

## CHAPTER 14.

## ART

The perfected individual can merge with the triad of Reality; because there are present in him all the levels of Being required for the concrete exemplification of the Principles of Wholeness, Relationship and Structure. Such a being is called a Sage when he has knowledge of Function, experience of Being and understanding of Will in an equal degree. For him there is no distinction between science, art and religion. At a lower gradation of Being, the distinction must be made between learning, saintliness and wisdom. The, first is the possession of Objective Knowledge, the second is the attainment of real Being, and the third is the liberation of Will. The true learned man has not only the relative knowledge of Fact, but Objective Knowledge of the structure of all Existence. The scientist stands to the learned man as one who possesses fragments to one who possesses the Whole.

The saint has not only the experience of Being, but is established on that level of Eternity where the intensity of inner togetherness is invulnerable to the disruptive influence of Time. The artist stands to the saint as the scientist does to the learned man.

He has fragmentary experience of Being, but does not possess it. This comparison will help us to find the real significance of art in the life of man.

Being is the unifying or reconciling element in the triad of Reality, and therefore as such it neither affirms nor denies. Every existing whole is a triad in which Will and Function are united by a certain degree of inner togetherness, which is its Being.

During the past Epoch the relativity of Being has never been grasped in its full significance. It is therefore scarcely surprising that the need for expressing the gradations of Being has not been deeply felt. Of Western philosophers, Plotinus came nearest to understanding this need when he asserted that Being can be measured only in Eternity. He realised, moreover, that the measure of Being can be discovered only when a man 'withdraws' into himself and searches in his own conscious experience.

The question with which I shall be concerned in this chapter is the means whereby the experience of Being so discovered can be transmitted from one person to another. If two strangers meet and find that they have no language in common, one can begin to teach the other his language by the deictical process of pointing to an object and naming it. The act of pointing arouses the experience and the name then stands for something that can be shared. There is no other way in which a common language can arise. This seems to pose an impossible problem for communications about Being, for there are no ordinary means whereby we can enter; the consciousness, of another, and pointing to a specific inner state, says; "That is the gradation of inner togetherness which is represented by such and such a hydrogen number."

In the last chapter, I attempted, by means of descriptions, to carry out the deictical process for the twelve gradations of Being. To some extent this can be done because, the steps are so great that one level can be unambiguously distinguished from another. This does not mean that, the experience of Being itself can be described, but that the gradations of wholeness can be recognised even; externally from their influence upon the functions. Nevertheless, the indications are only approximate, and much that is deeply significant is left out of account. It is almost impossible to see that two wholes, very different in their function can nevertheless be on the same level of Being. For example, it is startling to discover that human food is on the same level of Being as the laws of nature, or finite selfhood as electrical energy. Such assertions seem to be not so much false as absurd, and meaningless. When their significance is grasped, we begin to understand the depth of meaning hidden in the axiom that Being cannot be known, but only experienced.

There is a further difficulty about the communication of Being and that is that when distinctions in level are small, functional descriptions entirely lose what little value they may have. I have already shown, in Chapter 12, how two apparently equivalent functional situations can correspond to quite different levels of Being. We therefore have the twofold-difficulty that our ordinary language fails to show how the same Being can be present in quite different, functional situations, and different Being in apparently identical functional situations.

We appear to be driven to the conclusion that the experience of Being must be a private matter, for individualised existence confined within the limits of finite selfhood. In the true sense, the communion of Being must be the communion of Saints. This is impossible in the third gradation of Individual Being, which constitutes the whole of the ordinary life of man. Nevertheless, the possibility of limited communication remains, and this is the authentic work of art. To make this clear, I shall start with the definition of art.

### **Art is the experience and expression of Being.**

Very little of the artistic life of man in recent centuries can satisfy this definition. This is scarcely surprising, since the experience of Being has long ceased to interest mankind. In former Epochs, when Being was recognised as the goal of human striving, the power of giving expression to its experience was recognised and respected as a rare gift, to be exercised only under conditions of special self-preparation. It is in this sense that Gurdjieff makes a distinction between objective and subjective art. The former is the conscious expression of an intentional experience. It is objective in the sense that those who create and those who enjoy the work of art share in the same, experience. In this way, objective art can rightly be called the language of Being.

Subjective art can be authentic or spurious. This does not depend upon the scale of the achievement or technical power of the artist. It depends solely upon whether or not a genuine experience of Being has been enjoyed and transmitted. This distinction is far more rigorous than those usually made by aesthetic criticism.

Much is accepted as art that belongs only to the activity of the functions, that is, sensation, feeling and thought. For the Greeks, art meant primarily the making of things and only secondarily the expression of an inner experience. One result of this was to fix attention on the effect of the work of art in terms of a functional reaction and so divert attention from the significance for Being, which was certainly understood by the earlier artists of Egypt and Syria.

For the distinction that I am seeking to make, it is not the grandeur or emotional force of the work of art, but the presence of an authentic inner experience that is decisive. The aesthetic situation arises only when there is an authentic experience of Being. A single line may convey such an experience in the midst of a poem which, as a whole, cannot satisfy the aesthetic definition.

The significance of art lies in its perspective. Artistic activity is a special form of the triad, in which Being is brought into prominence against a background of Function and Will. This can be compared with the description of Natural Science as the study of Reality from the standpoint of Function, with the minimum emphasis on distinctions of Being and Will. The division between science and art is one of the limitations of finite selfhood. For the Sage whose consciousness is established, Reality is directly perceived without foreshortening. Being, Function/and Will are seen by him in every situation in their true perspective. Insofar as science and art are divided, it is because the finite self in its ordinary states of consciousness is incapable of perceiving the full dimensions of Reality. They have therefore quite different tasks to perform in the ordinary life of man. Science is concerned primarily with Function, and since this is knowable, scientific activity can set before itself a clearly defined goal, namely, the discovery of a complete set of functional relationships within a given stratum of existence. It knows where it wants to go, and can fix the subject matter of its own activity. It can make a working distinction between its own proper domain and that of

technology, which is the practical application of its data .

No such convenient distinctions are possible for art; its goal, that is, Being, is unknowable. It cannot picture what it is looking for until it has found it. Its task is to express that which is essentially inexpressible. For this reason, art cannot be progressive. It cannot accumulate completeness of expression by increments. However much the perspective of art may fluctuate by reason of historical and personal influences, it does not advance. The fluctuations give rise to confused and contradictory interpretations of the significance of art in the life of man, but there is never any change in the artistic situation as such. As science must be distinguished from technology, so must art be distinguished from craftsmanship, which is the practical application in man's life of the fundamental principles in terms of Function . The craftsman transfers into practical life the artistic values in the same way as the technologist translates the discoveries of science. This can best be seen in ancient art, where the objects of everyday use reflected in their design and workmanship the artistic spirit of the age.

