

In the maze of Pindaric metrics

How did László Ungvárnémeti Tóth interpret Pindar's metrics?

Ágoston KEISZ

Independent Researcher, PhD

ORCID: 0009-0000-5921-6787

Abstract | In July 1818, László Ungvárnémeti Tóth published a bilingual volume of poetry in Ancient Greek and Hungarian, containing imitations of various Ancient Greek genres (odes, epigrams, idylls, and epistles). Four imitations of Pindar's victory odes in Ancient Greek and Hungarian are the most fascinating of these poems. In June 1818, the poet also published a treatise on the importance of early Greek literature and Pindar's poetry, particularly his metric patterns. In this article, Tóth published a Hungarian imitation of Pindar on the death of Archduchess Hermina, following the exact metre of a specific ode by Pindar (*Pythian X*). The various traditions of interpretation of the difficult Pindaric metre can be traced in the author's imitations and theoretical works. In his treatise, the author presents the traditional metric interpretation of the scholia on which the metre of the imitation published there is based. The ancient Greek poems published in the bilingual volume and a modified version of the Hungarian text of the Hermina Ode follow the innovative metric analysis of Gottfried Hermann (1798), while the Hungarian texts of Odes I, II, and IV use a method of free metre construction dating back to the Renaissance. This article shows how the poet used the various traditions of Pindar's metric analysis in his work.

Keywords | Pindar, metrics, imitation, New Ancient Greek poetry, 19th-century Hungarian poetry, bilingual poetry, Ungvárnémeti Tóth László

The period considered a time of revival in the history of Hungarian literature began in the last third of the eighteenth century.¹ New topics, genres, and styles gained ground, influenced by the models of ancient and Western European literatures. The Hungarian poets were much bolder in experimenting with various forms of quantitative metre than before, since it suits the Hungarian language just as easily as it does Greek or Latin, due to the phonetic characteristics of the Hungarian language, which differ from those of the Western European languages. The oeuvres of the greatest poets of the era, Mihály Csokonai Vitéz (1773–1805) and Dániel Berzsenyi (1776–1836) were also heavily influenced by ancient literature: for instance, Csokonai created imitations of Anacreon in the same metre as the original, while Dániel Berzsenyi (1776–1836) wrote his poetry on both personal and patriotic topics in a verse structure that he was familiar with from Horace.

At the same time, this period also represented a strong link to the literature of an earlier part of the eighteenth century. The tradition of patrician poetry remained influential, the occasional poets of which wrote poems according to the conventions that had emerged during the eighteenth century, addressing social events affiliated with aristocrats, noblemen, or prelates, including inductions, funerals, and weddings. They often did so in Latin, in a format that evoked the ancient genres. Latin was namely still widely used in Hungary at the beginning of the nineteenth century. It was used both in the written and in the spoken form, in state and cultural affairs, and it was also the language of instruction in schools.

The representatives of the literature undergoing reform set out to ensure that the Hungarian language gain as much ground in social life as possible, which also necessitated developing the expressive power of the language. The most renowned organizer of this work was Ferenc Kazinczy (1759–1831), who was one of the main facilitators of the efforts made to reform the Hungarian language in the 1810s, promoting the cause of language reform in his correspondence, translations, and studies. Kazinczy passionately advocated for studying and following the ancient and Western European models, recommending studying the Greek models in particular to his followers, as he was an enthusiastic reader of Winckelmann. From the representatives of the younger generation, Ferenc Kölcsey (1790–1838), who subsequently wrote the Hungarian anthem, and his friend, Pál Szemere (1785–1861) supported and represented Kazinczy's ideas in Pest-Buda, since Kazinczy lived in Széphalom, 270 kilometres from the intellectual centre of the country. As the largest city of the country, the only university of the country

¹ On this period, see: Tibor KLANICZAY, József SZAUDER, and Miklós SZABOLCSI, *History of Hungarian Literature* (Budapest: Corvina Press, 1964), 77–102; Lóránt CZIGÁNY, *The Oxford History of Hungarian Literature. From the Earliest Times to the Present* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), 82–119. For a more recent summary, see: Ernő KULCSÁR-SZABÓ ed., *Geschichte der ungarischen Literatur. Eine historisch-poetologische Darstellung* (Berlin–Boston: De Gruyter, 2013), 96–135.

was already located in Pest-Buda, and this was also where the most important publications of the emerging Hungarian press were published.

László Ungvárnémeti Tóth (1788–1820) was also a member of Ferenc Kazinczy's intellectual circle in Pest.² He conducted medical studies from 1814, and we know most about his approach to literature and his life from the letters he wrote to Ferenc Kazinczy. Ungvárnémeti Tóth sent his letter of introduction to Kazinczy in March 1814, also attaching the poems he had written in ancient Greek. Upon establishing contact with him, Tóth entered the literary scene with Kazinczy's support, and he followed the advice that arrived from Széphalom when he prepared his volumes of poetry following the ancient models. He published his first volume of poetry in 1816,³ and his second in July 1818,⁴ arranging his poems according to genre in both. He highlighted the background of these poems in terms of genre theory and literary history in commentaries and notes linked to the volumes, as well as pieces he published in the press.⁵ His study on following Greek poetry and Pindar in particular stands out among his theoretical texts, published in June 1818 in the first Hungarian scientific journal called *Tudományos Gyűjtemény* [Scientific Collection].⁶

In his second volume, Ungvárnémeti Tóth imitates his model in a radical way in that the volume includes every poem in both ancient Greek and Hungarian. The ancient Greek poetry that was part of European literature in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was considered quite exotic in Hungary at the beginning of the nineteenth century, since there was no tradition of ancient Greek poetry in Hungary in this period.⁷ On the one hand, the poet took Latin, which was widely used in Hungary, as a model, although the Neohumanist ideas that promoted following the Greek model also had a significant impact on him. In the first part of his study on Pindar, similarly

2 For a more recent edition of his work, see: UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH László, *Művei* [The works], eds. MERÉNYI Annamária and TÓTH Sándor Attila, the Greek texts ed. BOLONYAI Gábor, Régi magyar költők tára: XVIII/9 (Budapest: Universitas Kiadó, 2008), 580. See also the review of the volume: KEISZ Ágoston, "Ungvárnémeti Tóth László Művei" [The works of László Ungvárnémeti Tóth], *Irodalomtörténet* 92, no. 1 (2011): 110–115.

