

Introductory Narrative Theory, Semiotics, and Greek *dramatist* - Poetic Realism and Universal Legitimism - Awbrey Collins©; - "Mimesis" by Erich Auerbach;

A Jump from Mimesis to Arête - 'Ergo sum Apropos'

"The work of poet is the work of a dramatist whose voice has been realized by its players!"

I will work with cogito, how to read from text; where indeed, there is none? This essay will utilize "Mimesis" by Erich Auerbach as a comparative literature technique for creating definition in studies for furthered investigations. 'Not being so specific', like Clytemnestra's suicide, I comment that there is always the last words for *Posey*, and Dutch dramaturgy, that insubordination was not tolerated -- critiques of feminism. "*All for one and one for all...*" Unlike personal etiquette pertaining to sexuality, the induction of famous last echoes, these halls they begin with the Dutch Knight, Sir. Philip Sidney. Of whom is hailed for poetry, being as useless as seeing Richard's people, poetry again by slant of actor's, replaying Richard struck through the throat with an arrow. Like heuristic verb-verb agreements in Spanish, in latin orders of Lucretian poetica, arête, latin critics are just as much rhetorically ironic; grammatically, the racism and sexism is utilized critique, to its linguistic study, politics represent letters, mere semiotics uninvestigated nor interpretable require Greek dramatists. Mere letters in a language are spoken is the king's of Denmark. 'What a hustle'... This essay is to prefix introductory studies of Chansons de Geste, Pas de Deux, and Deus ex Machina; for means to finding praxis, linguistic solutions up-ending in American Standard English, providing further study of Hebrew and Latin language, long term. I mean to engage heuristic poetics, not latange Englishes, structures I require for elongated terms of study; and, to term investigative finds, classifying a linguistic analysis cross multiple languages, across politics and unique to cultures. These were my finds: a realm of historicism; both religions and aggregate literatures comparable to *mimesis* enabling Lucretian Poetics; and behavioral economics.

Universal poetry and linguistic theory are based upon Neo-Classical order. An objective of mysticism; fascination and enlightenment; and perfectibility are all exemplifications of poetic imagery, called semiotics. This is Victorian, literate critique of generated flow in interdependent instruction of Lucretian language principle, constructivist of historical language flows through Shakespeare yet not accredited to Shakespeare. These context are representative of measures of all aesthetics in realism. Poetic realism is the concentrated ability to have language flow through a medium and poet, without loss of comparison atmosphere, nor environment from which it was inspired. Legitimism is evidence equivocating clause for screenplay, and legitimate authority which critiques are seen to be both poetic and informative. They have been more or less an authenticity that comes from legitimism and will not come in historicism, nor the affirmative from prespired culture. Although it may inform about a culture, the language of origination should more or less be parallel to its poetry, or literature's critic. This notion of realism is no different from critiques of narrative theory whereas semiotics are dramatic. There is pivot point

for critique. By critic, it is made affirmative, these aesthetic language of exigence is one's ability to be literate: not the phonology used interpreting specific sound of dialect, nor interpreting found fundamentalism within constructing discourse.

Pragmatism in folklore is technically folk-culture in legend. Thus, the only difference is grammar in the affirmative language's influence on dialog. But without dialog, how do we differentiate the fictional from the real, or poetic from humanism? This accreditation to Gothic literature, like the philosophical approach to art known as humanism, is discussed by dominion, about religion(s) which parallel paganism. Again, we see how legendary characters have rationalized Greek dramatist through semiotics, and in most cases the narrative theory one in the same. These intense, robust and passionate instincts are both romantic and instantaneously sensational. Although their reproduction of similar feelings are phenomenality, their poetry and the emotions are triggered by the loss of innocence. Creating within the imaginative, or creative, a sensibility for literacies inspired by innocence loss is a linguistic sequence, or patterned organization. What abstracts from its parallel unity? In this union, there is an action-reaction sequence that is instantaneous, and incorrectly critiqued being phenomenal. The theoretical sciences leading to this rationale approach to humanism in developed inspiration, discussing teachings of philosophy relevant recourse, or discourse. Using the words and sentences for statements as art: when do words become art? The influence of semiotics on fictional context is the post-analysis relation allowing for such severe a critique, to say that all critiques of literary humanism only occur as a parallel to nature. I say, an emphasis on literary fiction is its critique on diadem, not praxis. Either that or, a critique reciprocates use of semiotics for using Greek description for dramatist. Both of these I will explain; but as a critique that uses dialog it requires speech critics to dialog comparing phonetic relations where follows editorial uses of narrative theories in fiction.