Art must also be distinguished from ontology, that is, the philosophy of Pure Being. Ontology is concerned exclusively with the relativity of wholes and the relationship of the many to the one. This it does by isolating the relationship of Being - greater and less - from the differentiations of Function and Will, Art, which is a practical activity, cannot dismember the triad in this way. Although its concern is with Being, it seeks the way towards experience and expression rather than to any exact determination. In either case, there, must be a sacrifice. Ontology is condemned to abstraction except insofar as it can borrow content for its symbolism from the aesthetic experience. Art is condemned to distortion except insofar as the consciousness of the artist is raised to that gradation at which his experience, of Being is immediate and undiluted by thought and feeling. The common goal of ontology and art is expressed in Plotinus' treatise on Beauty: "Withdraw .into, yourself and look. And if you do not find yourself beautiful yet, act as does the creator of a statue that is to be made beautiful; he cuts away here, he smoothes there, he makes this line lighter, this other purer, until a lovely face has grown upon his work. So do you also cut away all that is excessive, straighten all that is crooked, bring light to all that is overcast, labour to make all one glow of beauty and never cease chiselling your statue until there shall shine out on you from it the godlike splendour of virtue, until you shall see the perfect Goodness established in the stainless shrine.

"When you know that you have become this perfect work, nothing now remaining that can obstruct that inner unity, nothing from without clinging to the authentic man; when you find yourself wholly true to your essential nature, wholly that only veritable Light which is not measured by space, but ever immeasurable as something greater than all measure and more than all quantity - when you perceive that you have grown to this, you are now become very visions call up all your confidence, strike forward a step - you need a guide no longer - strain and see.

"This is the only eye that sees the mighty Beauty. If the eye that adventures the vision be dimmed by vice, impure, or weak, "unable in its cowardly blenching to look upon the uttermost brightness, then it sees nothing even though another may point to what lies plain to sight. Never did eye see the sun unless it had first become sunlike, and never can the soul have vision of the First Beauty unless itself be beautiful.

"Therefore let each become godlike and beautiful who cares to see Good and Beauty. The Primal Good and the Primal Beauty have one dwelling-place, and thus, always, Beauty's seat is There."

In this passage the artistic activity is seen as a self-purification of the artist whereby he can see the beauty that is essential Being. This does not resolve the problem of defining beauty in terms of our ordinary experience. Plotinus accepts the Platonic, notions of harmony and proportion as the determinates of beauty. Thomas Aquinas defines it as that which when seen pleases. These are the criteria by which

the functional situation is judged. They are the attempt at a deictical step which says that is what I mean by Beauty. Beauty in its essence is the indefinable 'thatness' of Being. What the functions can know is only the reflection of the beauty which is discovered in conscious experience. I believe that this is what Kant sought to convey when he defined taste in THE CRITIQUE OF JUDGMENT as "the faculty of estimating an object or idea in respect of satisfaction or dissatisfaction, but without personal interest. The object of such impersonal satisfaction is called beautiful." Such definitions miss an essential quality, recognised by Plotinus, whereby that which is beautiful arouses not only joy, but also astonishment and awe, the intensity of which are proportionate to the gradation of beauty contemplated.

Beauty is the essence of Being. It is as indefinable as Being itself. There are not two beauties; one of Nature and one of Art. Nor is there a distinction between physical beauty and moral beauty except in the difference of level. Beauty, whenever it is discovered, is the revelation of togetherness. The defects by which beauty is marred are the disruption or distortion of togetherness. The 'jarring' note breaks the inner unity. The higher the level of Being, the more intense the togetherness. Thus it is that the greater harmony can be enhanced by the lesser discord in the unity of an experience of intense beauty. A simpler whole, though free from discord, produces a lesser experience of beauty, precisely because its inner-togetherness is less.

Since art is a practical activity, it can be understood, only as a completed process, that is, by the Principle of Structure. It is an evolutionary process

I have already shown how the creation of a work of art is a characteristic example of a cycle of evolution. We have to answer the question as to the value of art in human life, but before this can be attempted, many misconceptions as to what art is and what it does must first be examined.

Misunderstanding of the role of art is characteristic of an Epoch dominated by intellectualism. We find it in the Socratic polemic against the irrational element in Greek tragedy, and what Plato called "the old quarrel between philosophy and poetry." The Greek philosophers before Plotinus were quite unable to grasp the relativity of Being. Even Aristotle understood it only in functional terms, and therefore missed the essential point. In such an intellectual environment, it was inevitable that Plato should not discover the significance of art, although he loved and practised it with such supreme mastery. The confusion comes from applying to art the meaningless question whether it is rational or irrational. By rejecting all but intellectual knowledge, the Greek philosophers were compelled to regard art as the imitation of natural or artificial things.

Plato, by demonstrating in his own person the contradiction in the intellectual denial of art, posed the question which could not be answered in the last Epoch as to the true role of the aesthetic activity in human life. The question became explicit for Aristotle, who realised that aesthetic was concerned with representation and expression, and who was mainly concerned in the Poetics with the problem of distinguishing poetry from science and historical knowledge. Neither Aristotle nor any of the Greek philosophers could get past the barrier of intellectualism, and find the way to reconcile the apparent irrationality of art with its power to express truth.

The relativity of Being implies the relativity of art. Because the Greeks could not understand relativity, they set human thought for centuries to search in the wrong direction for the meaning of art. It has not even yet been realised that there is not one art, but as many arts as there are levels of conscious experience.

In antiquity it was perhaps Philostratus in his LIFE OF APOLLONIUS OF TYANA who first made it clear that the narrow mimetic view of art must be faulty. He asked the question as to how, if the artist imitates natural objects or ideas, sculpture can represent the gods whom no man has seen and of whose nature no man can have a true conception? The recognition that the artist does something more than imitate what he has seen or heard of gave rise to the belief that there was a special faculty of

fancy or imagination which in the hands of the artist could become creative. Philostratus was perhaps first among the Greeks to recognise that art is creation, but who was also responsible for the belief in imagination when he wrote: "Imagination is a wiser creator than imitation, for imitation copies what it has seen, imagination what it has not seen."

