

**XL. Repetition and Irony: Horace, *Odes* 2.18**

HILBURN WOMBLE

DUKE UNIVERSITY

In a recent study<sup>1</sup> Professor W. C. Helmbold has shown many instances of word repetition both between and within the *Odes* of Horace, aside from incidence of anaphora. He questions whether the fact of iteration should in itself constitute cause for suspicion, or emendation, of the text. This study proposes to examine the artistic performance of word repetition in a single poem to discover whether or not it exhibits in that poem an esthetic function. To anticipate, its conclusion is that iteration is neither accident of transmission nor carelessness on the part of the poet, but calculated design, that its function is one of insistent recall. As such, repetition is an integral component of the poem's structure. Through recall it commands a backward glance,<sup>2</sup> and in the inevitable re-evaluation of the preceding occurrence as well as in the enlarged reference of the subsequent, it furnishes a basis for parallel and emphasis (if the subsequent reinforces the preceding), or irony (if there results a re-interpretation or inversion). Recognition of the role played by this poetic device is therefore important for the full interpretation and for reaching the organic meaning of the poem.

*Odes* 2.18 is chosen because it is particularly rich in repeated words. Eight words are repeated once,<sup>3</sup> and a ninth word occurs three times.<sup>4</sup> The poem's structure is formal and symmetrical,<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Word Repetition in Horace's *Odes*," *CP* 55 (1960) 173-74.

<sup>2</sup> The importance to the critic of a backward glance has been cogently stated by M. P. Cunningham, "*Enarratio* of Horace's *Odes* 1.9," *CP* 52 (1957) 98-102.

<sup>3</sup> *Domo* (2), *domos* (19); *clientae* (8), *clientium* (25); *deos* (12, 27); *dives* (10), *divitem* (31); *ultra* (24, 32); *Orci* (30, 34); also considered repetition are *aureum* (1), *auro* (36); *regiam* (6), *regum* (34).

<sup>4</sup> *Pauperem* (10, 39), *pauperi* (33).

<sup>5</sup> The relation of thought-sequence to form, strophic or lineal, has been discussed by H. L. Tracy, "Thought-Sequence in the Ode" *Phoenix* 5 (1951) 108-118. N. E. Collinge, "Form and Content in the Horatian Lyric," *CP* 50 (1955) 161-168, has laid a sound basis for structural criticism in maintaining that for Horace the term "symmetrical" must be divested of notions associated with the metrical structures of Pindar: "... for Horace it is the imposition of a stricter and symmetrical thought-pattern on

and its thought is arranged in a single triad of statement (1-14), counter-statement (15-28), and synthesis (29-40).<sup>6</sup> Prof. Mendell, in a study of the developing literary tradition of moral disapproval associated with the words *ebur* and *lacunar*,<sup>7</sup> includes an analysis of the poem's structure which indicates that it falls into groups of two eight-line strophes (1-8, 15-22), each followed by a six-line strophe (9-14, 23-28), with a final epistrophic stanza of twelve (29-40). The eight-line sections he labels "rich," the six-line "poor," and the final twelve, "merging the two in a common fate." This analysis is clearly correct as far as it goes, but it is not complete. The eight and six lines of each pair do not constitute each a unit but are together coordinate components of a larger unit. The character of these two larger groups has been made quite clear by the poet: the first fourteen lines are spoken by the poet in the first person, about himself. This is emphatically reinforced by rhetorical repetition of the pronouns *mea*, *mihi*, *me*. The ensuing section of fourteen lines is directed to second person, pointedly indicated by the pronoun *tu* in emphatic position at the beginning of line 17. The third section does, to be sure, embrace both the "rich" and "poor" of Mendell's analysis, but it also pulls together in synthesis and resolution the larger "I" and "You," and, as we shall see, all the literal and symbolic elements which constitute the "problem" of the two preceding sections.<sup>8</sup>

the more informal monody" (161); "... in place of the Pindaric interplay between matched and nonmatched rhythm and thought, the Horatian lyric sets a contrast between symmetrical and linear thought alone" (163). Simultaneity of these latest, which this present study attempts to illustrate, is considered by Collinge unthinkable: "These two different techniques (balanced thought and developed thought) can exist only in succession, and although theoretically a poet might produce a sequence containing each appearing more than once and interposed, it is difficult, and in Horace impossible, to analyze an ode in such a way, at least so as to command general assent for this analysis" (163). Perhaps it is general assent which is more likely to be impossible. At the time of this writing, Collinge's promised book on the structure of Horace's *Odes* has not been received.