3 UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH László, *Versei* [Poems] (Pesten: Trattner János Tamás betűivel, 1816). Its modern critical edition: UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH, *Művei*, 219–344.

4 UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH László *Görög versei Magyar tolmácsolattal* [Greek poems with Hungarian translation] (Pesten: Trattner János Tamás betűivel, 1818). Its modern critical edition: UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH, *Művei*, 345–459.

5 The articles were published in *Hasznos multságok* [Useful delights] in 1817–1819. For the exact details of the publication, see: UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH, *Művei*, 77–78. See the text of the articles: UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH, *Művei*, 545–561.

6 UNGVÁRNÉMETI Tóth László, "A Költő remekpéldáiról, különösen Pindárról, 's Pindarnak Versmértékiről, [About the excellent models of poets, especially about Pindar, and Pindar's Metres]" *Tudományos Gyűjtemény* 2, no. 6. (1818): 54–89. Its modern critical edition: UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH, *Művei*, 499–521.

7 For an overview of ancient Greek poetry in modern times, see: Filippomaria PONTANI and Stefan WEISE eds., *The Hellenizing Muse. A European Anthology of Poetry in Ancient Greek from the Renaissance to the Present*, Trends in Classics. Pathways of Reception 6 (Berlin–Boston: De Gruyter, 2022), 1–18.

to Winckelmann, Ungvárnémeti Tóth argued in favour of following the Greek model by claiming that early Greek poetry had in fact been the only truly original art form.⁸

The author divided the bilingual volume published in 1818 into odes, epigrams, idylls, and epistles, following Classicist genre theory. The poems were accompanied by explanatory notes, and a glossary arranged according to the Greek alphabet was placed at the end of the volume, explaining why particular Greek expressions were chosen with the help of the original textual locations. Eleven odes and fifty-one epigrams make up the majority of the volume, while the three idylls and the three epistles are much shorter.

In line with the Classicist hierarchy of genres, it is clearly the odes that constitute the high point of the volume. Verse form serves as the guiding principle for organizing the cycle of odes: the volume begins with four Pindar imitations (Odes I–IV), which are followed by poems written in the Aeolic metre, especially Alcaic and Sapphic stanzas (Odes V–IX), while the cycle is rounded off by two odes written in Anacreontic lines (X–XI). Based on Ernst Georg Stahl's (1659–1739) theory, Ungvárnémeti Tóth states that it is metre that provides a stable framework for the content of the poem,⁹ just like the body provides a form for the human soul. Therefore, following the metre of the original text cannot be omitted, as it constitutes an integral part of it.

This is also reflected in the relationship between metre and content, which cannot be separated from each other, either. According to the poet, “the Rhythm and feet of almost all types of poems, certainly according to the nature of the subject, are so set, that someone would not be able to change them up without resorting to using force.”¹⁰ As a result, the Pindar imitations are about the most sublime topics, the Alcaic odes discuss matters of public life, while the Sapphic and Anacreontic odes depict feelings and situations in connection with love in a more light-hearted tone. The wording and the topic selection of the odes, especially those written in the Aeolic format, were also heavily influenced by Horace, who had a great impact on the Hungarian lyric poetry of the beginning of the nineteenth century.

Ungvárnémeti Tóth valued the odes he had written in Pindar's style the most, which he clearly must have written in the final phase of writing the volume, between 1816 and 1818.¹¹ These are the most innovative texts of the volume, since imitating Pin-

8 For more on Winckelmann's explanation of the uniqueness of Greek culture, see: Elisabeth DÉCULTOT, “Winckelmanns Konstruktion der Griechischen Nation,” in *Graecomania. Der europäische Philhellenismus*, eds. Gilbert von HESS, Elena AGAZZI, and Elisabeth DÉCULTOT, *Klassizistisch-romantische Kunst(t)räume Imaginationen im Europa des 19. Jahrhunderts und ihr Beitrag zur kulturellen Identitätsfindung* 1, 39–59 (Berlin–New York: De Gruyter, 2009).

9 Francesco Paolo DE CEGLIA, “Soul Power. Georg Ernst Stahl and the Debate on Generation,” in *The Problem of Animal Generation in Early Modern Philosophy*, ed. Justin E. H. SMITH, *Cambridge Studies in Philosophy and Biology*, 262–284 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006), 264–265. See UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH, *Művei*, 511.

10 UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH, *Művei*, 511. The poet then goes on to show what topics and atmospheres accompany the individual metres.