When critique and linguistic theory meet, it query where historical recollection and literacy amass communications. Are these communications considerably "mass communications"? Increases in vocabulary and verbatim are signs of comprehension. The verbal, or oral response that is a method of language aggradation, apprehends correlative to increased ability seen in linguistic analysis, and synthesis. This ability to govern information as a hierarchy is production rounded data cache increases the validity, or volume, of possible reproductions in scientific elaborations and final analysis. The practice of comprehension, deduced here, or affirmative in language, is itself a method for measuring language comprehension, and acquisition. Increases in vocabulary reduce a stressor of understanding conflicts, its stigma increased by verbatim use and decreasing the analysis which produced invalid information, and incorrectly rationalized for dialect and phonetics. As dialect receives this non-Germanic, Dutch critique based upon historical recollection, Lucretian poetics is itself the verbatim by which a vocabulary becomes epistemic, or didactic. Ontologically receives its etymological basis, its reaffirming is a

communal effort for contingency, by political efforts establishes application to literacy and understood as the response to political efforts of authority acquiring dialect and represented in culture.

The uses and abuses to creating sub-real status, is divine contravention, a **cogito**. This creation is the singularity establishing union, the unity or unification. Its idealization or stylization, that is of realism, is the ante-schism for critical theory ascertaining its uses of realism to created poetry, for standardizing examinations for comparing foundational language to acquisition. The communal platform of poetic realism is authoritative. It does not 'agree' with its translation, nor its interpretation. Thus, critiques to create an etymological basis is understanding it as clinical pathology. The same acceptable standard must be used to inference a measure of dialect, for information collection, must be that standard and must balance itself, by basis of the cultural identity, for a much larger sample once information is grossed. Of examinations of a specific dialect, its derivative itself a language where acquisition is not poetic realism, which understands these critiques from within, must create literacy. In using language to produce artistic reproduction of Lucretian poetics, we require histories, historical conflicts and unification: of culture both liturgical and semantically of pragmatics dictated by Lucretian poetics. This is akin the hysterics of Cicero's Catalonian speeches removal of phonetic arguments in dialects against its authenticity. Thus, poetic construction is interesting because in its avoidance of critical analysis, to say that two poets who are equal in dialect are equal in their abilities to discern the commonality of a desired culture has proven false. This also is to say, two literates who represent equal share in etymological basis, are equal in discerning what makes something fiction. Where do we hear in the voice of that author, and when can we force our interpretations of their dialogs to take on the perspective directly from fictional narration, literally their authoritative manuscript?

It is utilizing nature v. nurture, where we found this pivotal point in humanist critiques, that nomenclature insipid of satisfaction, producing parallelisms of radical and fundamentalism. The impervious nature of literatures is nurtured through language. More or less, this forced nurturing of sentimentality is impossible. It is a rationalizable choice. For an example; we can rationalize the paradigmatic dialog produced in pragmatism of aggregated culture, with inundated technology, in amassing communications between linguistic datas. For their inferences, we reason the development in earlier second language acquisition to stages. A peer, acknowledgment dialect creating sub-culture influences the informed from within sample drawn on by culture. The community of cultures which nurture a language carry authority, usually their only derivative that has an inability to empower or govern authority granted, that authority correspondent ability of interpretation is translation in a manuscript text, corresponding interpretation into the culture's authoritarian language to providing literacy measure. How this affects a culture's critique is didactic in its diadem, or verbatim how interactions are semiotic

critic. These points of critique develop into grammatical structures for staging all narrative theory, and influence secular cultural authorities of a community. To cultivate the means to common culture is naturally measuring literacy, and then nurturing that epistemology is found understanding literacy subjectively. In objection, there will maintain a nature of peers whom acknowledge the communal status of language, then inference from speech what can be guessed about authoritative consent a language construction utilizes of its nature. This communicates both instruction and improvisation of a cultural dialect.

Where we compare Gothic drama and Shakespearean merchanche is the comparison of commonplace and lores of post-Sixtus Brittany, and post-Spanish Inquisition, France also known as Lucretian poetics. Examples of this mimesis are “The Beggar’s Opera”, results in anti-confucianism of Puritans; “The Phantom of the Opera” alluding to the mimesis of Pope Sixtus; Denis Diderot’s “Paradox of the Actor”, a mimesis resulted in its construction of Dorian Gray’s theatre; “Animal Farm”, a true Lucretian mimesis in the form of a play; and, Emile Zola’s Thérèse Raquin, who is juxtaposed mimesis explaining how dramatist and fiction sometimes result in reality. In the case with Zola it was the “accidental” death of Thérèse Raquin’s author. This is the first place in interpreting literature, using mimesis where poetic realism confounds, but also the first place it surfaces. This is where historical conflict takes the place of latin grammatical basis, and the historical subtext provided dramaturgy in commonplace of both dialog and syntactical construction. Within literature, it is this verbatim that occurs that more simply classifies Greek dramatist under semiotics. We should call this a hebrewism¹ of Greek dramatist. Whereas, a Greek would likely see its entirety of the play including the author a mimesis, that dramatic form will unlikely function for the audience specified in this interpretation. What we find semiotic is not in the text, from which would not exist in the textual translation for a specific cultural dialect, clearly promotes a specific author. The paradigmatic formulation for poetry, I abstract is only had in its ability to exist within paradox and contradiction, fictional narrative theory. Furthermore, as a right of regulatory convention, oxymoron and homophones cannot exist semiotically because it will give singularity and authoritarian function to the cogito, producing a dialog which prevents the study of mimesis.

