TAMÁS MÉSZÁROS

ONCE UPON A TIME IN THE EAST
MORAVCSIK VERSUS DARKÓ: THE HISTORY OF A CONTROVERSY[*]

Since the birth of Byzantinology as a discipline by its own right Hungarian Byzantinologists have considered the editing of the Greek records of Hungarian history and of the Byzantine historical sources related to the Hungarians to be a priority. This *local interest* of the research is apparent if we look at the editions prepared by Hungarian Byzantinologists, for example Moravcsik's edition of Constantinus Porphyrogenitus[1] or the edition of Leo Sapiens' *Tactica* started but never finished by Rezső Vári.[2] The edition of Laonicus Chalcocondyles by Jenő Darkó can also be mentioned here, the value of which has been questioned by some since the publication of its third volume.

Though the majority of scholars expressed their unequivocal appreciation for Darkó's work, the enthusiasm was not shared by all. The strongest criticism, unprecedented in discussions of this kind, was voiced by none other but his younger compatriot and colleague, the future *princeps philologorum*, Gyula Moravcsik. The argument between the two philologists, which grew more and more heated, gained international publicity due to some papers written in foreign languages. Although decades have passed since the repeated duels – Darkó has been dead for more than seventy years, Moravcsik for more than forty – we cannot consider the issue to be obsolete. On the one hand, presenting the whole material of the debate – at least in outline – can be of interest from the viewpoint of history of philology, while on the other hand, the Byzantine author and his work also deserves attention. All the more so because despite the growing interest in Laonicus recently,[3] a new edition has still not been published, and will not be published for a considerable time.[4] The Moravcsik-Darkó controversy and some of its arguments are known in the international community of Byzantinologists, that is they have heard the worst, but certain details are still unknown among the researchers abroad (*Hungarica sunt, non leguntur*). Here we will discuss some of these details.

Jenő Darkó,[5] just like Moravcsik, was educated in the legendary Eötvös Collegium, and obtained his doctorate as a student of Vilmos Pecz at the University of Budapest in 1902.[6]

---

[*] This study has been prepared with the support of the research project OTKA PD 104876 and the Bolyai Scholarship.

[1] *Gy. Moravcsik* (ed.): Constantinus Porphyrogenitus De administrando imperio. Dumbarton Oaks 1967.

[2] *R. Vári* (ed.): Leonis imperatoris Tactica. Budapest 1917.

[3] See: *N. Nikoloudis*: Laonikos Chalkokondyles. A Translation and Commentary of the Demonstrations of Histories. Book I-III. Athens 1996; *A. Kaldellis*: Laonikos Chalkokondyles. The Histories I-II (Greek text with English translation). Dumbarton Oaks 2014; *A. Kaldellis*: The Date of Laonikos Chalkokondyles' Histories. *GRBS* 52 (2012) 111–136; *A. Kaldellis*: The Interpolations in the Histories of Laonikos Chalkokondyles. *GRBS* 52 (2012) 259–283; *A. Kaldellis*: The Greek Sources of Laonikos Chalkokondyles' Histories. *GRBS* 52 (2012) 738–765; *A. Kaldellis*: A New Herodotus. Laonikos Chalkokondyles on the Ottoman Empire, the Fall of Byzantium, and the Emergence of the West. Dumbarton Oaks 2014.

[4] The editors of the series *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae* are planning to prepare a modern edition of the historical work, and as far as we know, due to Herbert Wurm and Michael Grünbart the preliminary work was started a few years ago. See: *H. Wurm – E. Gamillscheg*: Bemerkungen zu Laonikos Chalkokondyles. *JÖB* 42 (1992) 213–219; *H. Wurm:* Der Codex Monacensis gr. 307a. Ein Beitrag zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Laonikos Chalkokondyles. *JÖB* 44 (1994) 455–462; *H. Wurm:* Handschriftliche Überlieferung der des Laonikos Chalkokondyles. *JÖB* 45 (1995) 223–232.

