



ARTICLES

Stilyana Batalova

Cyrillo-Methodian Research Centre at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
Sofia, Bulgaria

stilyana.batalova@gmail.com

 0000-0002-1719-5604

<https://doi.org/10.33077/uw.25448730.zbkh.2023.764>

Paul Meyvaert and Paul Devos Duo Candelabra Cyrillomethodiana

Abstract: The paper outlines in historiographical perspective Paul Meyvaert (1921–2015) and Paul Devos' (1913–1995) contributions to the classification of the Latin hagiographical legends about Sts Cyril and Methodius. The author analyzes their three joint studies from 1955–1956. These studies first introduced into academic use the most comprehensive medieval copy of the so-called *Italian Legend* discovered to date. They also explored its links to the literary activity of Leo of Ostia (1046–1115). Through P. Meyvaert's fortuitous discovery, the two scholars proved that only the second redaction of the *Italian Legend* has survived. As a result of their research, they narrowed down the chronological limits of the appearance of its first redaction, compiled by Johannes Hymmonides and Gauderic of Velletri. They studied the manuscript tradition (of the *Italian Legend*) and proved that the reference to the episcopal rank of St Cyril and St Methodius is a late interpolation in the text. They established what influence Leo of Ostia's redaction of the *Italian Legend* exerted on the literary production in the Benedictine monastery of San Clemente a Casauria in the last quarter of the 12th century and on some legendaries containing abridged *legendae novae* of the 13th and 14th centuries. P. Meyvaert and P. Devos also attempted to clarify the place of the so-called *Moravian Legend* in the nexus of Latin Cyrillo-Methodian legends of the Bohemian lands.

The paper discusses the contributions of Meyvaert and Devos from the perspective of the development of Cyrillo-Methodian studies. It analyses the main approaches used for the successful solutions to age-old issues and the hypotheses that provoked debate with Jaroslav Ludvikovský (1895–1984).

Keywords: Meyvaert Paul (1921–2015) – Devos Paul (1913–1995) – Sts Cyril and Methodius – Italian Legend – Leo of Ostia (1046–1115) – Martinov Jean (1821–1894) – Moravian Legend – Ludvikovský Jaroslav (1895–1984)

Cyrillo-Methodian academic studies are a broad and complex field, which already has over three hundred and fifty years of history. The categorization and evaluation of scholarly contributions in establishing its scope and the structuring of the sources and traditions, on which it rests, remain an incomplete task.

This paper aims to profile in historiographical perspective Paul Jeffrey Meyvaert (1921–2015) and Paul Devos' (1913–1995) contributions to the classification of the Latin hagiographical documents about Sts Cyril and Methodius as currently available¹.

Since in Slavic studies, P. Meyvaert often remained in the shadow of P. Devos, it is necessary to underline that he was the primary author of most of their joint studies². The younger scholar provided the initial impetus for unravelling three of the greatest enigmas in Cyrillo-Methodian studies. The key to them was a copy of the so-called *Italian Legend (IL)*. P. Meyvaert came across information about it while working on the *Chronicle of Monte Cassino* from the time of St Benedict to 1075, dating from the late 11th century, whose author was Leo Marsicanus, also known as Leo of Ostia (1046–1115). Studying the *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of the Prague Metropolitan Chapter* by Antonín Podlaha³, which had earlier been sent to Dom André Wilmart (1876–1941) in the library of St Michael's Abbey in Farnborough, P. Meyvaert accidentally discovered that Leo of Ostia had written a *Life of St Clement*. Its second part in the manuscript, entitled *Translatio S. Clementis*, is relevant to the life of Sts Cyril and Methodius, Apostles of the Slavs, since this is the text known to us as the *Italian Legend*⁴.

In his autobiography, P. Meyvaert also mentioned that although he felt confident in his abilities to address the issues pertaining to Leo and the history of Monte Cassino, he realized he needed help with regard to Slavonic history and sources⁵. Therefore, he turned to the youngest Bollandist in Brussels, the prominent student of Hippolyte Delehaye and Paul Peeters – Father P. Devos⁶.

1 On the content of the hagiographical file of the saints See: A. Poncelet and Bollandists, *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina Antiquae Et Mediae Aetatis*. Vol. 1: *A-I*, Bruxelles 1898, pp. 312–313, No. 2072–2076 and H. Fros, *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina: Antiquae Et Mediae Aetatis: Novum Supplementum*, Bruxelles 1986, pp. 241–243.

2 Perhaps it is an accidental oversight, but it is notable that in the *Cyrillo-Methodian Encyclopedia*, the most comprehensive reference book in the field of Cyrillo-Methodian studies in Bulgaria so far, there is an article dedicated only to P. Devos. See: И. Дуйчев, *Девос П.*, [in:] *Кирило-Методиевска енциклопедия*. Т. 1: *A–З*, София 1985, pp. 380–381.

3 A. Podlaha, *Soupis rukopisů Knihovny Metropolitní kapitoly pražské*. Vol. 2: *F–P*, Praha 1922, p. 398, No. 1547, NXXIII.

4 P. Meyvaert, *Jeffrey's Story: The Autobiography of Paul J. Meyvaert*, Tempe 2005, p. 64. Cf. P. Devos, *Pourquoi l'Occident a-t-il si longtemps considéré Saint Constantin-Cyrille comme un évêque?*, "Кирило-Методиевски Студии" 1987, Vol. 4, p. 101.

5 P. Meyvaert, *Jeffrey's Story...*, p. 64.

6 About Devos see: U. Zanetti, *Le Père Paul Devos*, "Analecta Bollandiana" 1995, Vol. 113, pp. 241–257.

Thus, began a lifelong friendship and a fruitful scholarly tandem that worked together (intermittently) from 1955 to 1964.

After his dispensation from the Order of St Benedict, P. Meyvaert changed the direction of his research, while P. Devos continued exploring the Cyrillo-Methodian theme until his death in 1993. With varying success, he tried to clarify different problems in the Latin hagiographical file of the Thessaloniki holy brothers.

This study mainly focuses on their joint publications from the first period (1955–1964). P. Devos's articles on various Cyrillo-Methodian issues, which gained him great renown in Slavic studies circles and provoked a polemic with the Czech school in the person of Jaroslav Ludvikovský (1895–1984), will not be explored, as they deserve attention in and of themselves and provide directions for future historiographical publications.

Within the first two years of their collaboration, Meyvaert and Devos were able to shed much light on the Latin hagiographical file of Sts Cyril and Methodius, Apostles of the Slavs, through three studies that in volume and scope correspond to a monograph⁷. They resolved issues, which many scholars had been unable to since the first scholarly edition of the Latin hagiographies of the holy brothers in *Acta Sanctorum* in 1668. Godefridus Henschenius and Daniel Papebrochius published four Latin texts with commentary (*commentarius praeivus*) and critical notes. The *Italian Legend* [BHL 2073] had primacy, followed by the *Legenda Moravica*, as Josef Dobrovský called the second text [BHL 2073 z, BHL 2074], the *Breviary readings Beatus Cyrillus* (BHL 2075= excerpts ex BHL 8825) and a fragment of the *Life of St Ludmila*, recounting the Saints' activity in Moravia (BHL 5031)⁸. The commentary on these texts in the Baroque series *Acta Sanctrum* was merely the initial stage of research on them because new questions arose⁹.

The basis for Meyvaert and Devos's comprehensive study is manuscript NXXIII, dating from the 14th century, formerly from the funds of the Metropolitan Chapter St Vitus, today kept in the Archive of the Prague Castle under the same signature. Inside the manuscript are two separate hagiographic texts about

7 We must add the brief scientific communication of a preliminary character published in "Teki Historyczne" 1954, Vol. 6, pp. 204–205, as Meyvaert and Devos pointed out. See: P. Meyvaert, P. Devos, *Trois énigmes cyrillo-méthodiennes de la "Légende Italique" résolues grâce à un document inédit*, "Analecta Bollandiana" 1955, Vol. 73, p. 410, n. 1.

8 J. Bollandus, G. Henschenius, D. Papebrochius, *De sanctis Episcopis Slavorum Apostolis Cyrillo et Methodio Olomucii in Moravia*, [in:] *Acta Sanctorum. Martii tomus secundus*, Antverpiae 1668, col. 12–25.