For nearly a thousand years, from Augustine to Eckhart, there were philosophers such as Aquinas and Bonaventura who were, deeply concerned with Being, and felt that art must in some way; serve to express it. During the same period, art and religion in China, India and Persia were seeking for the bond which would unite the religious experience of Being with its expression in poetry, painting and sculpture. The Hindu doctrine of the essence (*rasa*, etymologically meaning the sap or vital fluid) refers to the inner togetherness which art seeks to express. In Islamic art this quality is seen especially in the combination of poetry with music and painting. The Middle Ages came near to discovering the relation of art and Being, but in Europe this was lost during the Renaissance, when art was treated as the work of a special faculty, inferior to the intellect and justified only by its didactic value. The belief in a faculty called 'imagination' was prevalent for many centuries. For example, Bacon attributed knowledge to the intellect, history to memory, and poetry to the imagination or fancy. For Bacon, music, painting, sculpture and the other arts were merely pleasure-giving. The intellectualist bias reached its climax with Descartes, who hated artistic imagination, attributing it to an agitation of the animal spirits.

One difficulty with the ascription of art to a faculty called 'imagination' is that it takes no account of the essential fact that art is expression and not only experience. Moreover, it is expression *sui generis*, and cannot be regarded as a stepping stone towards science and logic. Giambattista Vico in the *SCIENZA NUOVA* first recognised this in his assertion that all art is expression. Nevertheless, these writers continued to be hampered by the belief that there is a special faculty or function called the imagination which stands between the confusion of sensation and the clarity of intellect. On any such belief, art must be inferior in status to science. Thus Kant in the *CRITIQUE OF JUDGMENT* asserts that art is "always a sensible and imaged covering for an intellectual concept". For Kant, aesthetics is the combination of imagination and intelligence, and by this is distinguished from natural beauty such as that of flowers, where there is no concept.

The essence of the artistic situation is not knowing or feeling but the experience of Being. This explains why there is no specific artistic function or faculty. The artist works through the same functions as any other man. There is no separate activity corresponding to 'imagination' or 'intuition'. The experience of the artist takes shape through sensation, feeling and thought. The artistic activity is not-identical with that of the scientist and philosopher, who also of necessity make use of the basic functions of sensation, feeling and thought. Nevertheless, as we have already seen, the scientist cannot ignore Being, the distinctions of which give rise to the various branches of his science. There is nothing surprising in this conclusion, for both are concerned with the same Reality, but from a different perspective. Each must actualise the pattern of his experience through the same human functions and under the same laws. The difference, as I have repeatedly stressed, is solely in the perspective.

The work of art depends primarily upon the quality of conscious experience. To this it may be objected that the artist transcends himself in his work. He is sometimes scarcely conscious of his functional activity. He may even feel himself the spectator of his own activity, as Mozart writes in his letter describing his experience of musical composition. So far from being a valid objection, such observations confirm the thesis that the artistic experience is a change in level of consciousness. Insofar as the word 'rapture' is applicable, it means precisely to be carried from one level of consciousness to another. As I showed in the last two chapters, Being on one level does not lose but embraces Being on lower levels. So it comes about that the artist, returning to his ordinary state of consciousness, remembers only that which corresponds to the

content of that state, and for the rest there is only wonder and longing to return. If he becomes preoccupied solely with the attainment of Being, the artist sets his foot upon the way of sainthood. Insofar as he remains an artist, his task is to express and so communicate his vision of Eternity. The view that art is language is now widely accepted, but it is understood in very different ways, according to the status ascribed to language itself. In the Gestalt theory, language is the unity of behaviour. Koffka says in *PROBLEMS IN THE PSYCHOLOGY OF ART* that perception is an aesthetic process whereby, under the impact of a mosaic of stimulations which impinge on the retina of the eyes, the nervous system of the organism produces processes of organization in such a way that the pattern produced is the best possible under the prevailing conditions.

In general, the Gestalt psychologists make no distinction between the pattern of normal perception and that of artistic creation except the influences of training and environment. On such theories the excellence of a work of art can be assessed only in terms of design and craftsmanship. The Gestalt psychology is a striking illustration of eternity-blindness, for it is based on the idea of wholeness and its relativity, and yet does not see that this is meaningless without the recognition of different levels of Being. Gestalt comes near to the realization that Being is relative, and its exponents often speak of Being more truly than they know. The separation between expression and experience usually goes much too far in the so-called science of art. Wofflin analysed the work of art from every standpoint but that of the experience of Being. Croce, among modern philosophers, is almost alone in recognising that the work of art and the experience, of which it is the expression, are inseparable. He insists that the spectator must reproduce the experience of the artist if he is to understand his language. Nevertheless, he is so obsessed with the linguistic theory of art that he asserts that there is no qualitative distinction between our every-day speech and a sublime work of art, and so misses the essential connection between art and Being.

The modern world has revolted from all that goes under the name of mysticism, including mystical aesthetic which asserts that art can reach pinnacles of expression inaccessible to philosophy and science.

The modern attitude to art is expressed in such sayings as: "It has yet to be proved that the satisfactions derived from art are generically different from those of ordinary experience." Freud goes further in the well-known passage where he treats art as the escape from unsatisfied instinctive impulses: "The artist is originally a man who turns from Reality because he cannot come to terms with the demand for the renunciation of instinctual satisfaction as it is first made, and who then in fantasy-life allows full play to his erotic and ambitious wishes. But he finds a way of return from his world of fantasy back to Reality; with his special gifts he moulds his fantasies into a new kind of Reality and men concede them a justification as valuable reflections of actual life."

The extreme view that artistic genius is psychotic is represented by Lombroso. Karpov goes even further and says that normality is inconsistent with the creative genius of the great artist'. The general attitude of most psychologists towards art is expressed in the patronising conclusion of Longfield: "I think that at the present time it is generally agreed that most artists are not insane, that there is an enormous amount of artistic production among the mentally ill (most of which is of little value), and that when an outstanding work of art does spring from a disordered mind, it is merely because a latent talent has come, to light during the mental disease owing, perhaps, to a lessening of inhibitions and a consequent increase in scope of imagination."

Such views may seem strangely irrelevant to the central problem - that is, *what is art and what does it give to man?* Nevertheless, they are symptomatic of the generally low esteem in which art is held by the present generation. We are passing through a period in which mankind has almost lost touch with Being. The present century is not merely a period of decadence in art. It is one in which the need for

artistic experience, and expression is scarcely felt at all. Atomism, which is the negation of art, is the prevalent doctrine and it dominates the activities that pass for art no less than it does science and philosophy.