[5] See: *Szabó Á.*: Darkó Jenő emlékezete [= In Memory of Jenő Darkó]. *Debreceni Tisza István Tudományos Társaság Emlékbeszédek* I/4. Debrecen 1941; *Kapitánffy I.*: Darkó Jenő emlékezete [= In Memory of Jenő Darkó]. *AntTan* 27 (1980) 105–108; *I. Kapitánffy*: Jenő Darkó (1880–1940). *Homonoia* 4 (1982) 33–47. The University of Debrecen held a conference commemorating its late rector on the fortieth anniversary of Darkó's

He claimed to have been interested in the preparation of a Laonicus-edition since 1905,[7] which is supported by the fact that from 1907 he published a significant number of papers on the role of the author in literary history,[8] on his manuscripts,[9] and on his peculiar language.[10] Meanwhile his career also rocketed: first he was made *Privatdozent* at the University of Budapest (1910),[11] became a corresponding member of the Hungarian Academy (1913),[12] and finally he was appointed head of the Department of Classical Studies at the University of Debrecen (1914). A comfortable existence and the support of the Academy made it possible for Darkó to study the Laonicus-manuscripts with *autopsia* during his regular visits to Munich, Paris, Florence and Oxford and to obtain the photographs necessary for his work. Furthermore, he could also use the unpublished corrections proposed by Gottlieb Tafel from Berlin. It seems that everything was provided for the preparation of a modern, reliable edition.

Although we cannot say that Darkó got off the beaten track when editing the Laonicus-text, it is certain that – to pursue the metaphor further – he had to force his way across a field thickly overgrown with weeds, as the previous editions of Laonicus failed to meet the requirements in respect of both quantity and quality. Though the *editio princeps* was published in 1615 – it is interesting that the Latin translation became known earlier than the Greek original –,[13] the publisher, J. B. Baumbach prepared his text on the basis of as few as three Vatican manuscripts, and gave no critical apparatus either.[14] Ch. A. Fabrot, who published the text in the *Paris corpus*,[15] involved two further codices, but also failed to give an *apparatus*; another codex was also used by Immanuel Bekker when he published his own version in the *Bonn corpus*.[16] Looking at these editions now it is hardly an exaggeration to suggest that all of them fall short of expectations.

The first volume of Darkó's Laonicus-edition, which includes a short introduction (pp. V-XV), a review of the manuscript tradition (pp. XVI-XXVI) and the text of the first four books complete with an *apparatus criticus*, was published in 1922.[17] As the new Laonicus-edition had long been a *desideratum*, it came as no surprise that its publication generated a

---

death. The material of the presentations was published in the *ACD* 27–28 (1981–1982) (containing 11 papers, the most important for us being [11–16]: *I. Kapitánffy*: Die byzantinologischen Arbeiten von Jenő Darkó).

[6] *Darkó J.*: A κοινή viszonya az ó-görög dialektusokhoz [= The Relationship between the κοινή and the Ancient Greek Dialects]. *EPhK* 26 (1902) 484–515.

[7] See the preface to the first volume of the edition (VIII): *"Quum ante septemdecim annos consilium novae editionis Laonici praeparandae cepissem..."*

[8] *Darkó J.*: Adalékok Laonikos Chalkondylés történetírói egyéniségének jellemzéséhez [= Notes on the Characterization of Laonikos Chalkondyles as Historian]. In: *Budapesti VII. ker. külső M. kir. Állami Főgymnasium 1906-1907. évi értesítője*. Budapest 1907. 3–25.

[9] *Darkó J.*: Kézirati tanulmányok Laonikos Chalkondyles történeti művéhez [= Studies of the Manuscripts of Laonikos Chalkondyles' Historical Work]. *EPhK* 31 (1907) 25–47, 106–109; *Darkó J.*: Laonikos Chalkondylés újabb kéziratairól [= On Newer Manuscripts of Laonikos Chalkondyles]. *EPhK* 37 (1913) 645–666.