Aspects of an etymology that “cannot exist”, I say is mimesis. In further interpretation and translation, we view neoclassical order influencers in legitimism; using Lucretian poetics, their poetic realism are the semiotics of Greek dramatist. Our find is Lucretian poetics is a stable fictional context - the communication of two poets, or communication with a poet as the medium whose mitigating conflicts of major religious figure. Friedrich de la Motte Foqué in Undine writes, “Yet, do not be surprised if, in the end, things turn out quite differently than planned. That treacherous power lurks, waiting to destroy us, takes pleasure in singing its intended victims to sleep with sweet songs and golden fairy tales. In contrast, the messenger sent from Heaven to save us often knocks loudly and frighteningly at our door.” Hard work still exists, with my

critique using Lucretian poetics, and for its first time we can terminate etymological bounds to finding mimesis, we evoke ontological nature. Universal poetics act in asserting that cultural influencers provided translation, are the interpretation of manuscript. Original language and language acquisition differ from text and manuscript inscription, and they give like arithmetic language differentiations from formalities in mathematics. Latin grammar and Lucretian poetics has been sidelined for critique and dissent. In the inverse, the solution we see is an inability at becoming literate, because of judicial and individual authorities giving worth. Having to provide a value to a society is seen, politically, as an analytic for provided authority as is necessary to having a universal poetic. We fear this critique of mimesis, that somehow it will undermine the substance and have textualized the contextual semiotics meant to raise a flag about racist critique.

We use poetry, with sexism and racism removed, praxis Sixtus to discontinue Shakespearean literacy; and, we realize their powers to rhetorical guesstimation which have oral influence on statements that incur in verbatim. Recovering the generalities of authority and martial states are the eminent changes, by domain, of poetic realism we can compare during mimesis, relative language acquisition. It has real-estate governed living concerns that go beyond a poet's dialect, as does Greek dramatist. The voice of the dramatist can also be seen poetically, semiotics based influentially fundamental in power structuring, undermining instinct carrying no phenomenality. This clause of literacy of poet does not apply to the song and dance of culture. It prevents the counter-critique which all critique should perspire in narrative theory, provided fiction and nonfiction. Certainly, proving that a critique is of literal bounds, making a rhetorical justification in grammar necessity of manuscript authenticity is also the ability to comprehend a text purely from within the text, is mimesis. Using poetry to define literature is a measure we have provided for literacy perception, the authority and a test culture that means to a culture's authority the given place for critique. The instincts of a culture providing scholarship is that domain, this dramatist theorized. Language occupies transparency, where argument teaches didacticism. It is so important to recognize the profound ability of language to encapsulate culture, and replicate the semiotics that occur naturally in the case of historicism. Our semiotics symbolize destruction of culture, but will not preference the semiotic destruction of a language to produce a dialect. Furthermore, the dialectics that a language produce naturally are artless. The mimesis produced the critique, fundamentalist literacies and rhetorical justifications that should be equal to measures of critic efficacy, and ability of reproduction of originating text knowledge is the "Mimesis" unilaterally. A statement that can be orated to govern its methodological verbatim is the paradox that rhetoric is usually universal in poetics of Lucretian poetics, and this ordering should not be replaced, and should be protected by Geneva.

I have found that domain is rhetorical and eminence in a reproducing of justification is a culture simplification, which allows grammar to produce an epistemology of critique. That choice is a

context clue for reading mimesis, epistemic or ontological, in requiring sentisis in the grammar of measure, of latin grammars it sound etymological and renders critics negligent. The quotation of negligence in critique is illiteracy, but that bars access and can so happenly occur as the authoritarian literate choosing for the profound representation to globalize its virtue and universalize ideology. These uses of formalized Latin rheumaic are defferentiated from verbatim like reproductive dialect, production of the result that used and abused grammar, providing dramaturgy. This error is in formal training and not classic conflict. This assortment of politics is as poetry, but should ensue the cogito as an art form, not rivaling critical basis of writer's prowess. Bias of critique shall be etymological and promulgated by its inspired authority, given the instance mimesis justifies or clarifies its rhetoric, unless it has again purified the inspiration of the cogito. Epistemic challenges are not always mimesis. Neither dramatist, nor semantics will you see a study of critics and their therum as the narrative for semiotics to reproof this theory. Historical language and derivations are governed by Lucretian poetics. Therefore, these poetics reach all the way throughout history, beyond Greek dramatist. Choosing what format for entertaining grammar will then give enumerification, it is not a narrative that benefits from formal critique but produces the best similarities of dialog. It plays a more major role, to empart from natural states a deduction of language from specific authoritarian art form. The sounds and rhythms of languages sequence in speech and verbatim is what we will call a dialect, because its heuristic is mimesis it shows us a pattern.