Before we pass to the specific character of the artistic experience, I must, distinguish between the language of Art and that of Myth and Symbol. It is sometimes held that, the work of art is a symbol of the Reality it represents. This is a misunderstanding of symbolism, which does not transmit an experience, but represents it. Such a symbol as the Arabic numeral 9 does not serve to transmit an inner experience. It is a means of indicating an operation which consists, in verifying the one-to-one correspondence of the members of all classes containing nine objects. There is no essential difference in the use of symbols of deep philosophical or religious significance. A symbol always stands for an operation to be performed. The Cross stands for the operation described by Christ in the words: "If any man will follow after me, let him deny himself and take up his Cross." For the man who has not performed this operation the Cross may have many meanings, but it does not stand for the experience of Christ. The essential point here is that the symbol does not express an experience nor can it evoke one. The work of art may use symbolism, but unless it transmits a specific experience of consciousness, it is not art but symbolical language only. I do not, of course, wish to suggest by this that symbolism is inferior to art. It is different, both in its nature and in its role in the life of man.

It is the same with myth. Very great truths are expressed and preserved in myths. These truths very often concern Being. But myths are not art unless they are concerned with the experience as well as the representation of Being. Representation as such is not art. Nor need art represent. Myth and symbol, if authentic, always represent that that is, stand for a real truth. Moreover, myth and symbol represent always general truths and not particular states of Being. The authentic work of art is Reality viewed from a very definite and rather narrow standpoint.

Myth and symbol can penetrate to strata of Reality that art alone cannot reach. They are not confined in their significance to Being, but can express the concrete reality of the triad. In the last chapter, I connected certain myths, such as those of the Fates and Norns, with a particular level of Being. But far more than this is represented by such symbols. Generally speaking, they represent a concrete situation of structure and relationship as well as wholeness.

Art is thus in some way a less, but in others more, than symbolism. That which is more arises from the power of the artist to evoke experience as well as to express it. For this reason, the special perspective of the artist gives his work a public character. It is not his private experience but his relationship to Being that is important. Being is the universal reconciling principle, and to touch it means to participate in the unity which is the togetherness of all Reality. Moreover, in this togetherness there is one aspect which however distorted in its incomplete manifestations, which are all the finite self can encounter, remains nevertheless exempt from the subjective in the experience of the artist. It is in this sense that the work of the artist cannot be private.

He serves a Master whom he can never know so long as his Being remains on the subjective level. Nevertheless, that which he experiences he must transmit, and that, which he transmits must be shared by the spectator. Until this cycle is complete there is no artistic situation. Therefore, unless art is a public activity, it lacks an essential element.

The public role of the artist is obscured by the meaningless word 'imagination' which haunts the literature of art. When imagination is treated as a faculty or function intermediate between sensation and intellect, it refers to nothing at all. There is no special psychological function corresponding to imagination or equivalent words used in place of it.

The function whereby visual images arise is of the same kind as that which produces sensations and movements. The same is true of the representation of

sounds or the evocation of memory of tastes and smells. Image building is a real process, but it is not a special function in man. Function can adapt itself to all modes of experience and does, not serve to distinguish between them. The distinctive quality of art arises in consciousness and not in function.

Failure to recognise this leads to another misuse of the word 'imagination' - although the distinction between this use and the formation of visual images is not always clearly drawn. In this second sense, imagination is the process whereby new significance and dramatic content are injected into memories of past sense impressions, or even sense experience actually present. In modern theories the old concept of the imagination has been replaced by the ideas of empathy or the German word *Einfuehlung*. This postulates a specific aesthetic emotion determined by the objective form of a work of art. As developed by Lipps and his successors, the *Einfuehlung* theory derives the aesthetic experience almost entirely from the emotional reaction to the work of art, in the form of play or contemplation. The artist himself plays and so liberates himself from his own inner conflicts. The common defect of all these theories is the ascription to function of that which properly belongs to consciousness.

The conscious or unconscious concern of the artist is with Being, and it is only by realizing this that the true significance of the aesthetic activity, can be found. This brings us back to the definition of art as the experience and expression of Being. This definition, also points to the defect in theories of art as nothing but language. It is true that art is language, but it is not the same abstract language by which we communicate knowledge of function. It is a concrete language by which is transmitted from one consciousness to another the means of sharing a common experience of Being. I said earlier that there is no qualitative distinction between art and natural science. The meeting point is the concrete language of everyday sense experience, namely, the language in which we talk about material objects and the relation of our bodies to them. This language deals with particulars.

It is therefore not subject to the abstractions unavoidable in scientific generalisation. They are unavoidable because science studies different levels of Being in isolation from one another, and its language can only preserve this isolation by applying the Rule of Legitimate Abstraction. Although the common language of everyday speech has a concreteness which is absent from scientific communications, it is nevertheless abstract by comparison with artistic expression, for it cannot convey the differences of level which are the very essence of the artistic experience.

A sketch of a drawbridge may appear in a treatise on mechanics to illustrate the principle of the lever. It may also appear in the catalogue of a contracting engineer with his specifications and prices. Or again, it may be the painting by Van Gogh of the drawbridge at Arles.

In the first, the drawbridge could be replaced any system of rigid bodies and inextensible strings, which would serve to illustrate the theory. The entities are so abstract that they need not even be regarded as enduring objects. The generality of mechanics is unlimited but it is gained at the price of disregarding every distinction of Being. When we look at the drawing we see the picture with no past and no future. Strangest of all, the very direction of time could be reversed without the Picture losing any of its significance. In Part II, I emphasized this quality of abstractness, and we must not forget it whenever we make use of the scientific language.

The drawing in the contractor's catalogue is not scientific. It may specify the strength of the materials required, the type of foundations, and the general conditions of safe use, but in adding so different levels of existence are confused. There is no generality which would enable the data to be transferred to situations not covered by the specification; nevertheless, the sketch refers to real bridges actually built or to be built, that is, situations in which the life of man and his practical concerns must be taken into account. In this way, the contractor's sketch achieves a concreteness which the first bridge cannot have.

When we turn to Van Gogh's picture, we experience a moment of Eternity. The man in the cart still looks down at the washerwomen in the summer of 1888. In a minute he will have passed out of sight but in the picture he is eternally united with the washerwomen and the bridge and the swirling water, flowing past. In the painting, all bridges are present. We recognise the laws of mechanics in the thrust on the sloping beams.