[10] *Darkó J.*: Laonikos Chalkondyles nyelvéről [= On the Language of Laonikos Chalkondyles]. *EPhK* 36 (1912) 785–792, 833–855.

[11] His habilitation thesis: *Darkó J.*: A magyarokra vonatkozó népnevek a bizánczi íróknál [= The Names of the Hungarians used by the Byzantine Authors]. Budapest 1910.

[12] His inaugural lecture: *Darkó J.*: Bölcs Leó Taktikájának hitelessége magyar történeti szempontból [= The Authenticity of Leo Sapiens' Tactica from the Point of View of the Hungarian History]. Budapest 1915.

[13] The latin translation by Conrad Clauser was first published at Basel in 1556. Later, this version was often reprinted.

[14] *J. B. Baumbach* (ed.): Historiae Byzantinae scriptores tres. Genevae 1615 (Coloniae Allobrogum 1615). This edition contains the works of Nikephoros Gregoras és Georgios Akropolites besides the History of Laonikos.

[15] *Ch. A. Fabrot* (ed.): Laonici Chalcocondylae Atheniensis historiarum libri decem. Paris 1650 (Venice 1729).

[16] *I. Bekker* (ed.): Laonici Chalcocondylae Atheniensis historiarum libri decem. Bonn 1843 (= PG 159 Migne).

[17] Laonici Chalcocandylae Historiarum demonstrationes. Ad fidem codicum recensuit, emendavit, annotationibusque criticis instruxit *Eugenius Darkó*. Tomus I. Praefationem, codicum catalogum et libros I–IV continens. Budapestini, Acad. Litt. Hungar. 1922. XXVI, 206 p.

wide international interest, which manifested itself in the high number of reviews.[18] The comments of the critics from abroad, mostly appreciative and suggesting only minor corrections, were reflected on by Darkó in a paper.[19]

Fortunately, unlike so many other projects, the Laonicus-edition did not remain unfinished. Despite the numerous difficulties the second volume was published a year later.[20]

The first Hungarian review took quite a long time to appear, which was rather unusual at the time.[21] It was finally published by Gyula Moravcsik, already back from his five-year captivity in Russia as a prisoner of war (1915–1920), who was lecturer at Eötvös Collegium and from 1924 a *Privatdozent* of Mediaeval Greek Philology. Moravcsik, mentioned by name in the *praefatio* of the Laonicus-edition as one of the contributors,[22] is still of a very different opinion on Darkó's work than he will be later. Among the merits of the edition he mentions the "thorough research of the manuscript tradition" (p. 50) and the "determined and consistent methodological treatment" (p. 53), and points out that the *apparatus criticus* "presents a clear, explicit picture" and that Darkó's "corrections are all justified and mostly fortunate" (p. 54) – although about half of the approximately five hundred *emendationes* (77 of which concern proper nouns) are recommended by Darkó himself, based on Laonicus' usage. Although Moravcsik also comments on some shortcomings (the exact name of the author is not made clear,[23] and an earlier *coniectura* by Rezső Vári is not mentioned[24]), his general opinion, similarly to the international reviews, is definitely positive: "an exemplary modern *editio*" (p. 53), a "thorough and meticulous new edition", "valuable and fruitful work" (p. 54).

The third volume of the Laonicus-edition was published in 1927,[25] while Darkó continued his research on the author with unflagging enthusiasm.[26]

Then, out of the blue, Moravcsik published another review, his second one.[27] This time his tone is a lot more restrained, and he is anxious to keep his distance from the editor