11 He writes the following to Kazinczy from Vienna on 13 March, 1819: “However, odes in general are also dearest to me in them, especially the Pindaric ones, – and the fourth among those in particular (which

dar had barely existed in Hungarian literature before. *Ode I* is about Ferenc Kazinczy's approach to poetry, who supported Ungvárnémeti Tóth's career. *Ode II* is about the duty that a learned poet addressing an educated minority rather than the masses owes to his homeland, which can be linked to Kazinczy's highly elitist world view. The other two odes were about the traditions of patrician poetry and its characteristic topics. *Ode III* is an epicedium to the memory of Princess Hermine (1797–1817), who died very young and was the second wife of the extremely popular Palatine Joseph (1776–1847), who lived in Buda. *Ode IV* sings the glory of the Hungarian generals who returned from the Napoleonic wars, as well as the honour of the Hungarian ancestors that is associated with them.¹²

By studying the original Greek texts and the contemporary aesthetic literature, the poet gained a thorough understanding of the style of Pindar's odes, their language, structure, and main topics.¹³ His knowledge is reflected especially well in *Odes III* and *IV*, which are likely to have been written last and which showcase a fitting imitation of Pindar's poetry both in Greek and in Hungarian. However, in addition to wanting to imitate the stylistic and substantive characteristics of Pindar's poetry, the poet also wished to follow the Greek poet's metre: "But I now argue that Pindar's metre also merits attention, as well as following."¹⁴ His decision might also have been motivated by his above-mentioned view on the close link between metre and content. It also may have played a role that Hungarian poetry at the turn of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was positively charmed by the possibility to explore and use quantitative metre in the Hungarian language. Tóth aligned himself with this ambition when he also wanted to follow Pindar's poetry in terms of its prosody, although Pindar's metrics had not been imitated in this way in Hungarian before.¹⁵

I also admitted to in my notes) and it is a shame that I had not started on them earlier: the whole book would probably be in that voice." UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH, *Művei*, 591. On the genesis of the Greek poems, see: KEISZ Ágoston, "Az ógörög zsenyéktől a Pindaros-imitációkig. Ungvárnémeti Tóth László görög verseinek keletkezéstörténete" [From ancient Greek juvenalia to imitations of Pindaros. The genesis of the Greek poems of Ungvárnémeti Tóth László], *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények*, 127, no. 3 (2023): 296–331.

- 12 For an analysis of *Ode III*, see: KEISZ Ágoston, "Hermina emlékére. Pindaros-imitáció és alkalmi költészet Ungvárnémeti Tóth László Hermina-ódájában" [In the memory of Princess Hermine. Pindaros-imitation and occasional poetry in the Hermine Ode of Ungvárnémeti Tóth László] *Irodalomismeret* no. 3 (2024): 30–53. For an analysis of *Ode IV*, see: KEISZ Ágoston, "A rendiség mítosza. Ungvárnémeti Tóth László *Ἡρώες τῶν Οὐγγάρων* / *Magyar hősök* című Pindaros-imitációja" [The myth of feudalism. The Pindaric imitation in *Ἡρώες τῶν Οὐγγάρων* / Hungarian Heroes of Ungvárnémeti Tóth László], *Ókor* 22, no. 3–4 (2023): 15–28.

- 13 On Ungvárnémeti Tóth's sources and how he saw Pindar, see: KEISZ Ágoston, "A tükörben Pindaros. Az újkori Pindaros-utánzás dilemmái és Ungvárnémeti Tóth László Pindaros-képe" [Pindaros in the mirror. The issues of imitating Pindaros in the Modern Period and the image of Pindaros in the works of Ungvárnémeti Tóth László], in *Mathéma. Ókortudományi és recepciótörténeti tanulmányok III.* [Mathéma. Studies in classical antiquity and reception history] eds. DOBOS Barna et al. (Budapest: 2024), forthcoming.

- 14 UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH, *Művei*, 511.

- 15 UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH, *Művei*, 516.

However, Ungvárnémeti Tóth faced much more complicated problems in the case of the Pindaric metre he wished to imitate compared to the metres better known across Hungary he had also used before. The search for a solution to these problems happened to gain new momentum in Germany at the turn of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It is clear from the theoretical conclusions the poet made and the works he completed that he was fully aware of the disputed issues as well as some of the old and new answers given to them, and he also took these into consideration when he composed his pieces.

The various issues and variants of interpreting the Pindaric metre

In the case of the most frequently used verse forms in Hungarian quantitative metre, e.g. hexameter, the various iambic line types, or the Aeolic verse structures, the Hungarian authors working on reforming poetry at the end of the eighteenth century could rely on the clear tradition of interpretation that went back to the philologists of Alexandria. A large number of models were available for these verse forms, since the authors could find many examples for how particular lines and stanzas were structured in Horace's and Virgil's works. A knowledge of these forms was even part of the Hungarian school curriculum, mostly using Latin-language examples.¹⁶ It is thus no surprise that by the beginning of the nineteenth century, the hexameter, the distich, and the various Aeolic verse structures became popular verse forms in Latin and Hungarian-language poetry.

However, following the metre and genre of the Pindaric odes was a different story. Compared to the French, English, or German literatures, Pindar had a much smaller influence in Hungary and was also known much less, so the Pindar imitation familiar from Western European literatures did not emerge in Hungarian literature. All this was true even though Pindar's name was also known in Hungary due to the influence of German literature at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and a Hungarian translation of his full oeuvre was published as early as 1804.¹⁷ Beyond the low quality of Greek instruction in Hungary, following Pindar may also have been particularly difficult for Hungarian poets at the beginning of the nineteenth century because following the complicated metre of the victory odes posed an enormous challenge for the Hungarian poets who set out to write poetry that followed the same metre.¹⁸ The poets writing in their national languages in Western Europe did not face the same challenge. While Tóth could easily use Roman poetry, especially Horace's works, as an example

16 For a history of the Hungarian reception of classical literature, see: Réka LENGYEL and Gábor TÜSKÉS eds. *Vergil, Horaz und Ovid in der ungarischen Literatur 1750–1850*, Singularia Vindobonensia IX (Bécs: Praesens Verlag, 2020).