Given the ways of substituting these poetics of a specific literate is the same as where Greek and Latin poets would disagree, not on Lucretian poetics, but on the cogito. Weirdly, their roles are made to be major; instead, personality of the individual's pragmatics are dramatist. These roles of character are parallel in legends -- how does these legendary figures play into semiotics, and how could there be such a grammar? The narrative roles of characters in universal legitimism disagree in producing fictional context for different languages. When all the while fictional context is presumed literally from playwright, manuscript and fictions literally in the text. Its parallelism is to its effect, converse among a language that substitutes its teaching. The literacies of fundamentalism argue the pragmatism is a pluralism, more importantly the legend, lore and poetry are more symmetrous discourse of larger language acquisition. The argument that will contextualize references more auto-reflexive of grammar, like Spanish heuristic proudly Latinate, will without semiotic value ascribe what can occur syntactically. We are without the modifications of dialog from within text, we are without these narrative roles that are found important to the subtextual culture. Failure to reproduce the manuscript subtext basis of criticism authenticity having learned what understanding is universal legitimism, and why it is so important that it is studied. Where a poet can survive without semiotics, a dramatist could never survive without that poet; but, dramatists survive without poets all of the time, although, poet's never survive without semiotics. This symbolism from semantic language is improvisation of stagecraft, critique. How this is mimesis is the incredible workings of theatre that aid in

language. Further disdaining, it is credible for dramatist to admit that a more thoughtful critic would stay away from language, and the contextual dramas are not suited for the stage, no more real than dialogs that have been attempted in influencing our fictional contexts.

The importance of a well grounded historical rationale is to approbate to culture, from a syntax reliance upon in-text citing numbers, those number from language number system. Even more specifically, the key figures creating duplications in a drama's structure are provisional speakers and any given nominations for a perspective. These notions of mimesis will be valued as measures determining, granting authenticity. How well a player is familiar with a text and the text's origins will tell mimesis of how well the players influence familiarity with origin, specific with playwright and specific histories of the piece's performance. Like music, the audience's ability to follow through with improvisations will be clarified by the clues that are provided by these pivotal notions. As the familiarity pivots on the axis of a piece, their audience reproduces the value that virtue will be more exact. This complex culture of linguistic aggregation must be measured by critique. Critique must begin being numbered with historical influencers or the playwright will have follow-up by linguistic commonplace about common clause and cadence of neo-impressionists and semantic negotiations. These semiotic results of mimesis should be acquired in noting where semantics are syntactically apparent, and where it can be avoided to impress upon an audience their cultural values personalized for conspiring within the group of players of said drama. Epistemology, a production's opening to the public, for an example, in a neo-Classical context refers to the memory. If an epistemic trend continues to improvise itself from within any given piece of drama, then the etymological development from its origin will host an identical representation from the trend. The authorities of the peice's given transparencies replicate not only dramaturgy, but the poetics that identify with the piece from origin language that art observed.

When language has adapted itself as being art, the sublime identification with classified origin is parallel the interpretations and its translations. Even if a piece has not yet been translated, these poetics show in neo-Classical authority of given religion(s) that correspond to well found information about the authority inhabiting a linguistic manner, inert formalism. Also the regulation confines that result happened instantaneously, and an inspiration of both art and virtue - are influence on semiotics that were the art itself, as is latin grammar. Even in its destruction by informal critique, cultural aggradation is the conjugate contradiction that infers through our thesis, 'universal poetry and linguistic theory are based upon Neo-Classical order, that semiotics is the cultural appropriation to a contradiction.' The removed origin of religion gives something to a published manuscript's author, otherwise removed from a piece, political representation where authenticity is language, and it is linguistic! Recollecting mimesis is permeating a society! It is sensational, the effectiveness of determining effectiveness of receiving a critique, is at most a virtue, is efficacy of having heard differentiation from where it is applied and cognitive,

societal relativity. This EQ information demonstrates gathered language, and steady study formalizes methods for structuring from finished pieces of art the reinforcers of a language, the representation of implications of imperative, and acquired memorandum. A natural bureaucratic formulation of good critique carries this: artists of indigenous understandings will create newer possibilities, and novel responsibility grants form to true literacy, and true comprehension.