[18] As far as we know, the following reviews were published on the three-volume text edition (apart from those of Moravcsik): *N. Festa*: *RFIC* 3 (1923) 373–378; *F. Drexl*: *PhW* 43 (1923) 48–52; *R. Guilland*: *REG* 36 (1923) 561–564; *F. Drexl*: *PhW* 44 (1924) 1099; *F. Dölger*: *LZB* 75 (1924) no. 16, 1278; *W. Weber*: *OL* 27 (1924) 129–133; *D. C. Hesseling*: *MPh* 33 (1925) 18–19; *E. Kurtz*: *BZ* 25 (1925) 359–363; *P. Maas*: *UJ* 5 (1925) 439–441; *E. Gerland*: *BNJ* 5 (1926–1927) 429–431; *F. Drexl*: *PhW* 48 (1928) 259–261; *R. Guilland*: *REG* 42 (1929) 443–444; *V. Laurent*: *EO* 31 (1928) 465–470. In spite of initial praising comments, reviews on the third volume perceivably support the opinion of Moravcsik.

[19] *J. Darkó*: Vindiciae Laoniceae. *EPhK* 50 (1926) 18–27. Appreciating foreign language reviews are regularly mentioned by the EPhK. See: *EPhK* 49 (1925) 157; *EPhK* 52 (1928) 165.

[20] Laonici Chalcocandylae Historiarum demonstrationes. Ad fidem codicum recensuit, emendavit, annotationibusque criticis instruxit *Eugenius Darkó*. Tomi II. Pars prior libros V–VII continens. Budapestini 1923. 146 p.

[21] *Moravcsik Gy.*: *EPhK* 48 (1924) 50–55.

[22] Vö. XV: *"Insignia officinae chartariae codicum Parisinorum J. Moravcsik examinavit."*

[23] Darkó was in fact inconsequent using a different form of name in earlier publications (Chalkondyles) and in the text edition (Chalkokandyles).

[24] Moravcsik is right in that matter, too. Rezső Vári has noticed earlier (*EPhK* 40 [1916] 617) that the form Οὔγκραν is in reality the corrupted form of Ἄγκυραν/Ἄγκραν (see in Moravcsik erroneously 154_4; *recte*: 145_4). Darkó failed to mention it: here his error can be considered to be a forgivable lapsus, while later he almost seems to be intentionally silent on the results of his colleagues. See: n. 31.

[25] Laonici Chalcocandylae Historiarum demonstrationes. Ad fidem codicum recensuit, emendavit, annotationibusque criticis instruxit *Eugenius Darkó*. Tomi II. Pars posterior libros VIII–X continens. Budapestini 1927. 147–364 p.

[26] *J. Darkó*: Zum Leben des Laonikos Chalkondyles. *BZ* 24 (1924) 29–39; *Darkó J.*: Michael Apostolios levelei Laonikoshoz [= Michael Apostolios' Letters to Laonikos]. In: Emlékkönyv Csengery János születésének hetvenedik évfordulójára [= Papers Presented to János Csengery on his 70th Birthday]. Szeged 1926. 108–112; *J. Darkó*: Neue Beiträge zur Biographie des Laonikos Chalkokandyles. *BZ* 27 (1927) 276–285; *J. Darkó*: Neuere Beiträge zur Biographie des Laonikos Chalkokandyles. In: *Actes du II^e Congr. Intern. des Études Byz.* Belgrad 1929. 276–285.

[27] *Moravcsik Gy.*: *EPhK* 52 (1928) 23–28.

