**They say/ I say**

Jarrell’s opinion of Frost describes the general public’s lack of understanding of Frost’s true identity. Jarrell makes his case by basing this lack of understanding within ignorance, accrediting people’s over-familiarity with the wrong poems or lack of experience with reading the right poems. This argument blames an uneducated population, those who have not read the right poems, for not having a correct, in Jarrell’s point of view, opinion about Frost. Such an argument is obvious in itself; no one will deny that those that have not seen, heard, or tasted cannot know what it means to see, hear, and taste. Then, Jarrell continues to describe how those who are educated prefer to read Frost that is considered “easy”, that is, the “wrong” poems of Frost to read, elaborating on his previous argument that the public is not being educated about Frost’s true value. The passage is then an effort to educate those who are ignorant to the true Frost.

Jarrell is right in principle, but not reality. The first problem in Jarrell’s argument is the fact that Jarrell is writing the passage. It itself is an effort to educate, and therefor those who are reading it are being educated about the true Frost. Although this hole may be impossible to avoid, it brings to light a cascading series of questions that must be addressed in order to see if Jarrell’s opinion is right. The second problem in Jarrell’s argument that arises is of those who he is educating. His readers are most likely scholars themselves. Jarrell’s prose is much more complicated then Frost’s “easy” poems, so though Jarrell may be failing to educate the general public, he may be succeeding in convincing scholars about his own opinion of Frost, that some Frost is worth more then other in their literary aspects. This then leads to another quarrel: Is Jarrell trying to educate the public or the modern scholar that may has been lead to misunderstand Frost’s worth?

The truth comes to realization when those who have read Frost are asked about him. Frost is notorious for having written poems that are easily understandable and incredibly relatable, as described by Jarrell. His simple, fluid, and rhythmic style is unique. These opinions of Frost are well known, to the point where they have been considered fundamental characteristics of Frost as a poet, including, and most importantly, those who are educated about the true Frost. Those who are educated understand that Frost had laid deeper messages within his poems. Frost’s juxtaposition between his form and meaning is not seen as one of Frost’s main characteristics. Frost is known to have “deeper meaning” in his poems, not known to be deceptive. Frost is a considered a simple writer before he is considered a complex writer. Jarrell’s argument is valid in this case because he supports a view that people learn about Frost in a misleading way, causing them to think that Frost is simple. Jarrell is mistaken in thinking that the education of Frost’s true self is achieved by informing those who are not educated about Frost’s deeper meaning that such meanings exist. Instead, Frost could be taught in a reverse fashion, tackling his complexity before acknowledging his simplicity. The simplicity then holds not only a value for first-and-only-time readers, a value Frost was aiming for in his publications, but is also an object for literary attention, beckoning questions that lead to advanced analysis, including both picking at the word choice as well as letting the experience of the poem be easily soaked as it is being read. Educating about Frost in a manner that only addresses Frost’s simplicity leaves most of what is important in Frost’s poetry unobserved. Educating about Frost in a manner that only addresses his complexity leaves most of Frost’s artistic value unobserved. Frost’s work must be approached from both his complex and simplistic characteristics because they both have incredibly enlightening powers when combined. The truth in Frost is hidden within his complexity and simplicity.