<sup>6</sup> This division of lines seems unavoidable. The important observation, however, is the perception of its triadic and dialectic nature. As well as studying what the poem does and says, the critic must also address himself to the problem of what the poem *is*. As Collinge has said (above, note 5) 165, "The structure can *be* the meaning." The understanding that this poem is a sort of poetic syllogism is necessary to its interpretation.

<sup>7</sup> C. W. Mendell, "Horace, *Odes* II, 18," *YCLS* 11 (1950) 281-92.

<sup>8</sup> Mendell (above, note 7) 291 is willing only to concede a "somewhat formal strophic arrangement" and continues, "Horace's lyric art tends to conceal the art but it is there even if the unity of construction is less obvious and formal than that of others."

The first eight lines build a picture of an impressive establishment which Horace does not own. Its architecture is characterized by costly materials which must be sought from afar. There is ivory from the East, blue-white marble quarried near Athens, and the tawny yellow marble of Numidia. The source of the gold we can imagine to be Spain or the rivers of Gaul. *Ultima* (4) stresses and sums up all this. Mention of Attalus both maintains the aura of the exotic and adds to the idea of the grandeur of the house, for an Attalus was commonly and proverbially a personal symbol for great wealth. Furthermore, the name inevitably calls to mind that the last of the dynasty bequeathed his personal treasury and his entire kingdom to the Roman people. This historical association of Attalus with legacy, along with the word *heres* (6), leads into and supports the idea of how this air-built castle was acquired: the favorite dream from that fanciful realm of a quick and easy but still honest way to riches, the surprise inheritance. In this mood the poet, now a regally wealthy landowner, moves his attention to the dependants which his affluence will imply. Further illustrating this affluence, his clients' wives are *honestae* (8), well born ladies. They are weaving him expensive garments. The gift is impressive, but only suitable for the wealth and eminence of the patron; and that they are personally making the gift emphasizes the respect and devotion which these aristocratic ladies feel for their patron. The relationship of client and patron is what it should be, at least insofar as the attitude of the client is concerned; and perhaps there is some suggestion of "the good old days," which fit nicely into day-dreams such as this.

But the whole congeries is a fiction. All these things the poet does not have; there is a negative significantly placed at the beginning of each clause. At every stage in the growth of the fantasy they constitute a reminder that it is a fantasy; and although the fascinated specification and detail might suggest to the innocent reader that the poet wishes it were so, we are never allowed to be charmed into thinking that it is.

The second half of the section (9-14) is on every point adversative to the preceding. It begins, like the preceding, with treasures, but they are the treasures which the poet has, and, contrary again, they are not material possessions. The first, *fides*, is the transitional point from mention of the clients above, for loyalty and

good faith were part of the traditional association of this relationship. The intellectual image, *fides*, effects a lineal transition from the end of the first to the beginning of the second half of the section, although the content is antithetically balanced against the beginning of the first. This balance is continued in the next on the list of Horace's treasures, "a generous vein of wit." The figure is taken from mining, which recalls the marble of the beginning of the poem; contrast is maintained, intellectual against material, but expressed in the same figure.

*Pauperemque dives me petit* (10 f.) expresses the reversal of the client-patron relationship. It is because of his loyalty and his wit that Horace has a status opposite that which the economic difference would imply, and the vigorous placement of the words together (*pauperem dives*) points up this difference. His own sort of wealth has brought the same place and prestige which resulted from the material riches of his dream; but contrarily, the esteem comes from persons to whom he should normally owe respect, whom he would be expected to seek out. Ownership, the relations of rich and poor; the one missing element of the first half of the strophe follows: the means by which property was acquired. It is no unexpected legacy. Respectful mention is duly made of the gods as the givers of things, "I do not importune the gods" being a more or less literary way of saying, "I do not want." Our poet now moves on to the real giver, his patron Maecenas. The idea of *pauperem dives* is carried on from above, for Maecenas is easily the most notable example of a rich man seeking out Horace; but Maecenas is called not "patron," but "friend." The usual social stratigraphy was first reversed, now eliminated, and from it has come a relationship of friend to friend, a precious distinction the poet may well claim proudly, along with honesty and wit, among his valuable possessions. The antithesis is further operative in that here it is not how possessions were gotten, as above in the unexpected inheritance, but how possessions are not even sought.