We can even evoke the scene when the bridge was built and visualise the rule of thumb calculations by which the builders fixed the scantling of the timbers. But all this is irrelevant. The bridge as we see it in the painting expresses level upon level of Being.

Everything is there: the transformations of energy in the sunlight and the grass and the trees the whole life of Provencal. France entering, into and passing beyond the natural processes.

But above all, we experience the unity of the artist's vision. The river and the road cross one another at this point, and are united. It is only for a few moments that the man in the cart and the washerwomen cross their lines of Time. Space, Time and Eternity are united in a wholeness which is pure experience. It only exists for the artist for one summer's afternoon, but because of the intensity of its inner togetherness it leads us far beyond the limits of here and now.

Art is the experience and expression of Being on more than one level in Eternity. Croce feels an evident discomfort in finding himself compelled by his theoretical analysis to deny any difference in quality between the work of art and the language of our everyday usage. Whenever such discomfort is experienced by the philosopher of aesthetics, it comes from the vague realisation that the *non so che* of the work of art is in a literal sense that in it which can never be *known* but only *experienced*.

Art is rightly called the discovery of the eternal in the temporal. In the painting, Time and Space are reduced to the two dimensions of the canvas, but the painting exists in five dimensions. Space, Time and Eternity are not resolved into abstract levels as in science, nor are they reduced to the particular, as in every-day speech. Art is "the still point of the turning world. Neither flesh nor fleshless.

The dog who turns and looks at the Hay Wain in Constable's landscape is caught in one fleeting moment of sunlight. The boy who returns his look enters with him and the trees and the meadows into a perspective which has its reality in Eternity. The visible landscape merges into the whole English countryside. It is part of the Biosphere, and an expression of the unity of all organic life. The lighting of that present moment still expresses the whole recurrence of day and night, and all recurrent processes in the Universe. But the togetherness of the painting is the subjective experience of the artist. It is the representation of his own Being, that is, the power of his own consciousness to see as unity that which to his senses is multiplicity. The unity of the landscape is not its circumscription within the composition, nor the choice of the moment of light, though without these the unity could not be expressed. But all this can be found in a photograph or in the uninspired daub of mediocrity. The great painter experiences Being. His experience is at the same time its own expression in the work of art.

There is the multiplicity of sense impressions at one level, and at another level the unity of the artist's inner vision. This inner togetherness is expressed in the unity of the painting, which is in the true sense creation, for it is beyond both cause and purpose. Nevertheless, such art remains subjective, for the artist does not understand the operation of the Will by which the situation comes into existence. Objective art is possible only when Consciousness is emancipated from Function. Its highest degree requires also the liberation of the Will.

It is not easy to find in European painting the perfection of execution which alone can convey a state of consciousness liberated from function. Christian painters, have nearly all sought to express feelings of piety, reverence, compassion or other

religious emotion and have therefore missed the experience of Being. We must turn to Chinese and Persian painting to see what can be expressed by an art that penetrates deeper than function. Persian painting is of special interest, for it probably originates from Mani; the founder of the ill-fated religion which was persecuted by Zoroastrians and Christians alike. Mani used painting to illustrate his manuscripts and is said to have taught the Elect among, his followers the art of expressing their religious experience through painting. Persian painting, for more than a thousand years - from Mani to Bihzad - preserved the exquisite perfection which gives it an unique place in the world's art.

In Eastern art we can see how the inner life predominates over the outer. To make this clear, we must understand the difference between art as the expression of Being and life as the fact of Being.

Both art and life depend upon the relationship of different levels in Eternity.

In the living organism there is the essential pattern, there is also the physical body actualised in Time, and there are the regulating layers by which the active pattern and the passive organism are reconciled. But all this is unconscious; the wholeness of the organism is on three levels only. With the artist, there is the fourth level at which he experiences and suffers, at which the unity of the work of art is forged. If this is understood, all the apparently contradictory theories of art and aesthetic activity fall into place, and the essential can be separated from the irrelevant.

A further question arises in connection with the uniqueness of artistic experience, namely, the widespread belief that it is connected with the emotional function. To understand what is true and what is false in this view, we must consider the threefold nature of man. The triad affirming, denying and reconciling, or in its concrete aspect, Will, Function and Being, is manifested in man in his tripartite nature as soul, body and spirit, and in his functions as intellect, sensation and feeling. There is a correspondence of the reconciling principle with Being, with the spirit and with the feeling function in man. The full significance of this correspondence will become apparent only after we have completed the study of the triad. I anticipate the conclusions only to explain why, for the most part, the experience of Being is more closely related to the feelings than to intellect, or sensation. To this extent; it is true, to say that art has a more direct connection with the feelings and emotions than with sensation and thinking. Nevertheless, it is an error to conclude from this that art is, as so many have said, no more than the expression of an emotional state; or that, from the Objective aspect, the function of art is to give emotional satisfaction. Croce is right in his reiterated assertion that experience and expression are inseparable.

They are not even two aspects of the same thing. Experience-expression is a single moment. It is the unification of Time and Eternity in the consciousness of the artist, and also in the consciousness of those who participate in his work.

The foregoing discussion is relevant for the distinction between creative and interpretative art, for example, in music and the drama. Here the triad is unmistakable. The author or the composer fills the active role, the audience the passive, and the musicians or players are the reconciling force. It follows that in the actual representation it is the players or musicians who must experience the state, of consciousness upon which the unity of the work of art depends. If the musician or the actor will not or cannot discover in himself the experience of Eternity, there is no work of art but simply an emotional or intellectual communication on the level of Function. The deceptive element in the situation is the confusion which, can arise between emotion and consciousness. It is exceedingly rare that the interpretative artist is capable of an authentic experience of Being in Eternity, and therefore almost always the musical or dramatic performance makes its appeal only to the functions, that is sensation, intellect and feeling, in different proportions according to the balance that the performance accidentally takes. The rare interpretative artist, who can by the power of his own Being express consciousness of Eternity, raises his audience from a state of passivity to a state of active response. It will be remembered that this is the

characteristic of evolution. Such an artistic situation has its Being in Eternity, and it remains imperishable in the, experience of those, who have participated in it.