17 FÁBCHICH József, *Magyarra fordítatott Pindarus* [Pindar. Translated to Hungarian] (Győr: Streibig József betűivel, 1804).

18 TÓTH Sándor Attila, *Az istenülés dicsősége. Ungvárnémeti Tóth László költői portréja* [The splendor of deification. The literary portrait of Ungvárnémeti Tóth László], *A magyar irodalom kismesterei* (Szeged: Gradus ad Parnassum Könyvkiadó, 2001), 107–108.

for the poems he composed in Aeolic stanzas or hexameter, he could not rely on Latin or Hungarian models in Pindar's case.

Understanding Pindar's metre is also hampered by several factors that do not emerge with other metres.¹⁹ The metric structure of the victory odes is unique in each case. The metrical pattern may only repeat within the same ode, so the large amount of text that can help interpret the hexameter or the Aeolic verse structures is not available for these odes. In addition, the relationship between the metrical and the substantive units is not clear either, and since there is no consensus as to how the individual stanzas can be divided into lines, it is also difficult to define how feet and larger metrical units can be delineated from each other and what characteristics they might have. The stanzas are thus mostly segmented into lines based on the textual tradition and the publishers' beliefs regarding metre. The frequent use of resolutions that enhance diversity, as well as ancipitia, poses an additional difficulty, as does interpreting the syllables positioned at the end of the lines, which typically behave differently within the metre, due to a lack of clear delineation. For all these reasons, creating general rules pertaining to the metric system of Pindar's poetry based on odes written in such a variety of metres is a particularly complex topic and has been subject to debate since the antiquity.²⁰

Based on the metric scholia of the late antiquity, the ancient readers also knew that the triad was the largest metrical unit of an ode, consisting of the combination of three stanzas: one strophe, one antistrophe, and one epode. The strophe and the antistrophe have the same metre, while the epode has a different one. One ode may consist of only one triad, although the triad may also be repeated, even several times.

The Pindaric metre was seen as an example of prosodic freedom until the end of the eighteenth century. Until that time, the textual editions of the victory odes still presumably followed the line division that had been established during Hellenism,²¹ and they also tried to describe the metres of particular odes by mechanically labelling the feet based on the scholia. The very first general summary, *Μετρικά τινα τῶν παλαιῶν*, which was included in the metric scholia associated with the Pindaric odes since the beginning of the sixteenth century,²² provided a terminology for this, interpreting the

19 On the difficulties of interpreting the Pindaric metre and how it was approached in early modern times, see: Gilbert HIGHET, *The Classical Tradition. Greek and Roman Influence on Western Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 222–224; PINDAR's *Victory Odes*, ed. Frank J. NISETICH (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980), 31–39.

20 Another attempt to interpret the Pindaric metre: Kiichiro ITSUMI, *Pindaric metre. The Other Half* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

21 Gauthier LIBERMAN, "Hermann et la colométrie pindarique de Boeckh. Révolution et contre-révolution en métrique," in *Gottfried Hermann (1772–1848). Internationales Symposium in Leipzig 11.–13. Oktober 2007*, eds. Kurt SIER and Eva WÖCKENER-GADE, 197–219 (Tübingen: Narr Verlag, 2010), 197–198.

22 Modern critical edition: Anders Björn DRACHMANN ed., *Scholia veterena in Pindarica carmina. Scholia in Nemeonicas et Isthmionicas. Epimetrum. Indices*, 3 vols. (Stuttgart et Lipsiae: Teubner, 1903–1927), 3:306–311. B. Drachmann, who published the scholia at the beginning of the twentieth century, views this text with suspicion. In his opinion, Callierges placed this summary before the texts in his own scholion edition (1515). This text is missing from most codices that published older scholia. According

metre of the odes with the help of four-syllable feet (dipodia). This text lists a total of 16 different feet, which can be used in any combination in the individual lines. It also uses a separate term for those cases where the number of syllables in a line cannot be divided by four, i.e. the line does not end in a complete foot. This approach only registered in what order the long and short syllables followed each other, but it did not look for general explanatory principles for the Pindaric metre.

However, the fact that a general interpretation was not available did not make it impossible to imitate the metre.²³ In the case of the Pindar imitations created in ancient Greek during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the metrical pattern supplied by the scholia provided enough information to be able to create new texts by closely following the metres of particular Pindaric victory odes. Free metre, the new form of imitation, emerged from the view about the freedom and irregular nature of the Pindaric metre.²⁴ This essentially meant that the given poet wrote the first stanza freely, building the rest of the strophes and antistrophes of the ode on this metrical pattern. They proceeded along similar lines in the case of the epodes as well. The metre that was thus created in these texts did not have much to do with Pindar's metre any more, but this did not decrease the authenticity of the imitation, since they could not detect any kind of regularity in the original Pindaric odes, either.

It was Johann Gottfried Hermann (1772–1848) who made the first serious attempt to interpret the rules of the Pindaric metre at the end of the eighteenth century, around the time *Altertumswissenschaft* was born. His work was published in 1798, in the third volume of the second edition of Johann Gottlob Heyne's (1729–1812) influential Pindar edition, under the title *Commentatio de metris Pindari*.²⁵ In his introduction, Hermann stated that the metre of the Pindaric odes can also be described with the help of feet also known from the other poems (*trochee, iamb, cretic, anapest, dactyl, choriamb, ionicus a minore, ionicus a maiore, paeon*) instead of the 16 different feet included in the scholia, and so the metre of the Pindaric odes can also be described with the help of

to Drachmann, Byzantine scholars are also unlikely to have prepared it, so he published this piece in an appendix. For his reasoning, see: DRACHMANN, *Scholia veterana* ..., 281–283. I used the 1997 reprint of Drachmann's edition.