and his work. After an objective bibliographical description of the volume he outlines his task as follows (p. 24): "it is the significance of the edition that compels the reviewer to examine from every point of view whether the work complies with the general philological requirements in every respect". Then he discusses at length why he was unable to voice substancial criticism earlier (lacking the manuscripts he could only use the editions of Fabrot and Bekker), but he also hints at Darkó's privileged position (the financial support of the Hungarian Academy, research work carried out for years, *etc*.). Incidentally, collating the readings of the manuscripts and the text edition has not occurred to him because "to check the most fundamental requirement seems to be almost unnecessary" (p. 24). He claims that although he only came across the Vatican manuscript of Laonicus by chance,[28] even a superficial look revealed some substancial differences between the reading of the codex and Darkó's apparatus, which made him examine further parts of the text, using photographs of some pages of four manuscripts of prime importance.[29] These are preliminary to what is to come, as this time he has got plenty of critical comments. The thorough examination lead Moravcsik to an astonishing conclusion: the edition is full of errors. In order to support his claim, Moravcsik publishes in detail his "results of post-collation" (pp. 25–26). Thus Darkó's apparatus marks an omission of the text where the manuscript has none, while where there *is* one, he fails to mark it. "All the four manuscripts are copied in a clear, very easily legible hand, and there are no dubious places (...) at all" (p. 26); however, Darkó fails to understand even the essential paleographical markings and ignores the corrections underlined with dots. His list of crimes is very long: he was repeatedly inaccurate when giving the data of the Florence manuscript,[30] "he does not pay due attention to the suggestions of the researchers preceding him" (p. 27),[31] and the index at the end of the edition is also inaccurate (some proper names are left out, and the *loci* are not marked). Thus the summary is disillusioning (p. 28): an extensive examination – says Moravcsik – would in all probability "rock the foundations of the new edition", because despite Darkó's appealing methodological principles he "does wrong to the manuscripts" and "the result of his decade-long work fails to fulfil expectations".

The review and especially its harsh and almost rough manner perceivably came as a surprise to Darkó, but it goes without saying that he could not ignore the attack. In the very same issue of the journal he answers Moravcsik in a long paper,[32] continuing the debate, which seems to get out of hand.[33] In this paper his main objection is that Moravcsik's opinion is the opposite of not only the opinion of the majority of the reviewers, but of his own earlier opinion as well, and what is more, it is the *palinode* of it (p. 66): "Do not you feel that your present opinion which is opposite to your previous one sheds a bad light on yourself, because it reveals that you praised my work too much, carelessly and without sufficiently looking into it?" – asked Darkó. Although this monumental enterprise, says Darkó, cannot be judged on the basis of a few manuscript pages, he is willing to examine the places objected to in the review one by one. He claims that these are partly misprints, which were correct in the manuscript sent to the publisher, partly "orthographical variants" (p. 68), partly real but insignificant errors, but in any case, "there is not one among his objections which would

[28] For implications to come it might be a justifiable question to raise whether Moravcsik was turning over the pages of the Laonikos-codex really "by chance", or he was fairly conscious about what to "come across".

[29] Cod. Vat.-Pal. gr. 266, 158^{v}, 257^{v}; Cod. Laurent. gr. LVII. 9, 95^{r}, 136^{r}; Cod. Monac. gr. 127, 65^{r}, 200^{v}, 219^{v}; Cod. Monac. gr. 307a, 101^{r}, 185^{v}, 220^{r}.

[30] Darkó has published inaccurate data in his edition and in his later article (*EPhK* 37 [1913] 665): firstly Laurent. gr. LVII. 8, later Laurent. gr. LVIII. 9 (correctly Laurent. gr. LVII. 9).

[31] Here Moravcsik mentions three suggestions of S. Lampros, published earlier in *Νέος Ἑλληνομνήμων.*

[32] *Darkó J.*: A Laonikos-kéziratok collatióiról [= On the Collation of the Laonikos' Manuscripts]. *EPhK* 52 (1928) 65–75.

[33] *Wurm*'s opp. cit. Handschriftliche Überlieferung 223 expression is well-chosen: *"Rezensionspingpong"*.

effect the body of the established text (p. 73). Accordingly, Moravcsik's criticism is "wrong from its starting point and erroneous in its conclusions" (p. 74). It is him, Moravcsik, who committed a major professional blunder when in the course of the interpretation of the text of the *codex Vaticanus-Palatinus Gr. 266* f. 158^{v} he failed to consider the text of the 158^{r}.

The editors of the journal gave Moravcsik an opportunity to reflect on Darkó's reply immediately.[34] This time he also supplies the photographs of the relevant pages of the *codex Vaticanus-Palatinus Gr. 266* to prove his point. Although he alters his previous opinion – albeit he does not mention it expressis verbis –, his final summary is the same: Darkó misunderstood the marking *lemniscus* (·|·), which here functions like a modern insert-mark, purely to indicate an accidental scribal error of omission at a specific point in the text, so his procedure is "characterized by the lack of philological *akribeia*" and "is made worse by a rather grave philological blunder" (p. 77).