9 For the history of the first stage of Cyrillo-Methodian studies in the Baroque era and their reflexes, see: С. Баталова, *По следите на боландистите, или за първите приноси в научното изследване на изворите за живота и делото на св. Кирил и св. Методий*, "Palaeobulgarica" 2022, Vol. 46, No. 1, pp. 95–162.

St Clement of Rome, attributed to Leo of Ostia – *Vita Sancti Clementis* [BHL 1851ab] on f. 132r–147r, followed by *Translatio Sancti Clementis* [BHL 2073] on f. 147r–150r. Despite their inclusion by A. Podlaha in the inventory of manuscripts of the Prague Metropolitan Chapter in 1922, Leo’s texts remained unnoticed and unexplored until 1954. Brought to light by P. Meyvaert and published jointly with P. Devos, they became the last fundamental Latin Cyrillo-Methodian sources discovered in the 20th century and received a rapid and warm reception among scholars¹⁰. Six fragments of the same two parts of Leo of Ostia’s trilogy were discovered only recently in a manuscript dating from the 12th–13th centuries, which was probably dismembered in the 16th century in Copenhagen. These fragments are preserved in the Danish and Norwegian national archives in Copenhagen and Oslo¹¹. After careful collation with the previously known texts in NXXIII and Vat. lat. 9668 Åslaug Ommundsen edited and published them in 2020. Our knowledge regarding the textual history of the *IL* was not affected by these fragments because of their brevity. The text of Lat. Fragm. 23, 1–3+4 and Unnumbered Box III, [26] from the National Archives of Norway in Oslo corresponds to lessons 10 to 12 in the *IL* according to the numbering in *Acta Sanctorum* and in P. Meyvaert and P. Devos’s editions¹². There are some discrepancies noted, but they are transpositions and minor word substitutions with identical meaning. The most valuable contribution of Ommundsen’s study is that these fragments testify to the possible early dissemination of Leo of Ostia’s texts in northern Europe. Nevertheless, P. Meyvaert and P. Devos’ research conclusions remain relevant and the best-preserved copy remains the Prague codex.

To summarize, currently there are five manuscript traces of the *IL*. The earliest witness is Vaticanus Lat. 9668, dating back to the 12th–13th c.¹³ However, due to damage caused by moisture, it is in poor condition. Manuscript NXXIII, from the 14th century, kept at the Archive of the Prague Castle is the best-preserved one and the main object of study. Two late 17th-century research transcripts also exist – Duchesne 84 at the French National Library in Paris, prepared

10 A. Милев, *Италианската легенда в нова светлина*, “Исторически преглед” 1956, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 74–79; H. Grégoire, *Le mémoire des PP. Meyvaert et Devos sur la «Légende italique» des ss. Cyrille et Méthode*, “Byzantion” 1954, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 295–301; I. Dujčev, *La solution de quelques énigmes Cyrillo-Méthodiennes*, “Byzantion” 1954, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 303–307.

11 Å. Ommundsen, *A New Manuscript Source for the Legend of Saint Clement in Denmark*, “The Journal of Medieval Latin” 2020, Vol. 30, pp. 227–256.

12 On the alleged large size of the dismembered manuscript and the suggestion that it may have been copied by a Scandinavian scribe, see: Å. Ommundsen, op. cit., p. 244, for collated text see: ibidem, pp. 255–256.

13 We quote here the dating corrected by P. Meyvaert and P. Devos, who took into account that the manuscript includes the *Translatio Pescariam*. Extending the chronological limits of the dating made it easier to connect this text to the *Chronicle of San Clemente a Casauria* and to explain its influence on it. – see: P. Meyvaert, P. Devos, *La “Légende morave” des SS. Cyrille et Méthode et ses sources*, “Analecta Bollandiana” 1956, Vol. 74, p. 441, n. 4.

by André Duchesne¹⁴ and Phillipps 1717 at the State Library in Berlin, transcribed by Jacques Sirmond¹⁵. Their common antigraph is Vat. Lat. 9668.

The first study by P. Devos and P. Meyvaert *Trois énigmes cyrillo-méthodiennes...*¹⁶ is significant and important in that it puts a definitive end to the great debate about the textual history of the *IL* and its relationship with the so-called *Pannonian legends*, i.e. the Slavonic Lives of Sts Cyril and Methodius, introduced into scholarly circulation by Aleksandr Gorskij (Александр Горский) in 1843¹⁷, to which the *Sermon on the discovery of the relics of St Clement* (the so-called *Chersonian legend*) was soon added¹⁸.

In the beginning, P. Meyvaert and P. Devos presented the object of their research according to Editio princeps published by G. Henschenius and D. Papebrochius in *Acta Sanctorum* after Duchesne 84¹⁹ and the subsequent history of studies on the *IL* with all the phases of establishing individual facts regarding the criticism of the text from the time of August L. von Schlözer to the mid-twentieth century. P. Meyvaert and P. Devos made a considerable effort to present in a concise, lucid and traceable form the views of scholars on the time of origin of the *IL* and whether it preceeds, is secondary or independent of the already mentioned Slavonic texts²⁰. Their chosen approach can be seen as a logical continuation and extension of Jean Martinov's (1821–1894) work on the subject published in 1884²¹.

In the 19th century, there was a group of scholars including J. Dobrovský, Vatroslav Jagič, Vasilij A. Bil'basov (Василий А. Бильбасов) and J. Martinov, who in essence maintained that the *IL* was an early literary work of the ninth century, of undeniable importance as a source for the history of the life

14 Ms. Duchesne 84, Bibliothèque National de France, Paris. On the subject see below.

15 Ms. Phillipps 1717, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz. On the subject see below.

16 P. Meyvaert, P. Devos, *Trois énigmes...*, pp. 375–461.

17 А. В. Горский, *О св. Кирилле и Мефодии*, “Москвитянин” 1843, Vol. 6, pp. 405–434. The texts of the two Lives see: in *Климент Охридски. Събрани съчинения*. Т. 3, подг. за печат Б. Ангелов, X. Кодов, София 1973. Among the more recent studies on the text history of St. Cyril's Life see: М. Иванова, *Текстологически проблеми в Пространното житие на Константин-Кирил Философ. Кирило-Методиевски извори*. Т. 1. (= “Кирило-Методиевски Студии”, Vol. 22), София 2013.

18 Осип М. Бодянский introduced the so-called *Chersonian legend* in the Cyrillo-Methodian studies in his *О времени происхождения славянских писмен*, Москва 1855, pp. 27–28. The text was published in О.М. Бодянский, *Слово о пренесении мощей св. Климента Римскаго*, [in:] *Кирило-Методиевский сборник в память о совершении тысячелетия славянской письменности*, изд. М.П. Погодин, Москва 1865, pp. 319–326.

19 J. Bollandus, G. Henschenius, D. Papebrochius, *Vita cum Translatione Sancti Clementis ex Ms. Francisci Duchesne V. CL*, [in:] *Acta Sanctorum...*, col. 19–22.

20 P. Meyvaert, P. Devos. *Trois énigmes...*, pp. 379–409.

21 J. Martinov, *La légende dite italique des saints Cyrille et Méthode*, “Revue des Questions Historiques” 1884, No. 36, pp. 110–166.

and activity of Sts Cyril and Methodius²². This view, however, has been fiercely contested by their contemporary opponents such as Aleksej Viktorov (Алексей Викторов), Aleksandr Voronov (Александр Воронов) and Pëtr Lavrovskij (Пётр Лавровский), who favoured Slavic hagiographic documents and believed the *IL* was a late document dating from the 14th century²³.

Notably, during the period between the two world wars of the 20th c., both views had supporters in Bulgarian scientific literature. For example, Aleksandar Teodorov-Balan (Александър Теодоров-Балан) adopted and advocated for the position of most Russian scholars that the *IL* was a late work²⁴. In Meyvaert and Devos's historical review of the research, two arguments stood out, and even if they did not definitively decide the outcome of the debate, they indicated that the *IL* could not date from the 14th century.

The first of these are the facts presented by J. Martinov, who pointed out the well-known evidence in historical studies since the time of Caesar Baronius that 13th–14th centuries authors knew the content of the *IL* and quoted it in resume. Moreover, another valuable piece of evidence that it already existed in the 12th century is Johannes Berardi's *Chronicon of San Clemente a Casauria* for the period 866 to 1182²⁵. J. Martinov was the scholar who first introduced into Cyrillo-Methodian studies the evidence of Johannes Berardi's *Chronicon* by quoting passages in prose and verse based on Ludovico Muratori's 1726 edition of manuscript Parisinus lat. 5411²⁶.

