

Sarah Bedore  
Lil 420  
October 8, 2025  
Professor Frank  
Journal 5

### QCQ: Ways of Responding

#### Quotation 1: Seelye

“This house also was built by the father artist, With his own hands, floor upon floor...Nor will he ever go back inside: It will serve for cenotaph,”

#### Quotation 2: Rich

“This was our world...I am Effie, visible and invisible, remembering and remembered.”

#### Comment:

The contrast in these two quotes is interesting as they both have elements of the child's residual soul, but from different perspectives. In Seelye's poem, there's an outside perspective looking in on the parents and how their lives have changed. The father put care, time, and effort into his family's home, but now, I can imagine, it is an awful reminder of his late daughter. He may go inside again, but it will never be the same; it will never be completely filled. The house now acts as a time capsule for the lingering presence of his daughter. Rich's poem takes the perspective of the child, using it to demonstrate the middle ground she wavers in, seeing her living family, remembering every living detail. 'Our' world refers to when it was shared amongst the family, when they were in it together. While she's physically moved on, there's a middle ground of her figuratively being kept alive by memory and inanimation. From these aspects, I feel the variations in the poems reflect how the living and the dead still influence each other and shape our feelings and expression in art. An artist doesn't necessarily have to relate to grief (or any subject) to embody the perspective and create a meaningful interpretation.

#### Questions:

- What's the difference between poets writing what's blatantly visible in the art versus what's embellishing and adding to 'story'?
- While both poems drew from outside imagination, I felt Rich's poem was straightforward and didn't dive deep into the storytelling aspect of how someone could interpret this poem. Seelye's poem incorporates a range of extra details and concepts to expand what is on the surface of this art. Neither approach is wrong, but do we gain more insight in one vs the other?

- How do both writers use perspective in art to create a story and connect emotions?

Another side idea connects Moramarco's essay to these poems... Should poets be using paintings of the physical world to shape their ideas and convey a story that shapes the image?

Quotes on Moramarco that stood out-

Representations of the physical world are best left to painters; for poets, the inner world of the human spirit is best conveyed in a language shaped by ideas and feelings rather than the forms, shapes, and colors that inspire the painter.

The painterly poem, of course, is not always an attempt to transcribe materials literally from one medium to another; it more often seeks to imitate how a painter sees than what he/she sees

Painters language of expression vs that of the poet