The hand of Eleonora Duse as Mrs. Alving, tightening on the arm of her chair, when in the last act of *GHOSTS*, she learns the truth, brings Ibsen and the audience who once witnessed it into an eternal relationship that does not degenerate with Time. Nijinsky in the *SPECTRE DE LA ROSE* is as much a moment of Eternity for those who have seen it, as is the *BIRTH OF VENUS* in Botticelli's painting. These are elementary moments of Art - but they are authentic.

In the triad of artistic interpretation, the initiating factor is the experience of Eternity. It does not follow that this reaches its highest level in the author or composer. A fine musician may draw from a composition an experience of Eternity more intense than that of the composer himself. The expression 'intensity of inner togetherness' applies unmistakably to the experience evoked by a Toscanini taking in hand such a work as the Overture to *A MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM* and making it an imperishable moment of eternal consciousness.

The unity of art would be incomprehensible if it were not founded upon an experience which is independent of Function. If we compare two extremes of artistic experience, painting and music, we see how the first unifies Space and Time in a moment of Eternity. The second brings Eternity into Time and has little relation to Space. Not only are the two arts so differently related to framework, but they differ also in their operation in the functions. Thought, feeling and organic sensation are quite differently stimulated with music and painting. Each of the arts differs in the demand it makes upon the functions. This is the primary reason why one artist discovers himself as a painter, another as a poet, a third as a musician, and a fourth as an architect or sculptor. And yet it is beyond question that in its essential nature the artistic experience is one and indivisible. It is neither the arousing of emotion, nor the response of the senses. It is not the satisfaction of the mind, nor a combination of all of these, that constitutes the artistic experience. In the great work of art, all these are present, but they can, also be found in the work of mediocrity where technical achievement alone is present. This consideration disposes also of Croce's contention that art is language and nothing more. It is precisely that which is more than language that constitutes the *non so che* of art.

Nowhere is the quality of inwardness more unmistakable than in music. A single note played by a Casals or a Goossens is experienced in its inner togetherness as liberation from the limitations of Space and Time. I do not wish to imply that such art penetrates to lofty realms of Being beyond human experience. It is no more than the experience of finite selfhood discovering that Being can be liberated from functional activity. If we interrogate the performer he confirms that in his moment of mastery, thought, feeling and sensation all become passive and he ceases to do anything himself. The same is true of the great dancer whose perfection of movement is liberation from Function, and becomes the experience and expression of Being.

There is in music a direct transition from Function to Being that occurs but seldom, but when, experienced cannot be mistaken, It is scarcely ever achieved by Western composers of music who have been caught in the dualism of the classical and romantic tendencies, neither of which can discover the true significance of the musical art. Nevertheless, the greatest musicians, in their own suffering, have discovered that Being is real, and have succeeded in sharing this discovery with those capable of the experience. In such works as his Opus 111 and the last Quartets, Beethoven demands of the performer a state of consciousness which is a test of his capacity for experience. If it is true that he said in answer to a question about the *A Minor Quartet*: "Silence, I am speaking to my God" he was speaking of the experience of Being by which he had himself been liberated from bondage to his own functions.

The universal reconciling force is the true source of freedom. Nothing, therefore, could be more erroneous than to look upon the work of art as the passive element in relation to the active force of the artist. It is the spectator who is passive,

but the true work of art can confer upon him a moment of freedom. The greatest artists have understood that the work of art does not stand to their activity in the passive role. Michelangelo in his fifteenth Sonnet asserts that: "The greatest artist does not impose his experience upon the marble, but rather finds it contained beneath its rough hewn shape."

"Non ha l'ottimo artista alcun concetto  
Ch'un marmo solo in se non circonscriba  
Col suo soverchio."

There is, in the Accademia delle Belle Arti in Florence, a great block of marble, from which St. Matthew emerges as if he were alive in the stone, waiting for liberation at the hand of the artist. In this and other unfinished works of Michelangelo, we seem to be drawn into the consciousness of Eternity which is the moment of creation. Time and Space are waiting at the threshold. Nothing is actual and yet the intensity of inner experience of the artist can already be felt.

Sculpture and architecture combine in the experience of wholeness. They express that togetherness by which Being overcomes the limitations of scale.

The great Buddhist and Hindu temples of the Far East make a direct demand upon the spectator for an inner experience of unity, without which he is lost in the profusion of sculptural ornamentation. It is only the experience of his own inner need for deliverance from the multiplicity of his functional activity that raises him to participation in the unity of the temple.

Nowhere is the sense of unity in multiplicity experienced and expressed more completely than in the great temples of Egypt. In the Great Hypostyle Hall at Karnak, the intensity of experience is such that multiplicity disappears and the sense of Being as the unification of levels in Eternity is overwhelming. The Egyptian temples are among the rare achievements of man which go beyond the expression of subjective experience. They exemplify the triad of Reality, for they combine Will and Function with Consciousness. The Egyptian hieroglyphs express in a language which the world has long ceased to understand, the differentiations of Will which are the foundation of true religion. Nevertheless, even with such objective art, Being remains the centre of significance. They express just that element of 'Reality which, man can never reach through his intellectual function alone.

The seated statues of the Neter in the Egyptian temples, or even in the museums of Europe, produce on the spectator an impression which is a test of his own Being. The man who has experienced the inner togetherness of a higher level of consciousness recognises that this experience is captured and made permanent in the statues. Their power is objective; ordinary spectators realise with astonishment that they themselves are actually upon a lower level of Being than the stone figures which line the galleries. The figures do not merely represent but actually possess an inner togetherness that unites the Being of the artist who made them three thousand years ago with that, same level of experience that can be present in every finite self.

The power of art is experienced above all in ancient architecture. Architecture is the expression of Being on different levels. It enters into the functional life of man, and therefore must correspond to his needs upon the somatic level. It is at the same time a spiritual experience, a raising of consciousness. If it is a true, work of art, the building is also a similitude of the universal structure by which all Reality is pervaded. It thus exemplifies the Principles of Unity, Relationship and Structure. So it is a language spoken on three levels between each of which there are necessary relationships.

Architecture, by its permanence, has preserved the wisdom of very ancient peoples, and is the most direct evidence of the changes in man's experience of Reality which accompany the passage from one Epoch to another. The architecture of the early millennia testifies to his intense preoccupation with the central problem of man's Being, that is, the soul and its immortality. Through and through, the ancient monuments are impregnated with the realization that man can exist on very different

levels of Being, and that only upon the highest level has he the possibility of communion with the Higher Powers.

