

I. Lorenz: Somehow

An Auto-Analysis

*Do you feel
not
just there a little
nude?*

*Eh, why?
Your hot and admire-ing look
goes well through our skin deep and warm
to the heart.*

(From the poetry volume by the author "This feels that")

The poem presents a short dialogue of a single person with a group of other persons or a public in general. In the first stanza, the single person speaks – I may call him the sender; while in the second stanza, the group or public speaks – I may call her the receiver. The sender places an insinuation: bareness, to the receiver in a negated rhetoric or suggestive question about a physical subject. The receiver replies in a short counter question and expresses a love-full sensation.

The flow of words of the sender appears as torn. The text distributes to four verses, where the words "not" and "nude" take an individual verse in exposition. These words rhyme in their initial letters and with their single syllables. A seemingly monotonous and continuous iamb keeps the text in flow. Thereby, the author visualises the stressed syllables with some text decoration in the colour of the text. Both exposed words lie on the stress of the metre.

The word flow of the receiver appears to be continuously. The "eh, why" of the first verse is exposed. The words of the receiver's love-full sensation read like prose. Does the "eh, why" still follow a short iamb now without any

I. Lorenz: Somehow

An Auto-Analysis

visualisation, a dactyl with an upbeat modulates the flow of this love-full sensation. Looking at these two related verses separately, the dactyl moves into an anapaest with the dactyl's final stress on "look". The anapaest's final stress falls onto the word "heart" in a regular way. Dactyl and anapaest are visualised again, the dactyl in blue, the anapaest in a complementary orange.

In a first instance, the poem files into rather trivial literature. I personally consider such an interpretation a too broad-brush. The variety of stylistic devices and the to my eyes apparent dichotomy of sender and receiver let assume much more by far. The divinatory moment tells me that a common society paradigm opposes true Love. I continue to claim that the winner of this conflict is Love.

In relation to erotic and sexuality, I perceive society in double standards. On one hand, erotic is present all over the place (e.g. in advertising). On the other hand, society disapproves of and discriminates sexuality and erotic. Then, it appears to be legitimate that the sexes are using each other in erotic and sexuality.

I see the grounds of the last mentioned in certain religious intuition – and this fixed in a general subconscious as a quasi-truth since quite some times. In contrary, I perceive God as Love – without the necessity of any religion to postulate such. Beginning with God as a spiritual personality, Love is spiritual at first. As soon as she enters the natural world; amongst us humans, she expresses in erotic and sexuality the most intense.

The way, Love arises from God, she arises from the loving person with the focus on the loved person. They way, she amalgamates God and human, she also amalgamates people. Does sexuality more than apparently demonstrate this. With utilisation, disapproval and discrimination, the focus remains on the

I. Lorenz: Somehow

An Auto-Analysis

person of its origin. The used, discriminated or disapproved person is only a means to an end.

In this poem, I ascribe disapproval and discrimination to the sender. His rhetoric question acts as a finger point; the negated suggestion such that he imposes something in his eyes bad onto the receiver. It is not about the person; but, it is about the matter in the context of the paradigm. For me, the generalisation in the word “you” (in plural) as well as the mantra and the matter of course of the iamb together with its visualisation in the text’s colour is an indication for the just mentioned.

In a first instance, the exposition of the words “not” and “nude” suggests the opposite of that, what the sender must have perceived. I see this as a hint to the absurdness of this paradigm. The way, the text conducts these words, the way the paradigm even conducts its absurdness. As the subconscious cancels the word “not”, the paradigm stays alive.

The flow, which the sender aims at the receiver, abruptly ends at the exposed words “eh, why”. The receiver recognises the intention of the sender and his paradigm. She does not go into defence and does not give and justification. As simple as this word appears, with such a matter of course, she challenges this paradigm. It vanishes in the “eh, why”: the iamb is in its finals and lost its visualisation already.

I ascribe true Love to the receiver. She is the origin of an implicit flow: bareness as an erotic expression. In true Love, this is a matter of course and natural for her that it does not require any words. With her word “our”, she only expresses that many people can and would be that way. Her generalisation serves multiplication – and not any kind of broad-brush-ness of the sender.

I. Lorenz: Somehow

An Auto-Analysis

From the viewpoint of the receiver, the flow towards her is explicit again. The first part (in the second verse of the second stanza) point to the source. The dactyl conveys passion – a male archetype – enhanced in the blue visualisation, rather a male colour. The dactyl culminates in the word “look”, the actual source. The second part (in the third verse) points to the target. Now, the anapaest conveys devotion – a female archetype – enhanced in the orange visualisation, rather a female colour. The anapaest culminates in the word “heart”, naturally and as a matter of course in its metre.

An amalgamation with the sender only occurs within the receiver. With the sender, distance prevails despite of his knowledge of her perception. The text does not show any reaction of the sender any more. The receiver does not care about the intention of the sender. In the same moment, his disapproval and discrimination bounces at her. Even a possible use of the receiver vanishes in her perception and becomes meaningless.

Who is going to be the winner now? The one, who loves Love, may say, the receiver. The one, who likes the paradigm, may stay with the sender. Well – the receiver has got more style means at hand and makes up her love-full words in her perception in a direct way and with effectiveness. I may say: not only victory by score for Love, but also victory after K.O.

Somehow? No, exactly that way.