22 P. Meyvaert and P. Devos analysed the following: J. Dobrovský, *Cyrril und Method der Slawen Apostel: Ein Historisch-Kritischer Versuch*, Prag 1823; V. Jagič, *Die neuesten Forschungen über die slavischen Apostel Cyrril und Methodius*, "Archiv für Slavische Philologie" 1880, Vol. 4, pp. 97–128, 297–316; В. А. Бильбасов, *Кирилл и Мефодий по западным легендам*. Ч. 2, С. Петербург 1871.

23 А. Викторов, *Кирилл и Мефодий. Новые источники и ученые труды для истории словянский апостолов*, [in:] *Кирилло-Мефодиевский сборник...*, pp. 343–440; А. Воронов, *Главнейшие источники для истории св. св. Кирилла и Мефодия*, Киев 1877; П. Лавровский, *Италиянская легенда*, "Журналъ Министерства народного просвѣщенія" 1886, июль-август, Ч. 246, pp. 17–59, 234–275.

24 А. Теодоров-Балан, *Кирилл и Методи*. Т. 2, София 1934, p. 201.

25 P. Meyvaert, P. Devos. *Trois énigmes...*, pp. 395–398.

26 J. Martinov, *La légende dite italique...*, pp. 126–134. Cf. С. Бърлиева, *Латинско стихотворение от XII в. – още един кирило-мефодиевски извор*, "Старобългарска литература" 1998, Т. 30, pp. 1–15; eadem, *Кирило-мефодиевски мотиви в латинската и гръцката книжнина*, София 2021, pp. 81–95. For the first edition of the two fragments in J. Berardi's *Chonicon Casauriense* see: L.A. Muratori, *Chronicon Casauriense, sive Historia monasterii Casauriensis Ordinis S. Benedicti, a Ludovico II imperatore anno D. 866 conditi auctore Iohanne Berardi. eiusdem coenobii monacho, ab eius origine usque ad annum MCLXXXII quo scriptor florebat, deducta, atque antea partim a Du-Chesnio, et Ughellio, partim a Dacherio edita, nunc autem in unum collecta, et ordinata, atque insigni mole Charitarum nondum editarum, e Christianissimi Regis Bibliotheca depromptarum locupletata. Additamentum ad Chronicon Casauriense nunc primum edita ex manuscripto codice Regiae Parisiensis Bibliothecae*, [in:] idem, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*. Vol. 2. 2, Mediolani 1726, col. 779C and col. 986A.

In the Czech studies the second paragraph of Martinov's publication was introduced in translation by A. Havlinka, *Vlašská legenda o sv. Cyrillu a Methodu*, "Vlast" 1889, Vol. 11, No. 6(2), pp. 114–123.

J. Martinov considered the quoted excerpts from the *Chronicon Casauriense* an indication that Johannes Berardi was acquainted with the *IL*, whose author was the bishop of Velletri Gauderic, as G. Henschenius and D. Papebrochius logically supposed. J. Martinov also highlighted the following notable details. In the *Chronicon Casauriense* St Cyril is called Constantine in both passages mentioning him as *philosophus* or *sophus*, which corresponds to Anastasius' well-known characterisation of St Cyril in his letter to Charles the Bald from 875 "*Vir magnus et apostolicae vitae praeceptor Constantinus Philosophus*"²⁷. Moreover, in contrast to the brief motif in later legends, which situates the narrative in the pontificate of Pope Nicholas I (858–867), the chronicler reported that the relics of St Clement had arrived in Rome under Pope Hadrian II (867–872).

The second significant argument is Anastasius Bibliothecarius' letter to Gauderic, Bishop of Velletri [BHL2072]²⁸, published in Editio princeps by Johann Friedrich in 1892. Anastasius' letter is dated between March 875 and June 876²⁹. The letter mentions the redaction of the *Life of St Clement* and that its contents had been partially included in the *IL*³⁰. It testifies that by order of the bishop of Velletri, Anastasius Bibliothecarius, after some delay, had sent him crude Latin translations of two works by Constantine-Cyril the Philosopher, deprived of the elegance and clarity of the originals – a brief history of the discovery of the relics and a eulogy³¹. Anastasius further added the information about the discovery of the relics of St Clement provided by an eyewitness of the events – the Metropolitan of Smyrna Mitrophanes, exiled in Chersonesos by patriarch Photius, whom Anastasius had encountered during the Church Council in Constantinople in 869–870.

P. Meyvaert and P. Devos noted that while the publication of the text by J. Friedrich was his main contribution, his commentary rather confused researchers

The excerpts in verse from *Chronicon Casauriensis* were interpreted in the context of the Czech Latin legends in F. Snopek, *O působnosti slovanských apoštolů v Čechách a o křestu Bořivojově*, "Časopis Katolického Duhovenstva" 1921, No. 3–4, pp. 71–77.

27 J. Martinov, *La légende dite italique...*, p. 128.

28 J. Friedrich, *Ein Brief des Anastasius bibliothecarius an den Bischof Gauericus von Belletri über die Abfassung der "Vita cum translatione s. Clementis Papae"*, [in:] *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse, Historische Klasse, Sitzung vom 2. Juli 1892*, München 1893, pp. 393–442.

29 For the datation see: G. Laehr, *Die Briefe und Prologe des Bibliothekars Anastasius*, "Neuers Archiv der Gesellschaft für Ältere Deutsche Geschichtskunde" 1928, Vol. 47, p. 453.

30 P. Devos, P. Meyvaert, *Trois énigmes...*, p. 402; P. Devos, P. Meyvaert, *La date de la première rédaction de la "Légende italique"*, [in:] *Cyrillo-Methodiana. Zur Frühgeschichte des Christentums bei den Slaven 863–1963*, eds. M. Hellmann, R. Olesch, B. Stasiewski, F. Zagiba, Köln–Graz 1964, p. 61.

31 "Sed et duo eius opuscula, praedictam scilicet brevem hystoriam et sermonem declamatorum unum, ecce a nobis agresti sermone et longe ab illius facundiae claritate distante translata... iudicii tui...polienda comitto", see: E. Perels, G. Laehr, *Anastasii Bibliothecarii epistolae sive praefationes 15*, [in:] *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Vol. 7: Epistolae Karolini aevi 5*, Berlin 1928, p. 437.

about the *IL*'s significance as a source for the life and work of Sts Cyril and Methodius³². Instead of contributing to the clarification of issues concerning the authorship of the *IL* and the relationship between the *IL* and the Slavonic lives of Sts Cyril and Methodius, J. Friedrich aggravated them. For example, based on Anastasius' letter J. Friedrich concluded that Anastasius Biblotecarius influenced Gauderic regarding the content and structure of the *IL*. He suggested that the *IL* was partially Gauderic's work because the content of the *IL* did not correspond to the conception of the third book of *St Clement's Life* according to Gauderic's dedicatory epistle to Pope John VIII. J. Friedrich thought that the *IL* was a eulogy of St Cyril and it would be more precise to call it *Vita S. Cyrilli*. In his view, the *IL* was the primary source for the Slavonic *Life of St Cyril*. This hypothesis has been criticized by many of his contemporary scholars³³.

According to P. Meyvaert and P. Devos, Emil Georgiev made the most significant contribution to the clarification of the issue on the eve of the Second World War, because only he used all known documents and in such a comprehensive, clear and well-thought manner³⁴. In their opinion, the Bulgarian scholar had succeeded in doing what J. Friedrich had failed to do, even though he had had an advantage³⁵. In their first work, Meyvaert and Devos found a weakness in Georgiev's monograph, but they seemed to justify it. In their view, given the evidence he had at his disposal, Georgiev defended the hypothesis that the *IL* had originated in the ninth century, employing Slavonic writings. E. Georgiev assumed that most probably the *IL* had been compiled by Gauderic within the lifetime of St Methodius. Thus, he added to the evidence and substantiated the view already hypothetically expressed by G. Henschenius and D. Papebrochius in 1668.