Darkó replies in the very same issue, but this time in a letter to the editor.[35] He insists that the *lemniscus* here marks athetation, so "Moravcsik's twice repeated comment clearly failed to yield any results" (p. 80).

However, it was Moravcsik who had the last word. He closes the debate in the very same issue:[36] Darkó's answer "is no more than a false presentation of the facts and the subsequent correction of the interpretation of certain words", which makes any further discussion futile.[37] Nevertheless, Moravcsik published two further, similarly critical reviews on the edition elsewhere, and when a few years later in the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* Darkó mentions some copying mistakes in the Laonicus-manuscripts again,[38] Moravcsik is quick to doubt his statements,[39] which of course cannot be ignored by Darkó.[40]

Although the argument is about technical matters and thus seems to be easy to settle, it is not so easy, perhaps not even possible to do justice to the two parties. There is not much doubt that as far as the inaccuracies in the apparatus and the concrete paleographical questions are concerned, Moravcsik tends to be right, though certainly not in every case. However, we also have to accept Darkó's claim that "certain inconsistencies" in the apparatus do not affect the main text significantly and do not mean that the *entire* work is useless. In order to illustrate the difficulties encountered by the one who assumes the role of the judge, let us see the issue pertaining to the different readings of the Vatican manuscript. As we have seen, the randomly chosen folium of Moravcsik from the Codex Vaticanus-Palatinus gr. 266 was the 158^{v}. The procedure of the reviewer can be reconstructed this way: (1) he transcribed the text; (2) he looked up the corresponding part in the Darkó-edition (3) he compared the readings of the manuscript and the edition from line to line; (4) in the meantime, he was constantly checking the *apparatus criticus*. However, Moravcsik was wrong. He did not compare the corresponding pieces of the text, because due to multifold scribal errors, the text was displaced. Darkó's *"21 τῶν usque ad 22 στρατόπεδον omnia om."* comment did not refer to 158^{v} but 158^{r} , which was not even seen by Moravcsik.[41] From here (from the "original place") the aforementioned part is in fact missing, and it was replaced by the scribe

[34] *Moravcsik Gy.*: A bíráló válasza [=Answer of the Reviewer]. *EPhK* 52 (1928) 76–78.
[35] *Darkó J.*: Levél a szerkesztőhöz [= Letter to the Editor]. *EPhK* 52 (1928) 78–80. According to the title page, Károly Kerényi (classical philology) and János Koszó (modern philology) edited the journal at that time.
[36] *Moravcsik Gy.*: A bíráló zárszava [= Closing Remarks of the Reviewer]. *EPhK* 52 (1928) 80.
[37] *Nota bene*: Moravcsik has published two additional and similarly critical reviews on the edition. See: *PAA* 5 (1927) 302; *BNJ* 8 (1929–1930) 355–368.
[38] *J. Darkó*: Neue Emendationsvorschläge zu Laonikos Chalkokandyles. *BZ* 32 (1932) 2–12.
[39] *Gy. Moravcsik*: Zur Laonikos-Ausgabe von Darkó. *BZ* 32 (1932) 478–479.
[40] *J. Darkó*: Erwiderung auf die Erklärungen Moravcsiks. *BZ* 32 (1932) 479.
[41] Since the edition naturally does not indicate the folia of the codex, and certain expressions are frequently repeated (the same caused the error of the scribe, too), the error of Moravcsik is understandable, however, it still remains an error.

afterwards, in the first line of 158^{v}, totally deceiving Moravcsik. The same applies to the other critical remark: the seven lines marked as missing by Moravcsik are missing from 158^{v} in reality, but in their original place, on 158^{r} they are present. Since Darkó did not fail to mention the error in his reply to the review, the second time Moravcsik was more careful: his opinion expressed in his reply is the accurate description of the philological situation. A tiny flaw is (or not that tiny at all?) that he is silent about his own earlier error. At the same time, Darkó, too, commits an error: his reasoning concerning *lemniscus* is forced and evidently erroneous. Although from the point of view of the final *textus* it is insignificant how the marking is interpreted,[42] *lemniscus* indicates the replaced text and the *locus* of the replacement, as Moravcsik suggested. To put it in another way: both are wrong, but both are right in some way.