Line 14 seems to explain this, *satis beatus unicis Sabinis*. The reader will subordinate and paraphrase logically: "I do not seek more because I am happy enough with what I have." But *beatus* as often means "rich," and the complex which has been created allows the ambiguity to operate fully. Not only are both meanings substantiated in the context, the context requires a subordi-

nation of one meaning to the other: "happy enough because I am rich enough." We must also notice the place name here, *Sabinis*, the locale of Horace's actual farm, contrasted with the far-away names in the initial lines of the *Ode*. It is not simply "happy/rich enough," but "happy/rich enough with what I have here and now." *Unicis* stresses the singleness of it ("This one is all I have"), compared with the many far-away places from which material treasures had to be sought.

Every constituent element in the fancied picture of the first half has been counterbalanced by an opposite in the second. We shall see that repetition of significant words will expand the component parts of this antithesis into growing themes, expanding also the counterpoise in which the themes are suspended.

At line 15 the "subject" of content changes abruptly. There is no element of transition; lines 15 and 16 do in fact intrude themselves as effectively as day is pushed by jostling day here in the line, *truditur dies die*. The poet has not, of course, merely inserted two lines to disrupt any inclination in the mind of the reader toward expectation of a serial thought-pattern. The passage of time is a judgment on the activities of the "You." The practical value of these activities will not need to be assessed by backward interpretation at the conclusion of their expression, nor even by progressive evaluation as the maintenance of balance with the first fourteen lines is observed by the reader. Lines 15 and 16 not only institute the counter-motion of antistrophe by disrupting the thought-pattern; they also inform us in advance of the disapproving position assumed by the speaking person of the poem.

Initially, this disapproval is on practical grounds; the "You" is foolish. He lets contracts for marble to be cut (recalling the marble of lines 3-5), even though he is on the threshold of the grave. *Interire* is not only a vivid poetic figure; the swift coming of death, prefigured in the death of the moon, makes the plans of the aged builder silly. He builds houses (we notice the plural, and recall *unicis* above) which he will never occupy.<sup>9</sup> Moons "die," but they return anew. The significance is unavoidable: death is soon; death is final. Our builder has forgotten to build him a tomb, *sepulchri immemor* (18-19).

But the end of life is not the only limit which he ignores. He

<sup>9</sup> Contrast with that earlier fanciful house which Horace has not occupied is compelled by the repetition in *domos* (19), *domo* (2).

builds out over the sea at Baiae, struggling to push aside the waves. The word *summovere* is commonly used in technical sense to express the action of lictors pushing a way for the magistrate through a crowd. This man imperiously bids the sea stand back, offending nature which rages back in protest (*obstrepentis*, 20). His reason: he is not rich enough as long as the sea holds him in. The line parallels and recalls line 14, where the poet said of himself that he is "happy/rich enough with his one and only Sabine property." *Beatus* there was ambiguous, "happy" and "rich," and we saw that one meaning was subordinated to the other: "happy enough because rich enough." *Locuples* (22) is quite specific; with *parum* it is definitely "not rich enough," as long as there is a limit. The two lines confront each other, from the confrontation comes an ironic reversal of meaning in both, and the irony points to a synthetic meaning we could not otherwise have. Our wealthy builder disregards the end which is death; he reaches the limit of the seashore, which nature has put there. Nature tries violently to hold him in, and we may be sure that she will be successful; his encroachment can never be more than slight. And so he will never be rich enough, because he will admit no limit in considering himself wealthy, and the limit will always be there. Looking back to line 14, we now must reverse our previous subordination of it to the preceding lines. It seemed obvious then, "I seek no more because I am happy with what I have." Now we have a new meaning, "I am happy enough because I seek no more," that is, "because I have set the limit at what I have here and now." Previously we subordinated one of the two meanings of *beatus* to the other: "happy because rich enough." It also is now reversed: "rich enough because happy." Both meanings, "rich" and "happy," depend for their realization in life upon recognition of a limit. Our "rich" man, the "You" of the poem, will never be either rich or happy.

Just as the idea of loyalty was the link between the two halves of the first section, the word *continente* (22) joins the halves of this one. We have seen it in its meaning of "contain, hold in." With regard to property lines it means "adjoining," and in this the thought glides effortlessly to our builder's neighbors. We recall that in the fantasy above (1-8) the poet's imagined prosperity naturally suggested, in the implied responsibility of high place, his relations with his dependants. The pattern has been

repeated. In this element also, clients, the content is opposed to that earlier cozy picture in the first section; and to insure that we not miss the antithesis, Horace has in line 25 repeated the signal word, *clientium*.