At the end of the historical review of previous research, P. Meyvaert and P. Devos noted that a question that has not been answered but was relevant to the subject of the authorship of the *IL* was why Jacobus de Voragine referred to Leo of Ostia as the primary source of this story. P. Meyvaert and P. Devos enumerated several scholars who had in passing merely mentioned this attribution of the text as plausible, but had not provided further arguments – Yevgeny Golubinskij, Arthur Lapôtre, Josef Pekař³⁶.

32 P. Meyvaert, P. Devos, *Trois énigmes...*, p. 405.

33 See: J. Friedrich's 14. conclusions in J. Friedrich, *Ein Brief des Anastasius...*, pp. 437–438; On the debate provoked by J. Friedrich's commentary to Anastasius's letter see: P. Meyvaert, P. Devos, *Trois énigmes...*, pp. 402–408; С. Елевтеров, "Италианска легенда" – нейната ръкописна и историческа съдба, [in:] *Годишник на Софийския университет "Климент Охридски" Факултет по славянски филологии*. Кн. 2: *Литературознание*, София 1989, pp. 56–62.

34 E. Georgiev, *Italianische Legende*, Sofia 1939.

35 P. Meyvaert, P. Devos, *Trois énigmes...*, p. 408.

36 *Ibidem*, p. 409.

The discovery of the Prague manuscript NXXIII enabled Meyvaert and Devos to answer this question. They gave a physical description of the manuscript and the works included in it, and noted that most probably researchers had failed to notice the two texts attributed to Leo of Ostia due to incipits in the catalogue that do not allow identification of the texts' content³⁷. The first text was characterized by the initial words of the preface attributed to Leo of Ostia. The second one lacked any indication that the italicized text after the title was the incipit of the prologue to *De Translatione Sancti Clementis*, i.e. the *IL*.

Meyvaert and Devos published the two prefaces, preserved only in NXXIII, and provided a meticulous analysis. They emphasized that in the prologue to f. 147rv's *Translatio* Leo of Ostia presented the same aims and methods of work as Gauderic had in the preface to the trilogy on St Clement, which was already known to the early Bollandists via Abbot Ughelli³⁸. Additionally, they noted that Leo did not even mention Johannes Hymmonides and Gauderic of Velletri³⁹. Meyvaert and Devos also compared samples from the first text in the Prague manuscript *De origine B. Clementis et conversio* (f. 132–147) with excerpts from one of the sources Leo claimed to be using – Rufinus' *Recognitiones Pseudo-Clementinae*, and from the extant first part of the *Life of St Clement*, modified by Johannes Hymmonides and edited by Gauderic. The results clearly demonstrated that Leo of Ostia had known and used Gauderic's redaction and had misleadingly cited as his own sources Gauderic's sources in the prologue without referring to Gauderic⁴⁰. Still, the *IL* in the Prague manuscript contains variant readings that match Leo's favoured expressions and stylistic preferences, known from his confirmed works. Therefore, Leo's interference with the Gauderic text is indisputably proven with regard to *De origine B. Clementis et conversio* concerning the first work (Gauderic's *Vita Clementis*). *The Sermo domini Leonis Ostiensis episcopi de ordinatione sive cathedra S. Clementis Papæ, quæ colitur X Kalend. Februarij*, in addition to the evidence in the prologues and Leo's lexical preferences noted in the text, makes it reasonable to suppose that the same conclusion can also be made with regard to the second work (*De ordinatione*)⁴¹. The two Belgian scholars' key conclusion for the textual history of the *IL*, which is near universally accepted

37 Ibidem..., pp. 410–411. Cf. A. Podlaha, *Soupis rukopisů...*, p. 398.

38 Bruxelles, KBR 8953–8954, f. 34r–39r, [online] <https://uurl.kbr.be/1801550> [accessed 4.03.2023].

39 P. Meyvaert, P. Devos, *Trois énigmes...*, p. 413.

40 Ibidem, pp. 416–428.

41 An excerpt of this work from a manuscript by Fossa Nova is preserved in a copy sent to the Bollandists by Abbot F. Ughelli. Today this copy is part of a convolute in the Royal Library in Brussels, KBR 8953–8954, f. 40. The text was published by P. Meyvaert and P. Devos in *Autour de Léon d'Ostie et de sa Translatio S. Clementis (Légende italique des ss. Cyrille et Méthode)*, "Analecta Bollandiana" 1956, Vol. 74, No. 1–2, pp. 225–226.

today, is that Leo's text was not an entirely new work. It is rather a redaction of a copy of Gauderic's redaction of the *IL*, which was available to him at Monte Cassino, but has since been lost⁴². Based on their observations and the acquired additional information concerning the textual criticism, Meyvaert and Devos suggested that Leo of Ostia had compiled the second edition of the *IL* after 1109, when he was already bishop of Ostia and Velletri and had free access to the library of Monte Cassino and its copy of Gauderic's redaction of the *IL*⁴³. They dated the first redaction to the period 876–882, further narrowing the chronology established by E. Georgiev earlier⁴⁴.

The second issue the Prague manuscript helped resolve pertains to the relationship between the *IL* and the Slavonic *Life of St Cyril* and their reflection in the chronology.

To clarify the relations between the various hagiographic documents in Latin, Slavonic and Greek, P. Meyvaert and P. Devos returned to the prologue of *Translatio Sancti Clementis* in NXXIII and Leo's mention there of *Sclavorum litteris* and *relatio inventoris eiusdem corporis de graecis translatae*. They argued that this evidence and the conclusion already drawn as to the method of Leo's use of Gauderic's sources were sufficient indications to assert that the dating proposed by E. Georgiev could be further refined. As the evidence from Leo confirmed what was already known based on Anastasius Bibliothecarius's letter to bishop Gauderic, but also added an indication of the existence of a Slavonic *Life of St Cyril*, P. Meyvaert and P. Devos sought other sources for the dating of the *Life of St Cyril*. In their view, John VIII's (878–882) papal letter to Svatopluk *Industriae Tuae* (880) was one such source. In the letter, the Pope summoned Methodius to appear without delay in Rome to defend himself against the charges brought against him. P. Meyvaert and P. Devos supposed that this historical moment was appropriate and that St Methodius used the merits of St Cyril to defend their joint activities with regard to the Holy Office in Slavonic. They interpreted the coincidence between the main arguments used by St Cyril to affirm the right of Slavic converts to worship in Slavonic in chapter XVI of his *Life* and those in the letter of John VIII as evidence that the text of the Slavonic life existed before 880 and that the Pope was acquainted with it. In this respect, they concur with Georgiev's hypothesis. P. Meyvaert and P. Devos also suggested that Gauderic of Velletri also probably had access to it. The two scholars supposed that if Methodius was not the author of *St Cyril's Life*, he certainly had directly influenced its content and was the guarantor of its

42 P. Meyvaert, P. Devos, *Trois énigmes...*, pp. 431–432.

43 Ibidem; P. Meyvaert, P. Devos, *Autour Leon...*, pp. 222–223.

44 They returned to this theme in their latest joint publication, elaborated on their hypothesis and detailed all the written evidence that confirmed it. See: P. Devos, P. Meyvaert, *La date...*, pp. 57–71.

veracity. In hypothesizing the time of the appearance of the first redaction of the *IL*, they once again invoked Anastasius' name, in this context – in connection with his participation in collecting the materials and translating them into Latin. P. Meyvaert and P. Devos believed it likely that Anastasius was already deceased when Gauderic delivered the completed trilogy about St Clement to John VIII, and this was the likely reason why Gauderic had not included Anastasius in the dedication of the work to the Pope. This is another argument in support of the hypothesis that the *IL* appeared in 879–880. Also based on the content of Gauderic's prologue, P. Meyvaert and P. Devos underlined that Johannes Hymmonides must not be excluded as one of the two authors of the first redaction of the *IL* ⁴⁵.

