

CHAPTER FOUR

CREATION II

1. Is creation a good one? Can you say a work of art is better than a work of craft? Why? Isn't it your habit to give value to the first more than to the latter? Let us set some condition, to give creation the neutral-value. Supposing that God creates Good, and Satan creates Evil. Now we have the verb 'create' as a neutral term.

2. The artist creates the work of art, or in other words the work of art is out of the creation of the artist. The craftsman makes the work of craft, or in other words the work of craft is out of the craftsmanship of the craftsman.

These are the distinct activities.

3. The act of creation is identical with the act of expression. The act of fabrication is a distinct one. The latter is the method of craft. In many cases the success in producing the material instantiation requires skill and accumulated ability.

4. The creation only in the head of the artist, is a private one. Only this artist knows what it is. This privacy none can speak of. What matter is that one which is made public, the material instantiation. This means using skill as craft to make it to be successful embodiment of the imaginary object. (On the moment of creating the private and the publicly one can come as the one at that moment, we do not reject this possibility.)

5. Then, the criterion of the good artist. First, look at the criterion of the good craftsman. A good craftsman is one who can control or using his/her skill to fulfil his/her purpose, this means to produce successful artifact. This good is defined by end. The criterion of the good artist when create work to be publicly observed. This means the one who can produce the material body as successful as good craftsman. The artist's experience come from his condition. Some narrower, some broader. From narrow, if one's experience goes beyond its narrowness, then the great one. "Great" means here "beyond one own condition". Then we have the criterion of the great artist, distinguishing from the 'good' criterion.

6. The work of art, the private one, unknown to anybody except the creator, does not have to be considered. The criterion is for the good work of art, the work which is made to be known. This work is divisible into two parts: (1) the special experience in the creator's mind, the genuine one. (2) its sensuous basis, taking bodily observable. This sensuous basis if succeed as symbol, paves the way for the observer to construct the genuine one, it's require successful externalize the artwork. Then, this gives the criterion of the good work of art. The one which publicly successful observable. The great work of art is the one which is rich in its soil.

7. The sensuous bodily object is the medium through which artists express their emotion and after the work is created, it becomes a media for the observer to reconstruct the genuine one. The transition is from the artist's head, to the material work-of-art, and finally to the observer's head. After the material instantiation all that really is important is the material work of art and the appreciator.

8. Can we say that the genuine expression and that the observer construct are identical? There are two sense: (1) the same as, (2) approximately the same as. (1) means successful in reconstruction. (2) means less successful but not a total failure. For a failure is the one that can't reconstruct, not identical as the genuine.

How is any one to know that the imaginative experience which the spectator, by the work of his consciousness, makes out of the sensations he receives from a painting 'repeats', or is 'identical' with, the experience which the artist had in painting it? That question has already been raised about language in general (Ch. XI. section 5) and answered by saying that there is no possibility of an absolute assurance; the only assurance we can have 'is an empirical and relative assurance, becoming progressively stronger as conversation proceeds, and based on the fact that neither party seems to the other to be talking nonsense'. The same answer holds good here. We can never absolutely know that the imaginative experience we obtain from a work of art is identical with that of the artist. In proportion as the artist is a great one, we can be pretty certain that we have only caught his meaning partially and imperfectly. But the same applies to any case in which we hear what a man says or read what he writes. And a partial and imperfect understanding is not the same thing as a complete failure to understand. (Collingwood n.d.:309)