## The Poem or "Noem".

The articulation of Being through a poem requires just as much study as a scientific paper and can be equally poor. The advantage of the great poem is that your collaborators are unseen and it all seems to come from you alone. Of course, nothing comes out of the blue and influences are legion. Nowhere is the analysis of a poem better illustrated than Brodsky: on Frost or Hardy or Rilke or Tsvetyeva. But unlike a scientific paper the good analysis is just a way of introduction for you to find your own appraisal and if you are a poet to nudge you further on "to the holy image you are shaping". Art is never eschatological, it is always opening new doors into new realities, and the creative person enters the room to spend a happy lifetime rearranging it, renewing it. In science it seems there is a kind of desperation to sum it all up-look at the Field theory search. At least we know in biology that we have only made a start.

In poetry there is no school you can go to only the study of your predecessors and a massive hope in life. That hope may have to be abandoned if you live in a totalitarian state. Science can work in both but above all you must be in the right place with the right funding. The poet is on his own but this I believe gives him a special voice and a special insight into society. There will be many technical/ ethical decisions ahead but the poet will keep our heads above water.

The poor poem (who hasn't written one) has been called a noem and this is certainly more embarrasing than a poor science paper but at least less confusing. Probably about 1% of the population ever read a poem and it is probably similar for a science paper. There is much to be done.

P.Celan, F. Holderlin