The third question answered in the study pertains to the episcopal rank of St Cyril according to the *IL* ⁴⁶. Meyvaert and Devos once again relied on the Prague manuscript as the key to the textual history of the *IL*. The scholars justified their use of the then newly found copy by noting that it contained more reliable variant readings than the text published in *Acta Sanctorum* based on Duchenne's transcript. Firstly, they demonstrated this by comparing samples from Anastasius' letter [BHL 2072], the Prague manuscript transmitted with sigla P, and the text from Duchesne's copy (D). As a result, it became clear that most readings in Anastasius and P agree, while in D there are differences – transpositions, word substitutions or discrepancies. The comparison of P with the *Moravian Legend* allowed them to explain the replacement of Prince Rastislav with Svatopluk as the initiator of the engagement of Sts Cyril and Methodius for their apostolic activity in Moravia by the strength of local tradition and the characteristic stylistic features of the manuscripts copied by Czech scribes of the same period. By paralleling the text of P with the printed edition, Meyvaert and Devos revealed a previously unknown variant reading of the part of the text that caused the debate about the episcopacy of Sts Cyril and Methodius and prompted lasting doubts about the dating of the *IL* and its historical value. In *Trois énigmes...* they addressed the issue of St Cyril's episcopacy first. From the text quoted by P. Meyvaert and P. Devos, it is clear that P does not state that the holy brothers were consecrated as bishops in Rome. Therefore, the scholars noted that it was necessary to find Duchesne's transcript. P. Meyvaert and P. Devos reported that J. Martinov had already managed to track it down and identify it as Duchesne 84 at the National Library of France in Paris ⁴⁷. The manuscript contains two hagiographic texts about St Clement, the first of which is the *IL*. J. Martinov came across a note on its first folio indicating that the

45 P. Meyvaert, P. Devos, *Trois énigmes...*, pp. 433–440.

46 Ibidem, pp. 440–454.

47 J. Martinov, *La légende dite italique...*, pp. 112–113; J. Martinov, *A propos de la légende dite italique*, "Revue des Questions Historiques" 1887, Vol. 41, pp. 221–222.

transcript was from a manuscript possessed by Jacques Sirmond⁴⁸. Despite his efforts, Martinov had not been able to find this manuscript, which he assumed to be much older than Duchesne 84. Following his footsteps, however, Meyvaert and Devos succeeded in discovering J. Sirmond's copy, stored as Phillipps 1717 at the Berlin State Library (S). Meyvaert and Devos established the manuscript's antigraph – Vat. Lat. 9668 (V), which had previously belonged to the Clermont College library. As noted above, the Vatican manuscript, the earliest surviving copy of the *IL*, dates from the 12th–13th century. Almost simultaneously, but working independently from each other, both P. Meyvaert and P. Devos, and Marin Tadin discovered the manuscript⁴⁹. P. Meyvaert and P. Devos found the description in Albert Poncelet's catalogue of Vatican hagiographic manuscripts. In addition to the physical description, A. Poncelet gave some valuable details concerning the previous owners of the manuscript, before it was included in the Vatican funds. The attention of the scholars had been drawn to A. Poncelet's observation that the manuscript had been damaged by moisture to such an extent that the text was illegible in places. Checking the text at the end of the fol. 11r and the beginning of the fol. 11v, P. Meyvaert and P. Devos established that it was impossible to read the starting of the verso. Thus they, revealed that A. Duchesne had restored the text there *ope ingenii* without indicating his intervention in any way. They also examined J. Sirmond's transcript and observed that he had restored the corrupted text in the same manner. Wherever V was illegible, S and D contained strikethroughs or transcriber's uncertainty indicated by a dotted line. The differences in the variant readings between D and S that restore the corrupted places allowed P. Meyvaert and P. Devos to conclude that these two transcripts were based on the established antigraph – V, but were entirely independent of each other. Thus, Meyvaert and Devos significantly contributed to the textual history of the *IL*. In an appendix to their study on solving the Cyrillo-Methodian enigma, they published the text of the *IL* by collating the two medieval witnesses, choosing P's text as the main one⁵⁰.

Meyvaert and Devos continued elaborating on the theme of the *Italian Legend* manuscript witnesses in their 1956 study⁵¹. Establishing the misreading regarding Cyril's episcopal rank prompted them to make a fuller assessment of the way Duchesne and Sirmond's transcripts referred to their common antigraph Vaticanus lat. 9668. The two scholars described in comparative terms the significant differences between the two seventeenth-century transcripts and concluded that: Where the antigraph was severely damaged, the Baroque

48 J. Martinov, *La légende dite italique...*, p. 113.

49 M. Tadin, *La Légende intitulée Translatio corporis sancti Clementis*, Paris 1955.

50 P. Meyvaert, P. Devos, *Trois énigmes...*, pp. 455–461.

51 P. Meyvaert, P. Devos, *Autour de Léon d'Ostie...*, pp. 189–240.

transcribers approached restoring the text differently in ways that seemed most logical to them. The comparison reinforced P. Meyvaert and P. Devos' conclusion that Duchesne's and Sirmond's approaches clearly demonstrated the two 17th-century scholars had not been acquainted with each others' work and had not used the respective other's transcript⁵². With regard to the coinciding variant readings, which differ from the original in V, P. Meyvaert and P. Devos noted that the abbreviations and spelling corrections in the antigraph similarly presented difficulties for the transcribers.

In their June 1956 study, P. Meyvaert and P. Devos reported that they had learnt of the achievements of two other scholars – M. Tadin and Dietrich Gerhardt. After having made their discoveries about the *IL* manuscript tradition already indicated in their 1955 publication, P. Meyvaert and P. Devos noted that thanks to M. Tadin's study⁵³ as well as Franc Grivec's review⁵⁴, both works published at the same time as theirs, they had learned that in the period 1946–1948 D. Gerhardt of the University of Münster had investigated the relationship of Duchesne and Sirmond's transcripts to the Vatican manuscript. However, Gerhardt's work was an unpublished dissertation and thus his conclusions had only been available to the few scholars personally acquainted with them. Meyvaert and Devos corresponded with their German colleague, who kindly provided them with his work. D. Gerhardt, however, had not examined the Prague manuscript *NXXIII* in his dissertation, because he had been unaware of its existence. In their 1956 article, the Belgian scholars noted that they were gratified to have had their independent work confirmed by D. Gerhardt's conclusions⁵⁵. By introducing P, P. Meyvaert and P. Devos contributed to *IL* manuscript tradition scholarship by identifying previously unnoticed (due to the damaged state of V) misreadings in D and S. Thus, they uncovered A. Duchesne's false reconstructions reflected in the *IL*'s *Editio Princeps*⁵⁶.

The next detail that Meyvaert and Devos drew attention to is a continuation of the exploration of Duchesne 84's erroneous reading regarding St Cyril's episcopal rank. The new contribution in their 1956 study clarified the meaning of the reading "sacerdos" applied to Methodius in the original text of the *Translatio S. Clementis* based on P. The word "sacerdos" is part of the phrase "et consecraverunt fratrem eius Methudium in sacerdotem nec non et ceteros discipulos eorum in presbyteros et diaconos"⁵⁷. P. Meyvaert and P. Devos con-

52 Ibidem, pp. 190–194. Cf. P. Meyvaert, P. Devos, *Trois énigmes...*, pp. 449–451.

53 See above note 49.

54 F. Grivec, *Staroslovanski viri Italske legende Sv. Cirila in Metoda*, "Slavistična Revija" 1955, Vol. 8, p. 261.

55 P. Meyvaert, P. Devos, *Autour de Léon d'Ostie...*, p. 195.

56 Ibidem, pp. 189–196.

57 P. Meyvaert, P. Devos, *Trois énigmes...*, p. 460.

sidered the possibility that this reading existed in this exact form already in the first redaction of the *IL* text. They also explored the meaning of the word that Johannes Hymmonides and Gauderic of Velletri used regarding Methodius and his dedication at the time of his first visit to Rome. Noting that the first meaning of sacerdos as “priest” was characteristic of Christian era language and was still used in the ninth century, P. Meyvaert and P. Devos also pointed out that new semantics had also emerged in that period. By drawing for comparison material from the *Life of St Gregory the Great* [BHL 3641], compiled by Johannes Hymmonides, they illustrated the difficulty in interpreting the passage because of the possibility of the word applied as a denotative for both an ordinary clergyman and a bishop. Examples of such use in both senses exist in the *IL*⁵⁸.