23 On the metres of the Pindar imitations composed in ancient Greek, see: Jannika PÄLL, "The Transfer of Greek Pindaric Ode from Italy to the Northern Shores. From Robortello to Vogelmann and further," in *Hellenisti! Altgriechisch als Literatursprache im neuzeitlichen Europa*, ed. Stefan WEISE, Palingenesia 107, 349–368 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2007), 362–263.

24 For example, William Congreve (1670–1729) refers to the method in a study that first appeared in 1706, *A Discourse on the Pindaric Ode*, which was an introduction to the Pindar imitation he dedicated to Queen Anne. William Congreve, "A Discourse on the Pindaric Ode," in *The Complete Works of William Congreve*, 3 vols. (London: J. and R. Tonson, S. Draper in the Strand, 1753), 3:339–346, 341–342. We can see a similar method in the case of Gabriello Chiabrera's (1552–1638) Pindar imitations: HIGGET, *The classical* ..., 235.

25 Gottfried HERMANN, "Commentatio de Metris Pindari," in PINDAR, *Carmina*, ed. Christian Gottlob HEYNE, 3 vols. (Göttingen: 1798²), 3 (Pars 1): 177–356. – Volumes 2 and 3 of Heyne's Pindar edition were published in two parts (Pars).

a simpler conceptual framework.²⁶ In practice, Hermann's idea could be implemented by changing the lines were segmented within the stanzas in particular odes, thus creating metrical units that could be described with the help of these feet.²⁷ In his work, Hermann published the new line division by describing the metrical patterns associated with particular odes as well as adding commentaries to them, but he did not publish the odes themselves again. Thus, the basic principle and line division of Hermann's explanation of the metres published in the third volume of Heyne's Pindar edition differed from the division of the Greek texts published in the first volume of the same edition, as well as the commentary of the metric scholia published in the second volume. Heyne's Pindar edition thus published several metric interpretations that contradicted each other.

Although Hermann's approach was original, he did not have a major influence on Pindar's modern interpretations. The modern rethinking of the Pindaric metre namely started along the recommendations put forward by August Böckh (1785–1867) during the 1810s,²⁸ who provided a groundbreaking interpretation in the new Pindar edition he published in 1811. In his critical edition, Böckh broke with the tradition that went back to the antiquity, which divided the text of the odes into shorter lines, and he published a version that also considered the syntactic relations of the text, separating it into longer lines (periods). The Böckh text is the basis of one of the numbering systems for Pindar's works still in use today. Beyond publishing the text of the odes in 1811, Böckh also elaborated his metric principles in the second part of his work (*De metris Pindari libri tres*), also adding detailed metric commentary to the individual odes (*Notae criticae in Pindari epinicia*). The second volume was published in two parts in 1819 and 1821, containing scholia and commentary. Böckh and Hermann also got into a serious argument about the interpretation of the Pindaric metre.²⁹

26 PINDAR, *Carmina*, 3 (Pars 1): 210–234.

27 On Heyne's and Hermann's work on Pindar, see: Douglas E. GERBER, "Emendations in the Odes of Pindar: an historical analysis," *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique* 31 (1985): 1–25, 13–14. On Heyne, see: Diego LANZA and Gherardo UGOLINI, eds., Antonella LETTIERI transl., *History of Classical Philology, Trends in Classics. Scholarship in the Making 2* (Berlin–Boston: De Gruyter, 2022), 35–52. On Hermann, see: LANZA and UGOLINI, eds., *History of Classical Philology*, 133–138. On Hermann's and Böckh's work on the Pindaric metre, see: LIBERMAN, "Hermann et la colométrie pindarique ..." – A few years after the volume had been published, József Fábchich, Pindar's first Hungarian translator, was also aware of the novelty of Hermann's work. In his commentary, he compares potential metric interpretations by placing the metrical patterns based on the various interpretations of Olympian Ode I next to each other: FÁBCHICH, *Pindarus*, 349–352.

28 Böckh's division also has opponents/critics at the beginning of the twenty-first century, who would rather return to the line division used by the philologists of Alexandria. On the "metric counter-revolution," see LIBERMAN, "Hermann et la colométrie pindarique ...," 198–199.

29 On the debates between Hermann and Böckh, see: LANZA and UGOLINI, eds., *History of Classical Philology*, 133–161.

Out of the poets he imitated, László Ungvárnémeti Tóth revered Pindar's poetry the most. In his study on the Theban poet published in June 1818, he used the general issues arising from following models as a starting point. The title of the work reflects the main topics of the text well: *About the excellent models of poets, especially about Pindar, and Pindar's Metres*. In the first part of the text, he argues that poetry should follow models, emphasizing the Neohumanist idea about the original nature of Greek poetry. He then refutes the potential arguments against following the Greek model. He starts to discuss Pindar, whom he considers the most important Greek poet, halfway through the study. He first spends a page and a half describing various characteristics of the poetry written by the Theban poet of choral songs, then proceeding to a ten-page description of the Pindaric metre.³⁰

The text that explains the Pindaric metre builds on the scholia, as the author himself also declares: "for which reason, to ease my suggestion, I only carry out my goal according to the Scholiasta."³¹ So much so that this part of the study³² is in fact an abridged Hungarian translation of the metric summary that has survived as part of the above-mentioned Pindar scholia under the title *Μετρικὰ τινὰ τῶν παλαιῶν*. Ungvárnémeti Tóth might have read the original Greek text in Heyne's Pindar edition, at the beginning of the metric scholia.³³ Coincidentally, Ungvárnémeti Tóth showed his Greek poems to Lajos János Schedius (1768–1847),³⁴ a professor in Pest who was Heyne's student in Göttingen and kept up his correspondence with the German professor even after he had received an appointment in Pest.³⁵ It is possible that it was Lajos Schedius who recommended Heyne's work to Tóth.