Then, universal poetics created this altruism Auerbach calls “mimesis”. “Truth” of poetry; it is distinctly a dissent of language acquisition. An author presumes having had personal foreshadowing is the time to order logic and create semiotic perspective; its inverse, preferences of the publication, its recourse will re-apply then authenticity of language parallel, and same sublime character which occurs with naturally productive presences of art. Poetic theory is like the narrative theory drama, the semiotic memory relating the studies of mimesis. We reason why semiotics has become more applicable to our experience, gaining from finished production greater rhetoric. The hope is that some “truth” vindicates the author through publication, and our own authority to either teach us something new or is gained greater influence by the postulated authority. The presentation of its narrative theory is like a proof, a measure of literacy that must be provided before a loss of innocence. Loss of innocence happens when we rationalize literature. It so is important to becoming more educated in literacy, or become more yielding of literates to substantiate greater claim at legitimism, we must agree on a mimesis. Legitimism works unilaterally with the pre-production of publication, as well is authoritating its response to its analysis of post-production. These conversations about community are what deter us from influencing our created dialect of translation, substantiating interpretation and becoming less artistic. Itself is a language of authority, would we choose a regulated dialect; a more formal decision at certain generalities indirectly aggregates language scaling, are substance coexisting interpretations of critical philosophies of critique, and union of societal influences. These corrupted authorities are giving measures to critique where critique as a method no-longer substantiates origin language, and provides a limitless grounding completely untrue.

We fail our visions of semiotics, yet grammar becomes syntactical initiatives which rhythmically pattern conformity for desired comparisons: cultural, political, artistically. But, defamation of an illegitimate authority is a good place for prose; although, when it is critiqued, it sounds just as corrupt as the classifiable authority as being classified as ‘corrupted’. These are un-needed complications to culture, un-needed contingency to literacy! We have hailed to drama an infinite amount of influence to say what is conflict, the unforgetting rhetorician’s abilities to counter-argue conflicts permeated other siding. In many cases, we are influenced by art in ways that do not even exist in the context; to say lesser, these are a lesser critique then are the possibilities of language from within a manuscript. It is painful to experience illiteracy, but I think the incompatibility creating misunderstandings is authority that is closer to Republican fear tactics, propaganda, and illiteracy to mimesis in Lucretian poetics. The history of Greek

dramatist is short, the life of the drama's author. The hebrewism¹ is the single pivotal concept for mimesis to orient us in universal legitimizing, where many will exist. What is unique in nature, that is what we want for critique. We want to synthesize, from amalgamation, to reproduce authenticity. It is important to remember, that at this manner of formality, we reveal what we want and not what it is we do not want.

As players conspire around their interpreters, "they" produce more semiotics. However, this time, additional semiotics have become universally legitimate. They are transparent. They function both for culture, and how a culture has approbated for growth. Its cultivation is production occurred from its manner, and influences what may be taken lightly; but, critique holds this same weight of an editor's needs to create semiotics through syntax. Giving more light on final production, give the fictional function of a piece of art it amalgamated critiques by and the more natural influence premeditated from the cultivation of poetry. I say poetry, and only because poetry is one of the few transparencies which incur upon our judgment at being universalized. I mentioned universal poetics, but like mimesis it can only bring closer the understanding of approbation, the transparency of language required in universal legitimism. Why not, are we unable to argue a piece's authenticity? Why can we not argue "poetic truth"? We should be able to sit down, and rhetorically critique authenticity until we fall into a realistic jail cell of Plato's inner recourse. We should demolish ourselves as a call to finding growth of the origin epistemology, publicizing all written discourses. Etymology is useless to build or ascertain vocabulary, as this very same virtue was syntactical when delivered in text because of its unnatural influence to sounding ungrateful. And, without the oration of "poetic truth", the familiar virtue vocates subliminality, reproduces the ontology of mimesis, and although it is told syntactically it has avoided its detection of these vendetta's of popular culture. So what does this say about its semiotics?

It is all of us who feel connected to universal drama. Is this ironic? We build Mycenaean clusters of stagecraft, it magically render our rhetoric to be militaristically engaging on an Aegean battle ground of Spartans. As their Oedipus complex turns to elephantiasis, elephantiasis turns them fetish; we sail to absolve our tensions in a bath of blood lust and glory made them realize our barbaric inquisition of manner which has flawed for many years what was meant to expire. The colosseum drama still seems the most simplistic propaganda entertaining. The smart ones are outside of the coliseum, betting not on the ones who fight back against critique in their arena and are slain by blood lusting fanatics whom cannot provide falsification about someone's dramaticisms that are incorrect and slander. The arbitrary forces of mass communications, like the roar of a crowd blotting out the pornographic tendrils of RF-feed and white noise; where, the most outwitting thing a player can do is to challenge the authority and its personal mimesis that should feel personally about how he lost so many of his chess pieces to their process. That is not vengeance, that is not slander, that is comeuppance. Universal dragg then dirges the feelings of

connectivity that postulated around informal manners of poetics like rap-music and pop-music. Things that seem self-degradation we better hide behind than to reprove the manner in which we found something to be simple. And, when the semiotic catechism becomes the catastrophe of some wedded couple, society suffers.