As the idea of limit is lineally carried forward, it sheds its previous status of image and becomes embodied in denotative content. Implied in sepulchre and coming to the surface in shoreline, "limit" now becomes overt subject material in actual property boundaries. *Continente* marks the transition with its dual meaning, "limiting" and "neighboring," and the phrases *proximos . . . terminos* and *limites clientium* of lines 23–25 lock the two meanings together. Here our rich man is not merely disregarding the limit, as before; he is tearing out the boundary stones which define his property line and leaping beyond the boundaries of his client neighbor's land. This section has seen a forward progression in the "rich" man's reaction to limits, from forgetting the grave, to pushing against the sea, to ripping out the surveyor's stone. The sea could rage back against his inroads, but his poor client must give way. It seems that the greedy encroacher upon limits has won, and we have an ironic reversal of that fond scene from the poet's daydream. Here the client is driven out, evicted along with his wife, carrying his household gods and his dirty children.<sup>10</sup> The word *deos* has appeared before at line 12, in the poet's decently reverend expression of "not wanting more," and its repetition here triggers another irony of inversion: it is not now a matter of more property, of things to be wanted and gotten; his ancestral gods are all this unfortunate man has left to carry with him. And further, the inversion is not only of Horace's description of himself as inferior become friend through a transcended relationship of dependancy, but as well of the fanciful picture of Horace the patron receiving gifts from his clients' wives. The patron is "getting" in both instances: there the client giving, here the patron seizing. The strophe is sealed by compelling irony in the visual contrast between purple-clad patron (*Laconicas . . . purpuras*, 7–8) and the ragged, dirty children of the client (*sordidos . . . natos*, 28).

This whole second section we have seen parallel and contrasted

<sup>10</sup> Furthermore, the figure of this man, driven from his home, carrying ancestral gods and his children, inevitably suggests Aeneas leaving Troy. Symbolically, Rome has been evicted in the eviction of its founder. This is not merely the moralist's understanding of agrarian developments, but also the moral preceptor's concern for the public effect of these developments on the moral texture of Italian society.

to the first in each of its components: the house, how property is gotten, and personal relations of rich and poor. The outcome of the contrast was a complete reversal of everything in the first, and the parallel is minutely drawn, even down to such detail as marble for the house. But one important thing is missing. The content of the first section was organized around the distinction of "wealth I don't have" and "wealth I do have." In such parallel structure we should expect the same in the second section. The distinction is not there, and its absence is significant. It emphasizes the meaning emergent from the counterpoise: wealth exists only where the limit is recognized. The man pictured as rich will never be rich at all, because he will never set a limit to his seeking. Horace; as speaking person of the poem, has set the limit; he seeks nothing more. It is Horace who is truly rich, because he is happy with the little he has. But the paradox exists on a broader plane than that of wealth and reveals, through the reflection which this structure commands, the meaning of the poem, the very nature of ownership itself. Ownership exists only where the limit is respected. In the section addressed to "You" there is nothing which "You" has; they are all things which he is striving to get. "Having" begins at the end of "getting," where the limit of getting has been imposed by oneself. "You" has no house; he is building houses. The poet has only one house, but he owns it, and that is because he is content with only it. He has accepted it for what it is, where it is, and in the present, and so it belongs to him.

The growing theme of the limit is not separate from what is the major theme of the poem, the house; it is both an integral and necessary part of it. There is no private ownership of property unless there are property boundaries which are accepted and respected. Nothing is a personal possession unless the owner can point to where it ends.

Likewise with non-material possessions; Horace, in the opening scene, had the affection of his clients. This was then inverted when the poor Horace was courted by the rich, and since this inversion eliminated the whole matter of dependency, he proudly asserted possession of a friend to whose largesse the recipient had set the limit. Our boundary-jumper can doubtless claim little friendly affection from his abused and dispossessed client.

The tension which has resulted from the progressive evolution of image and connotative meaning within a counteractive and



regressive structure of literal content is resolved in the final strophe, as it should be in realization of the dialectic form. Images such as gold, palace, limit, are repeated and in the repetition are become symbols of their own history in this poem. These symbols, in harmony with the content of subject, carry forward the image from its past existence and significance so that it may take its part in the *finale*. At the same time, they cast our attention backward to recall the quality of its significance in its past existence. By means of the very iteration this forces a final confrontation of the import in both places and results in a final irony, which is the lineal conclusion of serial stages of irony created by previous confrontations. The concluding section is "final" in a larger sense than that it is also the last.