Tóth describes the traditional interpretation in his translation of the Greek scholion. He shows the significance of the strophe, the antistrophe, and the epode, the four-syllable dipodies and also names the 16 different feet that appear in Pindar's odes. He also outlines the expressions that refer to the truncated, i.e. 1, 2, or 3-syllable feet. Following the scholion, Tóth believes that the 16 feet can be combined in any form, and he does not create any additional rules beyond saying that one line may not consist of

30 On Pindar's poetry: UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH, *Művei*, 509–510. On the metre: UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH *Művei*, 511–521.

31 UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH, *Művei*, 514.

32 UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH, *Művei*, 512–516.

33 PINDAR, *Carmina*, 2 (Pars 1): 163–166. – Tóth quotes from Hermann's metric summary published in the Heyne edition word for word, which means he may have had the Heyne edition in his hands: UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH *Művei*, 520. He also provides a summary of Hermann's work: UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH, *Művei*, 514.

34 UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH, *Művei*, 581. According to Tóth, Schedius returned his poems with great praise: UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH, *Művei*, 583.

35 BALOGH Piroska, "Heyne és Schedius Lajos" [Heyne and Lajos Schedius], in *Göttingen dimenziói. A göttingeni egyetem szerepe a szaktudományok kialakulásában* [Dimensions in Göttingen. The role of the Göttingen University in the evolution of modern science], ed. GURKA Dezső, 127–140 (Budapest: Gondolat, 2010).

more than four dipodies, i.e. 16 syllables. At the end of his disquisition, he declares confidently that “Who knows these, knows everything that is necessary for either discussing or following Pindar’s structure of poetry.”³⁶

He fulfils this promise in the last part of his study. He publishes the Hungarian-language text of the ode he wrote for the unexpected death of Hermine, the palatine’s wife, followed by a description of the metre of the ode. He also names the particular feet with the help of the metric concepts he discussed previously.³⁷ He also names the imitated metre in the subtitle of the ode, publishing it in brackets: “(to the metres of the Tenth Pythian Hymn).” He also shares the metrical pattern of the strophe/antistrophe and the epode,³⁸ which follows the metre and division of the tenth Pythian ode of Heyne’s critical edition, which follows the traditional line division.³⁹ Tóth proceeded similarly to the Pindar imitations written in ancient Greek in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: he first put together the metrical pattern of the tenth Pythian ode, dividing it into four-syllable feet (dipodia) according to the traditional method. He then wrote the ode commemorating Hermine’s death based on this scheme.

The text variant of the ode published in the Pindar study is the fourth Hungarian-language variant of the piece. The first three versions, which also follow Heyne’s segmentation, had been written in September 1817, after the death of the princess.⁴⁰ The text published in the Pindar study only differs from the previous ones in that the poet corrected the metric mistakes of the versions that had been written quickly after the death of the princess. As a result, the text follows the metrical pattern with a rigidity that was completely foreign to the prosodic flexibility of the Pindaric odes.

Although the poet follows the traditional approach of the scholia in the Pindar study, he also clearly refers to Hermann’s new interpretation in one of his comments:

Although Hermann (in *Commentatione de metris Pindari*) had cast great light on Pindar’s metre regarding this point, according to which he says that even if we measure Pindar’s lines with Dipodia, he did not mix every foot with every other foot within the same line...⁴¹

It is clear from Tóth’s wording (“cast great light on Pindar’s metre”) that he was aware of the significance of Hermann’s new approach, and he also understood the rules that Hermann set up in connection with how much the particular feet could be combined with each other and what rules governed them. He also saw it clearly that this interpretation in effect questioned the freedom of the Pindaric metre: “the Poet may only have

36 UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH, *Művei*, 516.

37 UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH, *Művei*, 516–519. – See the variants and the strophes of the metrical patterns of the Hermine ode discussed in this study at the end of this study.

38 UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH, *Művei*, 519. Tóth publishes the pattern of the last line of the epode incorrectly, the correct variant is – u – – u –. All the text variants of the Hermine ode follow this version.

39 See Heyne’s text in volume 1 of the critical edition: PINDAR, *Carmina*, 1: 384–386.

40 For the text variants, see: UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH, *Művei*, 623–636.

41 UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH, *Művei*, 514.

some, particularly set freedom, not complete freedom ...⁴² As a conclusion to the few lines about Hermann's theories, he writes the sentence already quoted above: "but it would be too much to discuss all this [Hermann's ideas] here, for which reason, to ease my suggestion, I only carry out my goal according to the Scholiasta."

