

Reality again.

Why is it that scientists like Feynman go on insisting that nature is the only worthwhile reality to study. Very well it can be subjected to experiment and so ratify your theory. But the life of the world is not in this category. When the great poem, the great painting, the great symphony is brought into existence what kind of proof is needed to give it the same solid foundation that great science can claim by its analysis. Especially since it is likely to be ahead of its time (though not necessarily eg Mozart). It is filled with a combination of analysis and intuition resembling the scientific idea but it has another ingredient the prophetic or revelatory. Of course a new idea in science can be a revelation but the term here means a sudden overwhelming clarification of a previous problem. Revelation in the artistic sense means a new reality has appeared in that medium. This new reality is completely outside nature and is the product of the indecipherable connections of the brain producing something which has no previous existence in the universe. It is man's property of finality (ie his mortality) which gives him the capacity, the desire to reach and represent infinity. These new realities exist independently of nature and could not occur if he knew himself to be immortal.

How can we judge the value of this new reality which turns man the mortal into immortality through his work. Well that feeling is one answer. Another is the provenance of the artist, the history of his work. A third is its aesthetic appeal to the civilised world. A fourth is the test of time. A fifth is the explication by the few close observers who have insight into the revelation now proceeding. These are more difficult judgements for there is no simple measurement by which we can be sure but in time the clearing created will ripple out into the surrounding darkness giving us another glimpse of greater light.