Darkó's Laonicus-edition has undoubtedly become obsolete by now, but there are certain facts that should also be considered when judging it. It was published not long after the establishment of the methodological principles of modern textual criticism – Lachmann's Lucretius-edition (1850) is usually considered to be the starting point –, when the practice of editing, especially in the case of Byzantine authors was, accordingly, still unsettled; Byzantinology itself was still in its infancy. What is more, Darkó's work was hindered by several external circumstances: the world war, revolutions, the economic crisis, *etc*. And most importantly: despite its faults, the best Laonicus-edition available is still Darkó's.

As the result of the controversy the personal relationship between the two scholars got irreparably damaged. Between 1926 and 1937 Darkó published reviews on Moravcsik's papers, sometimes on ones only a few pages long, ten times (!).[43] Naturally, Moravcsik also took every opportunity to attack Darkó's statements in return.[44] This is illustrated by their argument concerning the lower part of the Holy Crown of Hungary, the so-called Doukas' Crown or corona Graeca, which seemed to be about a scientific issue as well. Soon after Moravcsik had published a new reading of one of the Greek inscriptions on the crown and it was unanimously accepted by other scholars,[45] Darkó also published a paper on the subject,[46] discussing the significance of the crown in a wider context and maintaining a critical distance from Moravcsik's reading and interpretation. Again, it was not the last word: Moravcsik replied with a caustic comment,[47] which Darkó was quick to answer.[48] All this led to a controversy similar to the first one (both parties still stuck to their opinion), with the only noticeable difference being that this time the editors of the journal were sensible enough to promptly put an end to it.[49]

---

[42] Concerning the main text there is no difference between the opinions of the parties, the debate pertains to the *apparatus criticus*. This is a vicious circle: Darkó evidently wants to delete the passage, since the text cannot be found in the proper place, thus it should be deleted *from its present place*.

[43] See: *I. Kapitánffy*: Bibliographie der Publikationen von Jenő Darkó. *ACD* 27–28 (1981–1982) 61–69.

[44] See: *Gy. Moravcsik*: Zur Geschichte der Onoguren. *UJ* 10 (1930) 53–90, where he refutes Darkó's opinion opp. cit. (n. 11) from fifteen years ago which equates Priscus' Oceanus with the Caspian sea.

[45] *Moravcsik Gy.*: A magyar szent korona görög feliratai [= The Inscriptions of the Holy Crown of Hungary]. *EPhK* 59 (1935) 113–162. Moravcsik supposed that the Δ΄Σ, which was regarded previously as an abbreviation for the word δεσπότης, is in fact the last syllable of the name Géza, the prince of Hungarians in Greek (ΓΕΩΒΙΤΖΑ΄Σ), thus it should be read Α΄Σ.

[46] *Darkó J.*: A Dukas Mihály-féle korona célja és jelentősége [= The Purpose and the Importance of the Michael Doukas' Crown]. *EPhK* 60 (1936) 113–152.

[47] *Moravcsik Gy.*: A magyar szent korona görög feliratainak olvasásához és magyarázatához [= To the Reading and Interpretation of the Greek Inscriptions of the Holy Crown of Hungary]. *EPhK* 60 (1936) 152–158. The debate reaches its lowest point when Moravcsik replies to Darkó – who dwells on the place and length of the vertical bar between the Greek letters – with one word: AKADE΄KOSKODA΄S [= angularity] (157. n. 7).