P. Meyvaert and P. Devos assumed that in the redaction of Leo of Ostia, “sclavorum litterae” meant a hagiographic text or a narrative about the story of the two brothers, the discovery of the relics of St Clement in Cherson and their transfer to Rome, which was marked by a solemn welcome and the cordial reception of the relics’ bearers. Therefore, they sought the key to revealing the meaning of sacerdos in the *Life of St Cyril*. In that text, as in the *IL*, St Cyril is referred to as a *Philosopher* in connection with all mentions of the ordination. Because the *Life of St Cyril* only mentions the presence of the disciples at the consecration of the Slavonic books in Rome, without specifying their number and rank, P. Meyvaert and P. Devos also drew on the *Life of St Methodius* and specifically the text of ch. 6⁵⁹, which notes that after their reception in Rome, the Pope had placed the Slavonic books on the altar of “St Peter” and had anathematized the adherents of the trilingual dogma who had condemned the Slavonic books. The Pope had then ordered a bishop of the trilingualists to ordain three priests and two readers from among the Slavonic disciples⁶⁰. P. Meyvaert and P. Devos compared these accounts with a passage from chapters 8–9 of the *IL*, which revealed two important highlights⁶¹. The first was that the two brothers had arrived in Rome with disciples worthy of being ordained bishops, and the second was that the Pope and his bishops had ordained Methodius as a priest and the disciples as deacons and presbyters⁶². In their analysis, Meyvaert and Devos stressed that the *IL* was closely related to the merits of St Cyril, and the chronological limits of the narrative fell within a time shortly after his death. Therefore, they concluded that the author of the *IL* had deliberately dedicated limited attention to Methodius. On the other hand, they noted that (as known from

58 P. Meyvaert, P. Devos, *Autour de Léon...*, p. 198.

59 *Life of St Cyril*, Ch. XVII. See: *Климент Охридски. Събрани съчинения*. Т. 3, подг. за печат Б. Ангелов, X. Кодов, София, p. 106.

60 *Life of St Methodius*, Ch. VI. See: *Климент Охридски...*, p. 188.

61 P. Meyvaert, P. Devos, *Autour de Léon...*, pp. 202–207.

62 P. Meyvaert, P. Devos, *Trois énigmes...*, pp. 459–460.

the *Life of St Methodius*) Methodius had become bishop of Pannonia only during his second stay in Rome, where he had been sent by Prince Kocel. Ch. 1 of the *IL* indicates that St Cyril was granted *sacerdotium* in Constantinople, i.e. he was a priest even before he went to Rome. Based on all these data retrieved from the Slavonic and Latin hagiographies and analyzed in meticulous detail, P. Meyvaert and P. Devos concluded that the Slavonic hagiographies (=Sclavorum litteris) did not contradict the *IL*. They explained the difficulty in interpreting the reading embedded in Duchenne and Sirmond's interpolations with the intervention of Leo of Ostia and his language and stylistic techniques. Thus, they clarified that by using the word *sacerdos* Leo meant that Methodius had been ordained a priest and given a superior rank to his and St Cyril's disciples, who in their turn had become presbyters and deacons. According to the two scholars, Leo of Ostia's interference in the excerpt could also be inferred from the fact that the text omitted the two bishops who had administered this sacrament, Gauderic of Velletri and Formosus of Porto, whose presence was well-attested in the Slavonic documents. P. Meyvaert and P. Devos supposed that the absence of the bishops' names was due to Leo's reluctance to mention Gauderic and Formosa's names – by analogy to avoid the awkwardness of using the plural of the verb “*consecraverunt*”⁶³.

On the other hand, the conjunction “*nec non et*” is antithetical and characteristic of Leo of Ostia's style. The frequent use of the conjunction in Leo's texts in comparison with the data from the works of Johannes Hymmonides – *Life of St Gregory* and the first part of the *Life of St Clement* in Codex 234 of Monte Cassino, as well as the uses of the conjunction recorded by A. Lapôte in *Liber Pontificalis*, helped P. Meyvaert and P. Devos to identify Leo of Ostia's intervention. Therefore, the conclusion that the style of the text also indicated Leo's authorship was persuasive and was accepted promptly in the academic literature⁶⁴.

As mentioned above, the investigation of Leo's authorship drove the discovery of the Prague manuscript. The third part of Meyvaert's second joint study with Devos is devoted to Leo's *Translatio S. Mennatis*, *Historia Peregrinorum* and *Sermo de Ordinatione*. However, as its scope exceeds the Cyrillo-Methodian domain, it is excluded from this analysis.

63 P. Meyvaert, P. Devos, *Autour de Léon...*, p. 207.

64 P. Meyvaert, P. Devos, *Autour de Léon...*, pp. 196–221. – Cf. A. Милев, *Два латински извора за живота и делото на Константин Кирил Философ*, [in:] *Константин Кирил Философ. Юбилеен сборник по случай 1100 годишнината от смъртта му*, изд. Б. Ангелов и др., София 1969, pp. 196–198. F. Grivec considered that Meyvaert and Devos had mistakenly believed that the *IL* was a translation of the *Life of St. Cyril* and had been unaware of the Slavonic manuscript tradition of *St Cyril's Life*. P. Meyvaert and P. Devos used Slavonic hagiographic material only to verify the information in the *IL*. In his own words, in 1957, F. Grivec complemented and increased rather than rejected the importance of the work of P. Meyvaert and P. Devos and their conclusions. – Cf. F. Grivec, *Cyrillo-Methodiana (1. Drêvo prahnêho – jagoda izgnila; 2. O Metodovem nomokanonu; 3. Praški rokopi Isalske legende)*, “Slovo” 1957, No. 6–7-8, pp. 51–53.

The final theme of Meyvaert and Devos' second study concerns the influence that Leo's redaction of the *IL* exerted on three other circles of texts. We can group these texts according to the time of their appearance and their territorial distribution. P. Meyvaert and P. Devos defined three directions of influence, which correspond to the conclusions they reached and the perspectives they outlined not just for themselves, but also for scholars in the following decades.

Firstly, they set out to clarify the influence of Leo of Ostia's redaction, designated as *Translatio Romam* (=BHL 2073), on two texts that originated in the Abbey of St Clemente a Casauria. These are the *Chronicle of Johannes Berardi*, known in its original form in the manuscript Parisinus lat. 5411, and a hagiographic text – *Translatio <corporis Sancti Clementis> de Roma in insulam Piscarie* [=BHL 1851 b] after Vat. lat. 9668, f. 8v-9.

Secondly, P. Meyvaert and P. Devos also analyzed the relations between those two texts. In their review of previous studies, they first noted that even Filippo Rondinini had been interested in Henschenius and Papebrochius' note concerning the fact that the date of the feast of St Clement was undetectable in the martyrologies calendar, but the date 23 January was indicated in the fragment of the *Sermo de Ordinatione* by Fossanova's manuscript⁶⁵. In 1706 Rondinini pointed out that the feast of the Cathedra S. Clementis was mentioned in a chronicle from the monastery of St Clement in Pescara, as he had discovered in Lucas Acherius' partial edition in pt. 5. of his *Specilegium*⁶⁶. P. Meyvaert and P. Devos noted this as evidence for the presence of the *Sermo de Ordinatione* in the 12th-century Abbey of St Clemente a Casauria. Over a century after Rondinini's study, J. Martinov highlighted the reflection of the *Translatio Romam* in the 1182 *Chronicle of St Clemente a Casauria* to decisively disprove the A. Voronov supported dating of the *IL* in the 14th century. By virtue of the calendar dates of the feasts of St Clement indicated in the *Chronicle of St Clemente a Casauria*, J. Martinov discovered proof that Johannes Berardi had known the *Translatio Romam*. J. Martinov, however, asserted that it was in Gauderic's redaction. The *Chronicle* by Johannes Berardi also solved the enigma associated with the feasts' dates. J. Martinov stressed that, according to the *Translatio Romam*, the Discovery of St Clement's relics was marked on 30 December, while the Slavonic hagiography and some old Slavonic calendars pointed to 30 January. He reiterated what the Bollandists and Ph. Rondini had already confirmed – St Clement's feast was not mentioned on 30 December in any of the Western martyrologies. J. Martinov noted that the *Chronicle* of St Clemente a Casauria

65 P. Meyvaert, P. Devos, *Autour de Léon...*, pp. 227–228. The text of the fragment in Editio princeps see in P. Meyvaert, P. Devos, *ibidem*, pp. 225–226.