In his bilingual volume of poetry published in July 1818, almost at the same time as the Pindar study, Ungvárnémeti Tóth advises the reader about the metre of his Pindar imitations in the general part of the commentaries to the odes in the following way:

Here it will be enough to mention that the Hungarian Pindaric Odes, except for the one on Hermine, are in the Poet's free metres, which, according to what was proposed in the treatise, do not bind anyone; they encourage similar boldness instead. The Greek Pindaric Odes, on the other hand, are created according to Hermann's measures! which only needs to be mentioned in case someone who has not seen Hermann's scholarly treatise should be confused by it!! Everyone who knows Latin will know the rest of the metres!⁴³

It is clear from the examination of the four Greek-language Pindar imitations that those indeed build upon the metrical patterns provided by Hermann. As we saw above, in the case of *Ode III* (Hermine), which was published in Hungarian to illustrate metre in the Pindar study, the metre of the tenth Pythian ode served as a model for the metre, following Heyne's segmentation. Although the tenth Pythian ode also served as a model for the Hungarian and ancient Greek texts of the Hermine ode published in the bilingual volume,⁴⁴ it is clear from the segmentation of the lines that the poet followed Hermann's scheme here, and so the metre of the Greek and the Hungarian text is identical.⁴⁵

The metric models can also clearly be identified for the rest of the Greek Pindar imitations: *Ode I* follows *Olympian Ode VII*, *Ode II* follows *Olympian Ode IV*, while *Ode IV* follows the metre of *Nemean Ode VIII*. Hermann's clearly explained metrical patterns, which were also illustrated with diagrams, might have been the easiest models for Tóth to follow when writing imitations using the same methods as his Renaissance predecessors, following the metres of particular Pindaric odes.

With the exception of *Ode III* on Hermine, he calls the Hungarian texts the poet's "own poetic creation," which is identical to the method of creating metre that had been used in the Renaissance age described above. This method only resembled the Pindaric metre in that the metre of the strophes/antistrophes, as well as that of the epodes were consistently repeated in the ode. We can also observe the repetition of the metrical pattern in *Odes I, II, and IV*, although the metre does not display any other regularity. Tóth clearly must have written according to the method he presented in his Pindar study,⁴⁶

42 UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH, *Művei*, 514.

43 UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH, *Művei*, 380.

44 For the ancient Greek and Hungarian versions of the Hermine ode published in Tóth's bilingual volume of poetry, see: UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH, *Művei*, 358–365.

45 For Hermann's scheme, see: PINDAR, *Carmina*, 3 (Pars 1): 296.

46 He introduces the method at the end of the study: UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH, *Művei*, 520.

as a result of which the metres of the Hungarian and the ancient Greek Pindar imitations differ from each other, with the exception of *Ode III*.

Ode III is the only poem that does not match the other Hungarian-language Pindar imitations. The poet did not create a new metre in this case, as he himself also states in his comment. Upon a closer examination of the metre of the Hungarian text, it can be concluded that in *Ode III* Tóth followed the metrical pattern provided by Hermann for the tenth Pythian ode. Accordingly, the ode in the bilingual volume differs from the text published in the Pindar study, since the version published there followed the traditional segmentation of Heyne's Greek text. In Hermann's version, the strophe is divided into 9 lines (in contrast with Heyne's 10 lines), and the epode consists of 8 lines in Heyne's version and only 6 lines in Hermann's. The two versions of *Ode III* published in the Pindar study and the bilingual volume also differ in the same way, so the poet must have edited his ode because of Hermann's metre.

However, rearranging the text did not simply mean reorganising the division of lines, it also involved corrections in terms of metre. Changing the segmentation of the lines namely meant that some end-of-line syllables were placed in the subsequent line. Tóth did not pay attention to the length of the last syllable in the earlier version, since "*the final syllable, be it long or short, does not make a difference*".⁴⁷ But if the syllable was transferred to the beginning of the following line, and a syllable of the appropriate length was not in the appropriate location, the text had to be modified. Lines 1–3 of the first strophe were originally: "Drága a' szerelemnek / Gyümölcse, mellyben az Istenni / szikra, az élet tüze ..." The *-ni* syllable that was originally placed at the end of line 2 became the second syllable of line 3 according to the Hermann pattern, but because of the word *szikra* that followed it, it could only be interpreted as a short syllable in the middle of the line. Hermann's scheme only allowed a long syllable in this location, so the poet modified lines 2 and 3 in the following way: "Gyümölcse, mellyben Olymp / ajándéka, az élet tüze ..."

Based on all this, the metre of the Pindaric odes published in the bilingual volume can be summarized in the following way:

Texts	Metre of the Greek odes (According to Hermann)	Hungarian odes	Earlier Hungarian versions
Ode I	Olympian Ode VII	own metre	–
Ode II	Olympian Ode IV	own metre	–
Ode III	Pythian Ode X	Pythian Ode X, according to Hermann	Pythian Ode X, according to Heyne/tradition
Ode IV	Nemean Ode VIII	own metre	–

47 UNGVÁRNÉMETI TÓTH, *Művei*, 519.

László Ungvárnémeti Tóth published his Hungarian and ancient Greek Pindar imitations between September 1817 and July 1818. The metre of the texts reflects his interpretation of every tradition he knew: the first four Hungarian-language versions of *Hermine* follow the traditional metric interpretation also represented by the Heyne edition. Three odes from the four Hungarian-language Pindar imitations of the bilingual volume build on the free use of metre that goes back to the Renaissance and presupposes the irregularity of the Pindaric metre, while the ancient Greek texts and the text of *Ode III* (*Hermine*) published in the bilingual volume follow Hermann's new interpretation, published in 1798. The theoretical explanation of the Pindar study and the version of *Hermine* published in it represents the metric tradition that goes back to the scholia, which Ungvárnémeti Tóth does not use in the bilingual volume that was published at the same time as the study at all. In addition, there is no indication that the poet knew August Böckh's work that was published in 1811.