The same realization pervades the literature of the Heroic Age. The Homeric poems which so bewildered Plato, who could not see their relevance, express above all the difference of Being that separates the gods, the heroes, and the common man. Plato, the child of the New Epoch, could no longer read the language of the old. Even more significant than Homer is Aeschylus, that majestic figure, whose prophecies have been fulfilled in the history of the modern world. If we ask ourselves what is the force of the Aeschylean Trilogies that raises them to a higher level than the marvellous art of Sophocles and Euripides, we can only answer that it is the direct experience and expression of Being. Aeschylus never loses sight of the different levels of Being of gods and titans, heroes, and men. Scarcely ever in art has the experience of Being been expressed so purified of functional accretions.

"Prometheus Bound" is a work of unfathomable power, and had we the whole trilogy, we should perhaps have preserved the key to the ancient wisdom. The tragedy of Prometheus can be read as an expression of the universal scale of Being, with its interplay of universal, individual and unconscious forces. Justice and love are the principles in conflict. Perfect and imperfect individuality are represented in Prometheus and Io, while the dark, elemental forces and the Fates brood over the scene.

Critics have been baffled by the character of Zeus in the Prometheus. The Tragedy expresses the experience of man at the end of the Epoch, at the start of which, he had been in communion with the Higher Powers, through his striving towards Being. It is also the beginning of the new Epoch in which a new god was to reign in Olympus, the god of the intellect, fundamentally indifferent to the sufferings of man.

The perfection of art could reach no higher intensity than in the experience of Prometheus, eternally present as the reconciling spirit seeing far into the future as well as into the past, and accepting the utmost pangs of suffering in order that the Epoch might be redeemed.

To interpret art is to drive out its soul. What I have written of Aeschylus is no more than pointing to an experience which can be shared; he remains holding open the gateway of Eternity to him that has the force to enter. The choosing, of examples in a brief survey, of so vast a subject must give an unbalanced picture. Aeschylus is not the only great poet-prophet, nor are the Egyptian temples the only monuments of objective art. Mere enumeration, or even a classification and description of the modes of artistic expression might be required in a treatise, on aesthetics. Here I am concerned only to establish the fundamental principle that art is concerned with Being. With the rare exception of the objective works of art in which the three elements of the triad are fully harmonised, there is always a limited perspective which brings one or another subjective element into sharper focus than the rest. The nearer the perspective is to the experience of Being itself, the more true is the work of art in its significance for man. For the artist and for the spectator, it is a communion of consciousness, an experience of Being which can be shared in no other way.

So it is with all true art. It stands as the eternal reconciling force by which Will and Function can be brought into harmony in the outer life of man. It neither affirms nor denies. It exists neither to instruct nor to give pleasure. It is one way to the expansion of consciousness in which Space, Time, Eternity and Number are redeemed from the incoherence from which in our ordinary experience they can never escape. Science can discover regularities of Function, but art alone can experience and express the unity of Being.

Art, in the past Epoch, has seldom filled its true place in the life of man. Four thousand years ago, in Egypt and Mesopotamia, the secrets of Being were better understood and their expression more faithfully sought than in later periods. This can be seen, for example, in the Sumerian sculptures. Thus, Sir Leonard Woolley writes of a statue of Gudea, King of Lagash: "It is not so much the physical likeness of Gudea

that the artist has set himself to carve, as a symbol of the man's essence; if the body is left a mere abstract of the human form in general, the face is an abstract of the individual so faithfully interpreted that through the stylised features the individual impresses himself upon us and we can see how the sculptor is preoccupied with the soul of the sitter."

As science is the way of knowledge so is art the way of consciousness. Consciousness is the universal reconciling principle. Therefore the supreme manifestation of art is the beauty of life. When Jesus spoke the words: "I and My Father are One," He expressed the ultimate secret of Being. In His Passion, he made manifest the beauty of the unifying power of Love, and established thereby in the world the reconciling force which should have redeemed the Epoch. In the event it transformed, but could not overthrow, the Zeus of intellectualism who has remained upon his throne as the one god in Whom this Epoch has placed its trust.

If the New Epoch is to be redeemed, we must recover in the contemplation of Beauty, not only the joy, astonishment and awe of which Plotinus wrote. We must also find in the imperfection of our Own Being the suffering and dread by which alone the great work of art can be accomplished in us and we can be made whole. But this is not the task of consciousness alone: there must also be the transformation of Will which in the next chapters we must seek to understand. Art alone cannot penetrate to the Universal Being, the *Noetos Cosmos* of which Plotinus wrote that: "All things are everywhere and all is all and each one is all, and the glory of it is beyond measure. Everything in that world is great, since the small even is great. In the intelligible world the sun is all the stars and each star and all stars are the sun. Everything has its own character, and yet it is the mirror of all the rest. Its becoming is pure, for the source of its becoming is itself, and there is nothing to, disturb it. There all is in perfect harmony and therefore its Being also is pure and holy."

I have, so far, said very little of the work of the artist himself. From the examples I have given, it is evident that the relativity of art extends over an enormous range of significance. It is necessary to examine this in the light of the Principle of Structure. The totality of artistic activity must constitute a complete cycle of which perhaps we can distinguish the principal stages.

First of all, it is necessary to distinguish between the authentic work, and all the activities which are either spurious, or simply not art at all. Craftsmanship and technique alone are not art. Nor is the experience and expression of thoughts, feelings and organic sensations as such. These alone are not the subject matter of art. It is the experience of Being alone that makes a work of art.

The foundation of the structure - the first stage of the process - is then the Experience. This can be called the moment of vision or inspiration. It does not necessarily come first in time. It may appear to be the result and not the cause of the artist's work. But however and whenever it may arise, it is the foundation upon which the structure is built. It is the moment when the artist touches Eternity and sees as a whole that which is before him. The intensity of the experience depends upon the Being of the artist himself, and this in turn is the result of his suffering and striving for perfection in the work.

The second moment is that of the elementary artistic event. It is the stroke of the brush on the canvas, the single note of music or the perception of the interval which both is and expresses the experience. In this moment consists the travail of the artist. It is the incessant care by which the detailed quality of expression is preserved in every gesture. Without this immediate inner discipline the artistic content disappears, and nothing remains but functional activity. The third moment is the work of art completed. In all subjective art, this is the end of the story. The structure has reached its point of abrupt change and there is no additional factor to enable it to make the transition.