66 See: Ph. Rondinini, *De S. Clemente papa et martyre ejusque basilica in urbe Roma libri duo*, Romae 1706, pp. 55–56. Cf. L. Acherius, *Veterum aliquot scriptorum qui in Galliae Bibliothecis, maxime Benedictorum latuerunt Specilegium*. Vol. 5, Parisii 1661, p. 517.

contained the only mention of the feast, however, not in the beginning, where it recounted the transfer of the relics of St Clement from Rome to Pescara, but rather under the year 1170. The chronicler wrote that after Pope Alexander III had allowed Abbot Leonas (1155–1182) to celebrate the anniversary of the relic's transfer on 27 May, the abbot (at papal request) had also instituted the feast of the discovery of St Clement's relics on 30 January. In addition, abbot Leonas had ordered that St Clement's See be commemorated each year on 23 January⁶⁷.

P. Meyvaert and P. Devos questioned why J. Martinov had stopped there and had not outlined the textual parallels among the *Chronicle* by Johannes Berardi, the *Translatio in insulam Piscarie* and the *Translatio Romam*. They were all the more astonished because J. Martinov had been well-acquainted with Ms. Duchesne 84, in which the two last hagiographic texts occur one after the other and in the correct historical sequence.

The first scholar to link these two hagiographic texts was A. Poncelet, when analyzing the content of the antigraph of Duchesne 84 – Vaticanus lat. 9668. He published *Translatio in insulam Piscarie* in an appendix to the second volume of his catalogue of Vatican hagiographical manuscripts⁶⁸. P. Meyvaert and P. Devos made a textual comparison of fragments to illustrate the relationship between the two texts: the *Translatio Romam* and the *Translatio Piscariam*. The parallel analysis led them to conclude that the second text had a terminus post quem in the first years of the 12th century, when the *Translatio Romam* (i.e. *Leo's redaction of IL*) had been composed. To define the terminus ante quem Meyvaert and Devos used the characteristic features of the handwriting of Vat. Lat. 9668. A. Poncelet had indicated that Vat. Lat. 9668 had been executed in the late 12th century in central or northern France and had then belonged to St Sauveur abbey in Redon, Northern France⁶⁹.

P. Meyvaert and P. Devos set out to trace the relationship between the *Translatio in insulam Piscarie* and the beginning of Johannes Berardi's *Chronicle* because of the similitude in the narrative content. Based on the comparison, they concluded that the form of the account and the words used unambiguously demonstrated that one of the two authors was acquainted with the other's text. A. Poncelet, without providing arguments, had stated that the direction of borrowing was from the chronicle to the hagiographic text. P. Meyvaert and P. Devos took the opposite view and supposed that the strongest argument, confirming their hypothesis that the *Translatio in insulam Piscarie* had influenced Johannes Berardi, was indirect. They believed it impossible for the text

67 J. Martinov, *La légende italique...*, p. 131, cf. P. Meyvaert, P. Devos, *Autour de Léon...*, p. 229.

68 A. Poncelet, *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum Latinorum Bibliothecae Vaticanae*, Bruxelles 1910, pp. 520–525.

69 *Ibidem*, p. 240.

to have spread so quickly and to have reached northern France within the last two decades of the 12th century. It seemed much more logical to them that the whole Leo of Ostia trilogy, especially the *Sermo de Ordinatione*, had exerted its influence on the monastery, which had St Clement as its patron saint, and had prompted the series of initiatives in the time of Abbot Leonas. P. Meyvaert and P. Devos, therefore, accepted the compilation of *Translatio in insulam Piscarie* had occurred around 1170⁷⁰. Thus, they put forward a convincing hypothesis of the influence of Leo of Ostia's work on the Casaurian literary production and pointed to its dissemination north. Although only through manuscript fragments, in the same chronological span, the influence of Leo's work in the north is also demonstrated in Å. Ommundsen's recent work⁷¹.

The second group of texts influenced by Leo of Ostia's work were the *Dominican lectionaries* and legendaries containing adaptations of old hagiographies, the so-called *legendae novae*. Geographically the material originates from Italy and France and chronologically refers to the period between the second half of the 13th century and the beginning of the 15th century. P. Meyvaert and P. Devos were interested in establishing the manner through which the data from the second edition of the *IL* had been included in the *Golden Legend* of Jacobus de Voragine (†1298), because since the time of the Bollandists this had been the earliest evidence from this circle to indicate Leo of Ostia as the data source⁷². More recent than the one by Jacobus de Voragine are the records in the hagiographic compendia by Petrus de Natalibus († between 1400–1406) and by Petrus Calo (†1348)⁷³. P. Meyvaert and P. Devos pointed out that the narrative of Petrus de Natalibus (c. 1370) contained elements that resembled, on the one hand, those of the *Golden Legend* and, on the other, the narrative of Petrus Calo and the lectionary of Toulouse, which they were first to publish. The question was whether all these legends had a common ancestor, predating Jacobus de Voragine. Although they did not fully clarify it, this question is significant. It was ultimately answered due to the fact that P. Meyvaert and P. Devos raised it, the manner in which they formulated it as well as the direction for further research they indicated – in the lectionaries of the Dominicans. Meyvaert and Devos reported that in Dominican lectionary 82 from the Municipal library in Toulouse,

70 P. Meyvaert, P. Devos, *Autour de Léon...*, pp. 234–235.

71 See above n. 11 and 12.

72 J. Bollandus, G. Henschenius, D. Papebrochius, *De sanctis Episcopis Slavorum...*, col. 14.

73 They found the legend's record in the unpublished text of Petrus Calo's collection based on the description by A. Poncelet, *Le Légendier de Pierre Calo*, "Analecta Bollandiana" 1910, Vol. 29, p. 31. – Cf. P. Meyvaert, P. Devos, *ibidem*, p. 236, note 5. We do not yet have a full critical edition of Petrus Calo's collection. A critical edition in the *Monumenta Ordinis Praedicatorum Historica series* is under preparation by Emore Paoli, Davide Bagnardi and Elisabetta De Sanctis – see: [online] <https://institutumhistoricum.op.org/ledizione-critica-del-legendarium-di-pietro-calò/?lang=en> [accessed 23.03.2023].

the excerpt referring to Leo of Ostia was the ninth reading from the Office for the feast of St Clement, the first eight being from his Life BHL 1848. In the edition of the *Translatio Clementis* from the Toulouse lectionary 82, f. 191, they included in the critical apparatus variant readings from two of Petrus Calo's manuscripts, but reproduced in full the passage in which Petrus Calo states that he had followed Frater Martinus, i.e. Martin of Oppava or Troppau (c. 1220–1278). In a very important for Cyrillo-Methodian studies note, P. Meyvaert and P. Devos emphasized the statement of Jacobus de Voragine "in quadam chronica autem legitur" that the relics of St Clement were discovered and brought to Rome "a beato Cyrillo Moravorum episcopo". They believed that Jacobus de Voragine had borrowed this information from the chronicle of Martin of Oppava, compiled about 1270⁷⁴. According to P. Meyvaert and P. Devos, thanks to this note in Jacobus de Voragine's legend Petrus Calo had found Martin's chronicle and used it, whereas, in Toulouse's lectionary 82, this element was absent. P. Devos would return to the subject in 1975 to supplement it with further witnesses and parallels⁷⁵. Before this, however, attracted by Meyvaert and Devos', in 1958, Leonard Boyle discovered the pattern to Jacobus de Voragine in reading nine in the Dominican lectionary of Santa Sabina manuscript XIV L 1, edited by the master general of the order Humbert de Romanis between 1254–1259⁷⁶.

The third group of texts influenced by Leo of Ostia's work is related to the Czech lands and the Czech Latin legends about Sts Cyril and Methodius. After the 17th century, the so-called *Moravian Legend (ML)* [BHL 2073z, BHL 2074] received the most scholarly attention. However, it contains other material in addition to the parts borrowed from the second redaction of Leo of Ostia's *IL*. Leo of Ostia's redaction and relations with *IL* prompted P. Meyvaert and P. Devos to put the *ML* at the centre of their third joint study. The paper's title orients readers to what they can expect⁷⁷. The central subject is the structure, themes, and influences identified through a comparative text study. A very detailed review of Czech scholars' studies of the *ML* from the beginning of the 19th century onwards precedes the core of their analysis⁷⁸. This review is essential as the content of the texts and their textual history are very complicated. The dates of Latin legends from the Czech lands, the introduction of new legends

74 P. Meyvaert, P. Devos, *Autour de Léon...*, p. 237, n. 2. The same conclusion see in P. Devos, *Textes dérivés de la "Légende Italiques"*, "Analecta Bollandiana" 1975, Vol. 93, p. 264. – Cf. С. Бърлиева, *Агиографските творби за св. Кирил и Методиј в Legenda aurea на Яков Воразински*, София 1998, p. 33 and p. 43.

