, but a turning toward the transformation of the world and a dialogue in and with that world.

CONCLUSION

Creativity, least of all, is self-absorption; it is always a coming out of oneself, because coming out is freedom. The relationship between the creator and creation takes place only at the level of dialogue. No sign of equality can be put up. Quite often the hero is spoken of as the author, which is completely wrong. (For example, the portrayal of Tolstoy in Levinas (Anna Karenina) or of Stendhal in Julien (Red and Black)). No writer can describe himself, not in his objectivity and completeness, not in his essential manifestations. These characters come alive thanks to him, but they are different from him. The author could not know himself in them because he does not create the work for himself and cannot live in it himself. Neither the rhymes, nor the story lines, nor the pictures represent the artist. They are only his children who, once born, already live another life, and this is precisely the essence of dialogue in culture. The quest for perfection can never be a repetition of something, but its modification and its projection into another reality. For this to happen, the complete alienation of the author from the text is necessary.

"Starting from myself, I have to find the world outside myself. Therefore, only I, being outside of existence, can accept and complete it independently of meaning... I have to value the whole of being outside of being, so that nothing of value to myself remains of 'me' and of 'mine' in being, subject to the act of aesthetic perception; I have to clear the whole field of the preexistent given being for the other, to direct all my activity before myself, and only then will preexistence stand as needy, as weak and fragile, as a lonely and defenceless child. passive and holy naive... But for being to reveal itself to me in its feminine passivity I must be fully active and stand completely outside it" (Bakhtin{4}, 1996).

Dialogue in culture takes place together with the birth of creation and the relationship between it and the creator, because this is the only possibility for objectivity. Distance is necessary for the realization of this dialogue and its possibility of touching the understanding, the harmony, so desirable in the cultural situation of our time.

REFERENCES:

1. Nikolov, P.N. (2024) Ontology of the virus. International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research, V.6, Issue 2., [doi:10.36948/ijfmr.2024.v06i02.15457](https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2024.v06i02.15457)
2. Nikolov, P. (2024) Philosophical Anthropology and the Study of Time. Advances in Anthropology, 14, 15-20. [doi: 10.4236/aa.2024.142002](https://doi.org/10.4236/aa.2024.142002)
3. Бахтин, М., Въпроси на литературната естетика, Sofia. 1983, p. 141
4. Бахтин, М., Философия на словесността, Sofia, 1996, p. 154
5. Бахтин, М., Философия на словесността, Sofia, 1996, p. 215
6. Витгенщайн, Л., Логико - философски трактат, Sofia 1988, p. 97