The fourth stage is the beginning of objective art. It is a new world, for the work of art no longer expresses a moment of subjective experience, but Being in its cosmic significance. This implies in the creator of the work of art a higher level of

Being than that of Finite Selfhood. I have used the expression 'creator of the work of art' rather than artist, because objective art is invariably the work of schools directed by persons who have attained levels of Being higher than that of Finite Selfhood (H.96).

The fourth stage of the Structure of Art is therefore the formation of the School of Art. The experience then passes from the individual to the school. For this a special discipline is required, even in those -who only execute the plan of the director of the school. Thus, for instance, we read that no one was allowed to work upon the Cathedral of Chartres when it was rebuilt after the fire of 1189 unless he was in a state of Grace.

The fifth stage is that by which new experiences of Being are sought and expressed. Moreover, the work is not confined to Being, for the works of art at this level embody the experience of laws of Will and Function. Here the artist and the learned have joined forces under the guidance of the Sage. Such art as this level can produce is very rare, but it has decisive importance for the life of man.

So long as art remains at the fourth stage, it can transmit objective truths about Being, but it cannot innovate. It is traditional and conservative. This does not mean that it is mechanical. On the contrary, the whole work is conscious, and those who participate in it, must obligatorily reach a higher level of Being. Their work is conservative in the sense that they transmit from generation to generation the experience of Being received from a higher level than their own.

It is at the fifth level that objective art begins to acquire its full evolutionary character. At this point the way of art and the way of sainthood join. The artist no longer experiences Being as beyond himself, but enters into it and merges with it. The higher levels of art belong to the gradations of individual Being which are beyond the limitations of finite selfhood. Art, science and religion have become one cycle of evolution and involution, by which man reaches the Universal Being and returns to transmit what he has received.

We have passed beyond the limited perspective of the artist. As he raises himself in the scale of Being by his labours and sufferings, he realises that Plotinus was right in asserting that he must himself become the Beauty he aspires to, and that for this it, is necessary to be a Saint.

To understand the transition, we must enter the inner world of the artist and find out where his work has to be accomplished. Four levels in Eternity are involved. The highest level is conscious experience. The second level, B, is not the Being of the artist himself, but a greater wholeness that he can touch in his experience. It is the eternal pattern which the work of art is to express in Time. The work of art itself is perceptible to the senses. It exists upon those levels A in Eternity, which correspond to the energy exchanges of sense experience. This is the starting point of the process by which the work of art comes into being. It is a process of evolution, as I have already described it.

If A is the material object or the external manifestation (*exoteriki praxis*), then B can be taken to represent the inner experience of the artist, the norm towards which he strives. Between these two is his own inner labour; this is accomplished on the levels C which correspond to the regulating layers of his psyche. In these levels proceeds the labour of self-criticism and discipline by which the outer expression is moulded into similarity with the inner experience. If the work is to have objective significance, there must be a fourth level, still higher than B, from which the conscience of the artist surveys and unifies the whole process. By 'conscience' I mean here the objective judgment which goes beyond the private experience of the artist himself.

These relationships can be represented diagrammatically as in Fig. 1

D Triad of Higher Level	Conscience. Objective judgment of artistic truth.
B Active Force	Experience. Beauty as the eternal pattern of Being.

C Reconciling Force	Discipline and self-criticism of artist.
A Passive Force	The work of art manifested in Space and Time.

**Fig. 1 Levels of Experience in the Work of Art.**

The level C is the reconciling force by which the affirmation of experience is related to the denial of expression. The artist cannot control either B or A. His own work is on level C. Sometimes he is aware of B, sometimes of A, only barely can he experience both the inner vision and its outer expression in one moment of consciousness - that is, the fourth level at which all are united. Normally A comes before B; that is, the artist starts work from the technical side and reaches the experience as the work of art comes to life. This is clearly seen in the notebooks of Beethoven, which show how often a banal theme suddenly came to life as a flash of genius after weeks, months or even years of struggle upon the C level. Or else it can happen that the vision springs into the artist's consciousness in all its eternal beauty, as with Kubla Khan or the improvisations of Chopin.

The manner in which the artistic event comes into Being is very significant for the classification of artistic types; but it is not essential for the authenticity of the work. When this work is carried through with a persistent devotion to the inner vision, it brings about in the artist himself a change of Being. He becomes like that which he strives to serve. This transformation is not necessarily visible in the external manifestations of the artist outside his, own work, but the change can be discerned by study of the expression. The change does not come often, for few have either the integrity or the strength to see the work through to the end.

Much artistic activity is spurious. Even that which is authentic remains almost entirely upon the subjective level. The role of art in the preservation and transmission of true experience could scarcely be accomplished, if it were not for the association of art and life to which I have already referred in connection with architecture.

In ancient times, nearly all art was brought into direct relationship with the daily life of man. Poetry, music and dancing were connected with religious ritual and the rhythms of life activity. Painting was- made upon the utensils of daily life. Sculpture and architecture were associated with sacred buildings.

Gurdjieff places special emphasis on the role of art as the means of preserving and transmitting-from generation to generation aspects of Objective Truth which man from time to time discovers. He connects this both with the sacred dances and rituals and also with the adornment of articles of use. These, in former times, were used as we use books, to provide a permanent record of experience. Whereas we are obliged to rely primarily on the intellectual function, in former Epochs, works of art conveyed the wisdom of their makers through all the functions to the consciousness which they awakened.

We find in this way also the connection between art and ritual. Both serve for sharing the experience of Being, but whereas art is specific, ritual is general. Ritual combines art and symbolism and myth in the evocation and renewal of conscious experience. All of these modes of human experience .merge into one stream, as we pass to the higher levels of objective work. Even on the subjective levels they have one essential feature in common. All are concerned primarily with Being, and the awakening of the consciousness of Eternity.

To conclude this chapter, I wish to quote an example which illustrates the power of Objective Art and its independence of scale and duration. It is the moment described in Luke's Gospel, when Jesus was known to the two disciples at Emmaus in the breaking of bread. A simple gesture made from the overwhelming intensity of God-consciousness in the resurrected Christ carries more conviction of Being and a deeper consciousness of Eternity than any work of art. The experience shared at such a moment remains inviolate through the centuries, notwithstanding all the distortions

and falsifications of the Event as it occurred in reality. Nevertheless, the force of the gesture is lost for those who have known nothing of such an experience. At its highest point, where Art merges into the language of Will, it ceases to be intelligible not only to the mind, but even to the feelings of ordinary people. Even so, each receives from it that which he is able to take, and thereby the experience of Being penetrates as a ferment into all levels of existence.