[48] *Darkó J.*: Utóhang a Dukas-féle korona eredeti jelentőségének megítéléséhez [= Epilogue to the Judgment of the Original Importance of the Doukas' Crown]. *EPhK* 60 (1936) 351–353.

[49] From 1935 József Huszti (classical philology) and Sándor Eckhardt (modern philology) were responsible for the journal.

Summing up and looking back on the stages of the debate what really seems interesting is the first attack launched by Moravcsik; further on we see little more than increasingly personal resentment under the facade of science. What was the reason for Moravcsik's odd change of attitude? How, and more importantly, why did an edition praised as exemplary turn into trash overnight? Was the Moravcsik-Darkó controversy really about the quality of the edition? Today we can only guess it, but the answer might be in connection with the narrowing of possibilities of the classical philology of the era.

By the second half of the 1920s Hungarian classical philology had seemed to have lost its initial momentum, probably due to the consequences of a lost war as well. The signs of the crisis were obvious for those concerned, who called the attention of the authorities to the fact.[50] Everyone was trying to find a different way out of the crisis. We are still before the bipolar approach to philology that characterized the 30s (classical studies of Hungarian interest *versus* that of universal interest),[51] but the jockeying for position had already started. All the more because, as Moravcsik's later friend and ally, József Huszti writes, "in our country for the scholars of classical philology a proportionally rather small number of academic positions were available, and if these were occupied by some for a long period of time, the healthy circulation soon stopped".[52] It is worth looking into the further career of the two opponents from this point of view as well. From the second half of the 30s – the years of the crown-debate – Darkó's scholarly interest took a different direction: he turned towards the Hungarians living in Rumania, to Transylvania and to 'Turanian culture' with growing interest. He did not write about Laonicus any more and neither did he devote his attention to any other topic connected to Byzantinology. Moravcsik, who has earlier missed the professionally challenging scholarship of the short-lived Hungarian Scientific Institute of Constantinople, not from his fault and for unfortunate reasons,[53] was appointed honorary associate professor of Greek philology in 1932, in 1936 he was made professor at the Greek Philology Department at the university in Budapest, where he was head of department from 1950. He also had numerous other titles and distinctions.[54] In other words Darkó's academic career ended after – due to? – the Laonicus-debate, while Moravcsik's star seemed to be in the ascendant after – or due to? – the same debate.

The two careers intersect each other at another point as well. When Jenő Darkó died suddenly of blood poisoning in 1940, his obituary was written by Gyula Moravcsik,[55] who pays his last respects to his past colleague and opponent with the following words: "even those who used to be his opponents in the academic battlefield must admit that his exceptionally rich literary work yielded several groundbreaking results of lasting value", and "I am certain that Hungarian Byzantinology (…) will always pay tribute to the memory of Jenő Darkó".

---

[50] See for example: *Vári R.*: Klasszika-filológiánk [= Our Classical Philology]. Budapest 1927; *Huszti J.*: Klasszika filológia [=Classical Philology]. In: *Magyary Z.*: A magyar tudománypolitika alapvetése [= The Foundation of the Hungarian Science Policy]. Budapest 1927. 101–103.

[51] The question does not belong to our topic discussed. See: *Szilágyi J. Gy.*: Mi, filológusok [= We Philologists]. *AntTan* 31 (1984) 167–197.

[52] *Huszti* opp. cit. 102. That from 1920 the University of Kolozsvár moved to Szeged and the University of Pozsony to Pécs, did not help either.

[53] Vö.: *Nagy N.*: A Konstantinápolyi Magyar Tudományos Intézet története (1916–1918) [= The History of the Hungarian Scientific Institute of Constantinople (1916–1918)]. Pécs 2010. Herewith let me thank Zoltán Farkas for drawing my attention to the paper.

[54] See: *Harmatta J.*: Moravcsik Gyula (1892–1972). *Magyar Tudomány* 1973/10. 683–686.

[55] *Moravcsik Gy.*: Darkó Jenő (1880–1940). *EPhK* 65 (1941) 58–60.