Reflection

Looking Back:

I remember really enjoying Slaughterhouse-Five and Pale Fire. They were two of my favorites of 2017. I think that because I enjoyed the books, I had an easier time writing the essay.

Postmodernism, as I had come to understand it, is a genre that challenges readers' notions and preconceptions of literature.

Postmodern stories typically subvert some "tradition" of narrative. For example, in Slaughterhouse-Five Kurt Vonnegut inserts himself into the story as a narrator who is both part of and distanced from the story he's telling.

I was very proud of this essay, but the version I turned in for the class isn't the version I'm looking at now. I edited it for a third or fourth time to submit it as part of my application to work in the writing center. I like this version much better than the original.

Looking Inward:

I feel very good about this essay. I think I captured much of the admiration and excitement I feel about those texts. I used a lot of quotes to

Looking Forward:

Reading this essay again makes me want to experience the novels for a second time. I want to take more notes and look more closely at those texts. If I could revise this essay, I'd like to fix up the awkwardness that, even after having edited it for the writing center application, still lingers in some of those sentences. But more than that, I think I'd like to take out *Rose Mellie Rose* entirely and bulk up the essay with more examples from *Slaughterhouse-Five* and *Pale Fire*.

I argued about t/Truth represented within those stories, but if I could write it again, maybe I'd try to write about the reality that these characters are facing: the death of loved ones, the memories of war, conflicting sexualities. Are these texts the ramblings of misguided, unreliable characters, or are what they're saying true? Does that matter? Those are some of the questions I'd like to try to answer.

I would also give it a title. Maybe something like "The t/Truth in Postmodern Literature," or "'So it Goes' and Other Euphemisms in Two Well-known Postmodern Texts...." I'd have to think about this a bit more.

Looking Outward:

This piece was both alike and dissimilar to other essays I've written. It's similar because in my literary analyses I tend to use (potentially

supplement my argument and to supplement my sentences. I repeated "so it goes" in the Slaughterhouse-Five portion of the essay because the phrase is repeated many times in the novel itself. I think I was trying to capture the "essence" of the novel while I was writing about it. When I was writing this, I felt like I understood the texts and like I understood what I was saying about the texts. It was very exciting.

overuse?) plenty of quotes, but I don't usually try to capture my affection for a work of literature in my essays. Or at least, not so explicitly.

Though I have to acknowledge that it's possible that I'm overselling my words, and that my feelings for the texts don't come through for the audience as clearly as I'm saying, but thus far, this is the essay in which I've taken the most risks, and I like that about it.

I think this essay makes me a writer because I think I was able to clearly describe and represent my ideas about these novels. I think this shows that I can write critically and knowledgably about the books I love and that I can enter the larger conversations about the books that I've studied—especially when it comes to the three I talked about in this essay.