

Stephanie Coen

22 October 1987

Language is in many ways the most potent and at the same time the most primal of all human resources. The ability to give expression both to the emotional/instinctual fountainhead that governs our inner lives and to the intellectual/ordered wellspring of our consciousness (although no individual can ever really be split into so structured or neat a dichotomy) might, in biblical language, be construed as something of a blessing and a curse. The former often is the cathartic effect of language, especially the very personal catharsis that results when an individual truly comes to grips with something through doing battle with it—the battle of transmitting that which is sensory is a tangible reality. The latter, however, lies in the challenge of achieving that catharsis and of truly doing justice to what may be only a singular, overwhelming moment. While words have the power to illuminate an entire world of experiences, whether they be personal or epic, there is also the danger that words in the shadow of experience will be reductive and banal.

For those who survive catastrophe, every moment of time must be lived in the shadow of one hundred, one thousand, one million singular moments. It is for the lucky ones, perhaps, that those individual moments become a whole. Consider, for example, the man with the cross carved and burned onto his forehead—the man haunted by an image and a word. On a superficial level, his deadened language and heightened interiority may

Here the metaphorical language blurs the distinction you want to make because the internalized battle of the senses sounds more formidable than the externalized battle of the words. "Doing battle" is a lot stronger than "Doing Justice."

nice

indicate that he has objectified and therefore to some degree reconciled with the past. The man's desire to transmit his experience to a metaphysical level ("...the prairie began to translate into its language what the ocean had said to me." The Cross, 14) is, however, a means of avoiding what he hesitates to acknowledge in full. When he does cry out, it is unquestionably one of the most powerful accusations in this writer's experience of literature—"A frontlet between thine eyes.' Ha! Is this the kind of "frontlet" that our dear, old God meant?" The Cross, 13.) The one rhetorical question comes nearer to expressing the man's rage than any ritual of his three year wandering through and with Nature, and suggests strongly that neither memories nor emotions can be left without some form of outward expression.

In contrast to the man with the cross, for whom one instant in time became a microcosm of the entirety of the horrific period, others who suffered trauma understood the war/pogrom as a macrocosm of their own experiences. For many of these individuals, speech became a means by which they reconciled their own involvement to the greater whole. The narrator of And Then There Were None, for instance, repeats the pronunciation "The prisoners are dead. I feel it in my bones" throughout the story. Although his involvement proper is de-emphasized to some degree, the above phrases link him immediately and irrevocably to the dead. While the narrator is not a victim but a figure of power, the use of his first-person memory serves to blur the distinction between the two.

needs 2 direct object

That is pretentious. Use "my" "mine" at this stage in your career.

good

Here you needed an extra  $\frac{1}{2}$  page to arrive at a summary.  
The paper got too weighted towards the theoretical. On  
the whole, I am greatly impressed by your command of words  
and clarity of mind. Don't rein in your love of language.  
At this point you should use it to the fullest. The last  
thing you want to become is another Minimalist!

9/10