Back on pageantry island, where mannerism is improper in literature, it institutes formalism's profitability to exhibit a sort of poetry - algorithmic the critique that entertains us the most, seems always to be Greek. It is all merely a dramatic approach to critiquing method. Requivocated all in a single space, "...and after the comma, there is a space before the quotation marks." And, I realized a long way back, that there is a certain musicality to duress, and a sound that the dirge makes. When I first studied semiotics, it was all posthumously; and, I had not seen the power of mimesis, nor semiotics; nor what the two make together. Tantalizing sorrowful woe. When I finally noted that universal legitimism was the monsters that tears through all of my studies, and noted that running into the face of battle with a medicine bag was not something I was going to do only because I found it easier to enshrine ways of making "them" feel more powerful and important, the propaganda is what made me do it. It made me submit to the indefinite exposures to culture that made middle-class, middle-class. I realized its uniqueness. I saw in realism the life of constantly changing remarks about marketable critiques, about failure of etiquette or efficacy that personal doubt is insubordination. About mimesis, I walk the plank; really, long before I started sending people off my ship -- "You're a racist," they thought... "You're not legit," I said.

From globalized authenticity, our universal legitimism gleans just one thing! We shall run steadfast with zeal, blindly into the stratagem that should be rain; not to fuel the fires of burning crops from harvesting the blood from the dirt, but to wash from the street's products, from societies. Scholarship confirms moments of much needed resolve from study, but we recognize adherence to inner confluence of mind that relates, there we incorrectly organized to be a culture. We presume without poetry, a course of Posey that should be rationale and parallel, then return to the next time we meet; in the hopes that, our conversation will sound somewhat the same to its pivot point, to its origin. We will step through martial entanglement, embattled by the knots of all marital impunity and take from learning lessons as quickly as possible. Instead of applying praxis to how we feel about specific people, who's prespired thought acts as what we resume into their dramas; like the clown embodied that poetry, it is at its heart. Our sentimentality is not a joke to being lost, to further struggle; instead, we word-smith our presence. What gains in our affinities, is lost at being authentic, which has transparency. Said to be unique, even in our grammar; to collaborate together, and honestly return to a complete, different pace of thinking; to re-syncopate from our names, down to our perception what got us to whittling out why, this is so conflicting! Instead, we rise to the notion of change, with the ambivalent hysterics, and its

rationale; and, assume that Peter from the bible was being biblically semantic when saying that 'no one could read your mind'!

Where justification comes from -- we see in the narrative instincts of writer Kenneth Graham. The illusions to nature compare mimesis' personality as a character, dramatist share the sured literalisms of poetry not Posey, and narrate for required conflict between love or shared realities of the dialog. This mimesis required we approximate text and character traits, influence semiotics, and reveal disillusioned syntax to make semantics like the characters who are known to be "legendary". Animals of the forest, with their naturally inspired character traits, inspire us in the focus of natural intuition. It is almost like intuition in forced attack, instinct and what is natural to fictional propaganda. Nature produces propaganda, it nurtures itself with the rain cycle. Frogs wear bright colors because they are poisonous, they do not want to get eaten. Natural intuitions can make use narrative theory, as Kenneth Graham utilizes the technique, observable mimesis. When language comparison is allowed literature, we experienced its realism through animals that truly talk; and, more importantly, they speak our language. Example: when the animals in Kenneth Graham's story "The Wind in the Willows" are brought to life by dialog, are they saying the exact same thing in animals' sounds? When this is truly evolution, does this mean that a dialog can truly respect the realization of an animal(s) or "the ones that are speaking"? Imagine, if we had crashed down through the forest canopy landing next to a foreigner who was reading Kenneth Graham in their native language, will we be able to use understanding pragmatics and semantics to determine if the animals are speaking? A living hebrewism¹. It will serve seeing attritions in interpretation, whom is speaking; and, kind of figure out what it is they are trying to observe or explain? This is the perfected example, and rhetorically it occurs within a fairytale; which, unfortunately it means that it is directly tied to culture, and it can only inspire nourishment which cultivates from itself a healthy result of appropriation in linguistic apprehension.

If civilization is sociology, then the psychology of its class-structure is praxis. The ominous sects of neo-Classical order retains that linguistic developments by comparisons that a secular origin of linguistic differentiation, neuter called dialect. It retains the historical impression of cultural order, who rely on "pas de deux" to explain the times that divine contravention is made as a choice. Further hypothesis, if improvisation of secular community is provided for in "chansons de geste", then supported through that is a "deus ex machina", the hebrewism¹. The gathered will of nature is a force that recognizes the Arabian subjugation(s), the alienating principal of evolution have created a Latinate binary to coding the concepts of *you are what you eat* in communicating *nature's food chain (hierarchy)*. It has a life cycle of dramatic semiotics which diadems a heuristic of dominion, called representation of superiority and symbols of appearing closure to which interpretation it didacticizes; and, it breaks origins with basis among dialect improvement, to prove cultural authenticity based in literacies - cultural primacy. The parallel of

pluralism is the *locat* of political action, *polis*. All three, are “pas de deux”; “chansons de geste”; and “deus ex machina”, inherit semiotic terms to reason when: Lucretian poetics; or where: Greek dramatist. It is the fictional context for conversationalism. I presume it will be where phenomenology conspired from.