Almost every word in the first sentence of this section is ironic in its parallel but opposite relationship with its antecedent equivalent. The single exception is *tamen*, an almost patronizing sign to us that we are now beginning resolution of the previous antithesis. *Nulla* is not merely a negative; it carries forward the initial statement that Horace has no palace, and the implication that the supposedly rich man has none, along with the fact that the evicted client now has no home at all. The sentence would seem to indicate ironically that he will at last get his palace, the hall of death, and "none more sure awaits the wealthy master" would seem to assure the inevitability of this final, unsought possession. *Certior* reminds that Horace's palace was imaginary, and recalls also the property of the poor client which was not secure; it was lost. The houses of the builder were not and never will be his. *Manet*, "is waiting," ironically calls back the contractor latent in *secunda . . . locas* (17-18) above: "Death is a reliable contractor, and this mansion will infallibly be ready when the day arrives."<sup>11</sup> Also, "it remains," it will not go away and cannot be driven away. He will finally own something, like it or not.

*Divitem . . . erum* (31-32) is twice ironic. *Divitem* is repeated from the *pauperemque dives me petit* of lines 10 and 11 and so summons the previous passage into this context. "The rich man seeks me out," but here "rich" modifies "master," and *erus* properly refers to the master of slaves. All this points directly to the land-grabber, a rich man who did not seek out a poor man who normally would

<sup>11</sup> E. C. Wickham, *Q. Horati Flacci opera omnia* (Oxford 1896) *ad loc.*

be his client, as did Maecenas, but one who drove out the man who was his client. This relationship is for the second time inverted; now it is toward slavery rather than toward friendship. *Divitem* also has a sort of dramatic irony since we remember that this same man is not rich at all.

*Rapacis* (30) is as true of the boundary-jumper as it is of Orcus, and is neatly equivalent to *avarus* (26) which has been applied to him above. The last greed will not be his. But there is ambiguity in *Orci* (30). Is it the name of the god or Orcus the place? Since this house is to be the man's final and only possession, *Orci* would seem to be not possessive but appositional, like *urbs Romae*. We might suppose that the reason for our rich man's eventual ownership is that here he will be forced to recognize a boundary because there is nothing beyond, and this supposition seems assured by *fine destinata* (30). Both of these words are taken in more than one sense. *Fine* is the end of life. He may forget it (*sepulchri immemor*, 18-19) and therefore not possess life, but the end is there and must be respected, not as the end of that which he never had, but the termination of his ability and potentiality to have it. Likewise Orcus is an end to itself, a boundary which cannot but be observed since there is nothing beyond it. Several meanings of *destinare* are ironically applied. "Destine" is obviously understood. As a technical term of the surveyor, synonymous with *describere*, we understand: "The property line of this palace has already been surveyed and the boundary is permanent; there will be no boundary-jumping here." In the language of trade, it means "to fix upon for oneself, plan to buy." Here is the single mansion which this man's money will sooner or later buy for him, whether or not it is included in his extensive plans.

The next sentence, three words (32), completes the evolution of the poem's larger reference and is at the same time contrasted in retrospect to each stage of its evolution. In the first strophe the poet said that he was rich because he sought no more than what he had. Therefore, "Why do you seek beyond what you have? It will prevent your ever being rich." In the second, the builder in his disregard for limits insured that he would never own anything. To be quite sure that we draw the connection the poet has repeated the important word, *ultra limites* above (24-25), *ultra* here. Beyond what? Beyond the limits which the very idea of

property demands. Here within the final strophe the most recently mentioned is the boundary of the mansion of Hell, in the preceding sentence. Now we see the full significance of the intruding lines at the beginning of the second strophe. Time runs fast, and the end is quickly approaching. "Why do you strive beyond the limit which nature has put to life?" The answer which this last section emphasizes is that already implied in *fine destinata* (30): "Possession of life also begins at the moment when striving has come to an end." Just as he has nothing because he is always getting everything, in his insatiable getting he loses even life itself. We remember *sepulcri immemor* (18-19): "By not respecting the limits of mortal life, you have paid no mind to that which might have been yours, life, and your chance is almost gone."