The poet clearly realized that a new interpretation of the Pindaric metre was in the making, but he did not take a stand in favour of any interpretation, testing and using every version he knew. His decision is particularly interesting because the preparatory work on the Pindar study, based on the traditional metric interpretation, and the bilingual volume that used Hermann's new interpretation was taking place at the same time, during the first part of 1818. The decision to use the different metric interpretations in parallel with each other is therefore likely to have been a conscious decision on László Ungvárnémeti Tóth's part.

Ungvárnémeti Tóth does not share any of his reasons for doing so, he only shares his decision. Is it possible that he wanted to display his erudition, or was this solution a result of some factors in the creative process that are unknown to us? We do not know. However, he was not the only one to use such a variety of metres, since the Heyne edition he used also included both the line division of the text edited by Heyne that went back to the scholia and Hermann's metrical pattern and commentary, which was fundamentally different from it. Tóth added to this the free method of creating metre that originated from misunderstanding the Pindaric metre, so he followed three different metric traditions in his Pindar imitations at the same time.

One important goal for László Ungvárnémeti Tóth, who joined the pursuit of reforming Hungarian literature at the beginning of the nineteenth century, was to better acquaint learned Hungarian readers with Pindar's poetry, since Pindar was not really known in Hungary. That is why Ungvárnémeti Tóth wrote his study about the Theban poet's oeuvre, and also why he prepared his ancient Greek and Hungarian-language Pindar imitations. Tóth may have had Horace on his mind, whose poetry was well-known and popular in Hungary, and who was imitated by many people in both Latin and Hungarian. However, his ambition ultimately remained unsuccessful, since his attempt to popularize Pindar remained an isolated phenomenon that had no continuation in the history of Hungarian literature. Tóth could not change the traditions of Hungarian literature: Horace remained a fundamental point of reference in the nine-

teenth and twentieth centuries, and Pindar did not receive even a fraction of the attention that he got in English, French, or German literature.

The strophes of *Tenth Pythian* and the *Ode III (Hermine)*
 Texts and metrical patterns

Σ. 4. K. 1.

Ὀλβία Λακεδαῖμον·
 Μάκαιρα Θεσσαλία· πατρὸς
 Δ' ἀμφοτέραις ἐξ ἑνὸς
 Ἀριστομάχου γένος Ἡρακλῆος βασιλεύει.
 5 Τί; κομπέω παρὰ καιρόν;
 Ἀλλά με Πυθῶ τε καὶ τὸ
 Πελοπονναῖον ἀπύει
 Ἀλεύα τε παῖδες, Ἴπποκλέα
 Θέλοντες ἀγαγεῖν ἐπικωμίαν
 10 Ἀνδρῶν κλυτὰν ὄπα.

The Greek text of the *Tenth Pythian* of
 Heyne's edition (note 39)

A' Strophának, 's Antistrophának alkatja.

1)	— v — v	v — v
2)	v — v —	v v — v —
3)	— v v —	— v v
4)	v — v v	— v v — — — v v — —
5)	v — — v	v — —
6)	— v v —	— v — v
7)	v — — v	— v v
8)	v — — v	— v — v' v. v
9)	v — v v	v — v v — v v
10)	v — v —	v —

The metrical pattern of the *Tenth Pythian* in
 Ungvárnémeti Tóth's Pindar study, following
 Heyne's segmentation (note 38)

1, Strophá.

Drága a' szerelemnek
 Gyümölcse, melyben az Isteni
 Szikra, az élet tüze
 Firól fira kel, hogy az édes magzatot ismét
 Teremtői tehetség
 Szállja meg. Áldott szerencse,
 'S magas cél az Aszszonyé!
 Ha látnók az égi pálya körét,
 Hol ő az örök Istenek éltető
 Szerelmöket szedi,

Hungarian version of Ungvárnémeti Tóth's
Ode III (Hermine) in his Pindar study, following
 Heyne's metrical interpretation (note 37)

P Y T H. X

STROPHAE:

	- ū -' v v ∞ ū
	v -' ū -' v v -
	v -' ū v v -' v ∞
	v -' v v - v v -' ū ū - v v - ū
5	v -' ∞ ū ū - ū -' v v -
	-' v -' v v -' v - v -
	v -' v - v -' v v - v - v
	v v -' v v - v -
	ū -' ū -' v -

Hermann's metrical interpretation of the
Tenth Pythian (note 45)

Στρεφὴ α΄.

Σεμνὸν ἔστιν ἔρωτος
 Ὅ καρπὸς, ὃς τὸ μένος
 Βίου νείματο, σπινθὴρ ἄε-
 νάου πυρός, ὥστε γενέθλιος ἦν ἐνόησεν
 Ἄριστον Θεὸς ἔργον, ἐπέλεσαι
 Ζῶα πάντα κτίσιν. Βελτίων, ἄνῃς,
 Πέπρωται γυναικὶ μοῖρα, μάθοις ἄν
 Ποτὶ ἀθανάτων δόμους
 Αὐγὰν μὲν αἴλου

The Greek text of Ungvárnémeti Tóth's *Ode III (Hermine)* in his Greek–Hungarian poetry collection (strophe I), following Hermann's metrical pattern (note 44)

1. Strophä.

Drága a' szerelemnek
 Gyümölcse, mellyben Olümp
 Ajándéka, az élet tüze
 Firól fira kel, hogy az édes magzatot ismét
 Teremtői tehetség szállja meg. Ál-
 dott szerencse, 's magas czél az aszszonyé,
 Ha látnók az égi pálya körét, hol ő a'
 Gyökerő kisugározott
 Fényében osztozik,

The Hungarian text of Ungvárnémeti Tóth's *Ode III (Hermine)* in his Greek–Hungarian poetry collection (strophe I), following Hermann's metrical pattern (note 44)