I retained linguistic orders for poetry, literature and prose. “Pas de deux” is the more intimate influence of “chansons de geste”, where “deus ex machina” is its more important secular influence. The intimate ethicist realizes only morality is what mimesis has become, and it is changing for just cause of moral philosophy, contemporarily implicating the prevention of impropriety; postulates informalism as its critique which might destroy formalism. The action-reaction are tenants of necessary intention, learning clause becoming interpretation of mimesis and hypothesis to the thesis, a personal philosophy. Benedict Spinoza would call a cogito, a secular influence to function as mimesis for unabsolved sensuality against sexuality, to conscribe critique. Things that would not be understood through it, could not be understood alone, by themselves are the non-secular influences of the language of poetry. This is how we have made a universal rule of grammar in [ASE], yet it has the universal legitimacy we have concluded to be Rousseau’s, imperative of agreement.

Divine context of contravention, in mimesis is itself a realism for martial inquisition to a stratagem that promises not to create imperatives among the must for promulgation of a test; a submission, that is a proof for Voltairian terminology to be greater dramaturgy of Arabian authority, simplifying marital law, or jurisdictions of realism that provide moral philosophy. There is no formal literature intent on populating cultural primacy. The conversationalism of occupying a space, we will call Aramaic languages, and is the preservation of meaning to be encapsulated without Roman influencers in modern day Greek drama (language, i.e. dramaticism). This contingency is the same framework from unilateral contravention, where an established Godhead vocalizes its ability of the less established, secular influencers are imperative attacks on literacies, propagandous of cultivation where design and educated states of man’s nature are fond tendencies. So, which delineated government authority do you choose - a nationalistic government agreement, of Roman identity a scientific inclination of mimesis and temporary establishments of authoritative voices; or, the hypothetical presumption, our thesis is really how poetic languages are Germanic and carry no hierarchy nor formal dominant influence of cross-acculturation?

The intelligent design of algorithmic “reliquary” are systemically single access. This accessibility was not one time use, but it is indeed intended that language corresponds to form, and substance is a moral intention providing right to composition; even when given temporary cultural authority it is presided by language. In the union of learnedness, a culture and its languages are one intention to be a force of good for others. We inscribe an interpretation and

translate then functioning dominion. Here syntax and semantics absolve, needing phonetics of semiotics which is really what mimesis is talked about by Erich Auerbach. An example is the orders of the Holy Cross, which pit to tests poetics. Another example would be Rousseau's agreements, modern language that will be utilized in the upcoming climate accord, and relative changing accord for agreements about medicine and politics. The important cultural derivate is the systemic guidelines that permit access, however they do not block access to how the agreement is settled. Basically, you can say whatever you want and it meant nothing to semiotics, which makes it a very useful solidifying critique on hebrewism¹, when settling theories of narrative theory. Hypothesis: can narrative theory be a drama composition critique? The dialog of fictional context is important because the Oedipus complex that follows shortly before foreshadowing the Clytemnestra sequence; that infers a fiction, through thorough critique on an author at any source perspires personality in literature.

“O Tuscan! who through the city of fire goest alive, speaking thus decorously; may it please thee to stop in this place. Thy speech clearly shows thee a native of that noble country, which perhaps I vexed too much.’ Suddenly this sound issued from one of the chests: whereat in fear I drew a little closer to my Guide. And he said to me: ‘Turn thee round; what art thou doing? lo there are Farinata! who has raised himself erect; from the girdle upward thou shalt see him all.’ Already I had fixed my look on his; and he rose upright with breast and countenance, as if he entertained great scorn of Hell; and the bold and ready hands of my Guide pushed me amongst the sepulchres to him, saying: ‘Let thy words be numbered.’ When I was at the foot of his tomb, he looked at me a little; and then, almost contemptuously, he asked me: ‘Who were thy ancestors?’ I, being desirous to obey, concealed it not; but opened the whole to him: whereupon he raised his brows a little; then he said: ‘Fiercely adverse were they to me, and to my progenitors, and to my party; so that twice I scattered them.’ ‘If they were driven forth, they returned from every quarter, both times,’ I answered him; ‘but yours have not rightly learnt that art.’ Then, beside him, there rose a shadow, visible to the chin; it had raised itself, I think, upon its knees. It looked around me, as if it had a wish to see whether someone were with me; but when all its expectation was quenched, it said, weeping: ‘If through this blind prison thou goest by height of genius, where is my son and why is he not with thee?’ And I to him: ‘Of myself I come not; he, that waits yonder, leads me through this place; whom perhaps thy Guido held in disdain.’ Already his words and the manner of his punishment had read his name to me: hence my answer was so full. Rising instantly erect, he cried: ‘How saidst thou: he held? lives he not still? does not the sweet light strike his eyes?’ When he perceived that I made some delay in answering, supine he fell again, and shewed himself no more. But that other, magnanimous, at whose desire I had stopped, changed not his aspect, nor moved his neck, nor bent his side. ‘And if,’ continuing his former words, he said, ‘they have learnt that art badly, it more torments me than this bed...’” *The Inferno Dante Alighieri*. English version by Dr. J. A. Carlyle. “Temple Classics” edition. J. M. Dent, 1922.