"The doors of earth are thrown open without discrimination to pauper and to prince" (32-34). Our deluded would-be owner will not be master of the palace after all, and we see now that *Orci* in line 30 was a possessive. The builder is frustrated again; he will be only a guest, and one who will probably not enjoy the company, for *pauperi* summons to this context the *pauperem* of line 10 and the rich man who courted the poor poet. This rich man also reversed the normal relationship of patron and client; he destroyed it by taking cruel advantage of his client's weakness. If he is embarrassed to find this witness to his perversion of an ancient institution among his fellow guests in the underworld, and chooses to quit such entertainment, the attendant will not let him out. The minion of Orcus did not ferry back even the wise Prometheus, who improved the lot of men. He will certainly not give return passage to this unsaintly man. Further, the iteration of *Orci* participates in the complex of irony which has been developing. The possessive form is repeated, and in a poem about ownership, this is meaningful: it is death which will be the owner. In the first occasion (30) of the repetition, possession of a palace is involved; in the second an inferior, an attendant. This pattern has appeared twice before, and the previous course of the poem makes its appearance here more than mere suggestion.

*Auro captus* (36) points back to the *aureum* of the first line, and *captus* could mean either "impressed" or "bribed." Gold did not impress or bribe even in the case of the proud Tantalus and his exalted descendants. Tantalus is a symbol both of wealth and of the abuse of a sacred relationship (the murder of his own son,

Pelops). His punishment is well known: he is cursed with an eternal hunger and thirst, and like the boundary-jumper, he will never have enough to satisfy his craving; in fact, he too will never have any at all.

*Coerct* (38) states the final stage of a progression initiated at the beginning of the epistrophe: owner, guest, prisoner. But this is ironically reversed in *levare* (38). Death releases the poor man who has discharged his labors; Death hears him when he calls. This seems to be a boon, a grant of that which is sought, and there appears to be in the last sentence a final contrast between rich and poor, a prison for one, release for the other. But *vocatus* (40) commonly means also "invited," and the phrase "invited or uninvited" removes the contrast and reiterates what was said about Death the indiscriminating host. The irony has been inverted in a greater climax of irony which is a fitting culmination for the poem: release into a prison, and an uninvited host.

The content of this third strophe resolves the conflict arising from the antithesis of rich and poor. As literally stated, Death the leveler is just in receiving them both. It embraces also the "I" of the first strophe and the "You" of the second. We have seen how Tantalus represents "You"; Prometheus represents Horace. *Callidum* (35) suggests the wisdom which the poet claims for himself as the preceptor of the poem. Also, like Prometheus, Horace is attempting to help man, to improve mankind.<sup>12</sup> The wise man and the cruel, the rich man and the poor, all must dwell in the halls beneath the earth. At least the wise man has had things which were his, among them life itself, because he remembered that it would end.

There have been shown several forward surges of lineal development, within and between strophes, encompassed by this responsive framework. There are also several such forward movements which run continuously through the poem. The first section exploits, in positive and negative, the idea of the present. We move to depiction of a man who in the present has no present because of his preoccupation with the future; then to the universal future: present, present looking to future, future. Also, the last

<sup>12</sup> Perhaps the most notable exposition of Horace's poetic position as priest-teacher is that of A. Y. Campbell, *Horace, A New Interpretation* (London 1924) 56 ff. There is no necessity to assume reference to some unknown version of the Prometheus myth, as do Wickham, Orelli, Kiessling-Heinze-Burck, and others.

section is a final stage of progression in its catholicity. The thought has moved from "I" to "You" to "Everyone," a progression in comprehension as natural as the developing awareness of a human being as he himself grows and matures. There is at the same time a narrowing *decrescendo* in "riches" to "ownership" to "life." Further, there is a forward movement in the cumulative thematic reference and balance. The second half of the first strophe embraces and is opposed to the initial half, the antistrophe to the whole first strophe, and the epistrophic section to both strophe and antistrophe.

The final section represents, then, a concurrence of opposite modes of development. It is a final harmonization of antithetical form (and its denotative content) with the lineal and forward evolution of connotative meaning which has been urgently directed by suggestion. The device of repetition participates in the responsive structure of counter-statement, by pointed iteration of image as well as in overt repetition of the actual word which has now become a symbol of its own past significance. At the same time iteration sets into motion a forward development of meaning. The meaning, progressively revealed, is product of an interactive system of ironies, and it is the very repetition which makes many of these possible. The second occasion of a word allows, or compels, ironic inversion of the first. Likewise, that history within the poem which earlier occasion of a word gives to subsequent incidence makes possible the dramatic irony of an informed reader who understands broader or deeper meaning than do the characters portrayed by the players.