[“I think it was to try and combat the existence... dividing us blacks... education has got a certain stultifying influence for instance on the development of an African child. It does not train him for an independent existence... history for instance which is painfully taught to children... establishes in the minds of the kids that themes we reject as Blacks are in fact a fact that cannot be changed... so that it entrenches in the mind of a kind the whole unholy division of blacks into virtual cocoons... precisely because we do not control those who set up this system...”] (Arnold, Millard. *Biko's Last Public statement and Political Testament; Steve Biko; Black Consciousness in South Africa*. p106, 107.)

Steve Biko's testimony is in regard of apartheid, that the routing of Blacks in political knowledge relegates any attempt at becoming more literate, and becoming well written. Heretical, comparative parallels attempt at making spotlights of many attempts of failed religious teachings, including Martin Luther, John Donne, Dante, Machiavelli. These are all the same arguments of Nat Turner. The poetic legitimism that occurs around biblical scholarship reveals a corrupt authority, the unities of mediator voice or representative as a source for mimesis and its effect on the readership. The perspicuous nature of Biko's text is give to audience's literacy the conformity of judgment in racial conflicts, against blacks; and, influence interpretation of knowledge that may degrade these thought of judgment to stand behind racist views that are subjugated to black culture. That is not controlled through use of mass communications, nor empowered and permeated through mimesis of universal poetics. It acts Greek. It acts religious.

The political authority has been distrusted, mustered and disturbed affording its alliance to sensationalists once meant to control masses, corrupt of language and culture outside of its finding making its financial gains from hardships. Here life is better! Mimesis are the poetic natural hate crimes called bliss. Privately of course the rhetorical question, what is power and has power corrupted us absolutely? We could now ask the same questions about literary influences. Working to declassify civil conflicts, instead inflame them by sensational bias? Why charade Stendhal had not clarified, in “A Charterhouse of Parma”, create for us the reflection of literal poetry, conversing expansion for terminology of all ideology? Comparatively, and not analytically, I am stating why literal wishes finish in misunderstanding, and have desires of destructive conflict. Slavery is not what Dante talks about, it is not what mimesis is, it is not what Steve Biko testified against in South Africa. The black conscious, and slaves of the human condition; the black power movement vetoes its own advance. It will not answer to anyone. The poetic downfall of word-smith and epic is eminent. Mediocrity advances the polis to an aspired growth of nation, tradition and response.

Lyric postmodernism is a learning curve. It requires measure of poetic realism. Developing on an ethical purpose will clarify conclusion. It will objectify subjects for formal educational promise,

to provide neo-classical insight. I ordered, before language existed to disturb someone's religion! I want to speak more definitively to interpreting such text, "Mimesis" by Erich Auerbach. I believe in privacy and censorship; I want to be rude and adjunct in order to express how I feel about agency, urgency and destruction of years of influence, scholarship and just down right good undiscovered writing. Criticism is a perpetuated cycle. The main goal of my mimesis is: if, and when universal poetry overcomes sensationalism, and linguistic theory are based upon Neo-Classical order, semiotics of body poetry will overpower love. It is the socialized appropriation to a contradiction, then provided the contradiction used by a Clytemnestra sequence, to reveal fictions of [Hebrewisms]. Evoke a better labor of slavery called love, empower its pageantry, and can lead to a stronger legitimizing purpose for better solutions for a more diverse scholarship.

Works Cited:

Auerbach, Erich. "Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature". (translator Willard R. Trask). 2013. Princeton University Press. Princeton, New Jersey. [Primary text]

¹A Hebrewism will be granted trademarking through Macauley Austin USA© via publishing author Awbrey Collins© - {A hebrewism's literal definition is applied from defining Othello, the black character as member of Shakespearean dramaturgy}.

Fouqué, Friedrich de la Motte. Undine. "Romantic Fairy Tales". 2000. Penguin Classics. London, England. Page 113. [Primary comparative resource]

Zola, Émile. "Thérèse Raquin". 2004. Penguin Group. London, England. [Secondary comparative resource]

Stendhal. "The Charterhouse of Parma". (translator Richard Howard). 2000. Modern library Paperback Editions; Random House, Inc. Toronto, Canada. [Relative comparison resource]

Biko, Steve. "Black Consciousness in South Africa". Mary 1979. First Vintage Books Edition. Toronto, Canada. (text). [Supported argument reference]

Dent, J. M. "The Inferno Dante Alighieri". (translator Dr. J. A. Carlyle). 1922. Temple Classics. [Secondary, supported argument comparative resource]