75 P. Devos, *Textes dérivés...*, pp. 261–268.

76 L. Boyle, *Dominican Lectionaries and Leo of Ostia's Translatio S. Clementis*, "Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum" 1958, Vol. 28, pp. 362–394.

77 P. Meyvaert, P. Devos, *La "Légende morale"...*, pp. 441–470.

78 *Ibidem*, pp. 441–449.

and new transcripts are all intertwined in the history of the research. In 1668 the Bollandists published the *Moravian Legend* according to a manuscript from Blaubeuren (B) transcribed by Bartholomew Kraffe in 1480⁷⁹. In their commentary, G. Henschenius and D. Papebrochius noted that the first part of the *ML* was based on the legend they had chosen as the main *Vita of Sts Cyril and Methodius*, i.e. the *Italian Legend*. In 1826, J. Dobrovský prepared a new edition of the *ML* based on two manuscripts predating the *Codex Blauburanus*. The first (A) is X. B. 12 from the National and University Library in Prague, dating from the late 14th–early 15th century. The second (C) is manuscript no. 12 from the library of the Metropolitan Chapter in Olomouc, dating from the middle of the 14th century. In 1823, J. Dobrovský dated the *ML* to the 14th century. He believed that the first part of the *ML* reproduced the content of the *IL* and the second – the so-called *Legenda Christiani* [BHL8825]. In his opinion, the *Legenda Christiani* was a late forgery from the 14th century. He also noted that the contents of ch. 12 and 13. had no correspondences in *Legenda Christiani*⁸⁰. Among the later legends, J. Dobrovský also mentioned the *Quemadmodum* [BHL2076], which, however, according to him, was dependent on the *Legenda Christiani* and especially on the *Moravian Legend* and was composed in the time of Charles IV of Luxembourg (14 V 1316 – 29 XI 1378). J. Pekař later proved that the *Legenda Christiani* was the earliest Bohemian Latin legend. Pekař agreed with J. Dobrovský that the main sources of the *ML* were the *IL* and *Legenda Christiani*, but thought *ML* had originated in the 12th or 13th century⁸¹. P. Meyvaert and P. Devos pointed out that acquaintance with the *Quemadmodum* would have prevented J. Pekař from believing it to be a later text than the *ML*⁸².

In 1939 Václav Chaloupecký made a new edition of the *ML* according to five manuscripts. In the same miscellany, he also made a first edition of the text named after its first words, *Beatus Cyrillus* [BHL 2071r]. Along with several other Czech Latin legends, V. Chaloupecký used the *ML* and *Beatus Cyrillus* (*BC*) to reconstruct a Cyrillo-Methodian text that has not reached us, the so-called *Privilegium Moravensis Ecclesiae*, mentioned in the chronicle of Kosma of Prague (1045–1125)⁸³. He regarded *BC* and *ML* as independent

79 The sigla in parentheses are the designations of the manuscripts used in the edition of V. Chaloupecký, *Prameny X. století; Legendy Kristiánovy o Svätém Václavu a Svaté Ludmile*, Praha 1939, p. 506. The sigla were also adopted in P. Devos, *Textes dérivés...* passim and J. Ludvikovský, *Tempore Michaelis imperatoris – Legenda Moravica*, [in:] *Magnae Moraviae fontes historici*. Vol. 2, Brno 1967, p. 257.

80 J. Dobrovský, *Cyrril und Method...*, §3, p. 17; J. Dobrovský, *Mährische Legende von Cyrille und Method*, Prag 1826, p. 8.

81 J. Pekař, *Die Wenzels- und Ludmila-Legenden und die Echtheit Christians*, Prag 1906, pp. 188–190.

82 P. Meyvaert, P. Devos, *La “Légende morave”...*, p. 445.

83 V. Chaloupecký, *Prameny...*, pp. 80–94.

works that probably had *Privilegium* as their common source. V. Chaloupecký devoted several pages to the dating of the *ML*. His views remained vague and his dating had rather wide chronological boundaries – between the tenth century and the second half of the 13th – the first half of the 14th centuries⁸⁴. Concerning *Beatus Cyrillus*, he believed it to be earlier than the time of Charles IV, probably appearing in the 11th-12th centuries and reflecting the persecution of the Slavonic God service in Moravia during that period⁸⁵.

The last Czech scholar Meyvaert and Devos included in their review is Rudolf Urbánek. R. Urbánek considered *BC* to be a legend based on the *Legenda Christiani, Diffundente sole* [BHL 5030] and the *ML*. R. Urbanek identified Jan IX of Středa, bishop of Olomouc (1364–1380) as the probable compiler of the *ML*⁸⁶.

P. Meyvaert and P. Devos used the Prague copy of the *Italian Legend* (P) to explain some characteristic features of the *ML*. Such an approach seemed appropriate because P originated in the Czech lands and dates to the same time as the time ascribed to the *ML*. Meyvaert and Devos's first goal was to explain the origin of the *ML*. They used manuscript no. 12 from the library of the Metropolitan Chapter of Olomouc (C), as it presents better readings, matching those of P. In addition, they used extracts from *Beatus Cyrillus* and *Quemadmodum* for their research purposes. Comparison of the excerpts revealed an ideological closeness expressed in similar lexical choices in places, but with different references to the biblical text. The most obvious example is the parallel between chap. 1§5 of *Beatus Cyrillus* (*hi sunt duo olivae et duo candelabra*) and ch. 5§2 of the *Moravian Legend* (*hi sunt duo luminaria*). P. Meyvaert and P. Devos noted that the first part of the *Moravian Legend* more closely resembled *Beatus Cyrillus* and the second – the *Quemadmodum*. The paralleled excerpts of texts led Meyvaert and Devos to conclude that the *ML* was the most recent of the Bohemian hagiographic legends composed of the motifs from the *IL*, the *Legenda Christiani*, the *Beatus Cyrillus* and the *Quemadmodum*. Despite Meyvaert and Devos's categorical tone, we should stress that the academic community was not unanimous in accepting this part of their study. In the following decades, the issue provoked an in-depth critical dialogue between Devos⁸⁷ and Ludvikovský⁸⁸. J. Ludvikovský, who studied

84 V. Chaloupecký, *Prameny...*, pp. 73–76.

85 Ibidem, p.78 and p. 501.

86 R. Urbánek, *Legenda t. zv. Kristiána ve vývoji předhusitských legend Ludmílských i Václavských a její autor*, Prague 1948, p. 137 and p. 143.

87 P. Devos, *Une mosaïque: la Légende morave des saints Cyrille et Méthode*, “Analecta Bollandiana” 1963, Vol. 81, pp. 229–251; idem, *La Passion de S. Liévin de Gand, source principale inattendue de “Beatus Cyrillus”*, “Analecta Bollandiana” 1971, Vol. 89, pp. 371–385.

88 J. Ludvikovský, *Legenda Beatus Cyrillus*, “Sborník Prací Filosofické Faculty Brněnské University” 1961 [1962], Vol. 10, No. 8, pp. 94–104; J. Ludvikovský, *Great Moravia tradition in the 10th century Bohemia and Legenda Christiani*, [in:] *Magna Moravia. Commentationes ad memo-*

the Bohemian Latin legends extensively, had a radically opposite opinion on the direction of influence and believed that the *ML* was older than *Beatus Cyrillus* and especially *Quemadmodum*. J. Ludvikovský considered the mention of Velehrad as the archepiscopal see of St Cyril and later of St Methodius as a hallmark of the late appearance of *Quemadmodum*. The Velehrad motif is absent from the *ML*. J. Ludvikovský explained the fact that the parts of the *Beatus Cyrillus* and the *Quemadmodum*, coinciding with those of the *Moravian Legend*, did not overlap with each other, by the difference in character between *Beatus Cyrillus* and *Quemadmodum* and the different intentions of their compilers⁸⁹. However, in 1965 Ludvikovský did not reject Meyvaert's and Devos's view that the *ML* had originated around the middle of the 14th century. And in 1967, he reported that after consulting photographs of manuscript 147 from the Kraków' Cathedral Chapter, he had found that in the late 13th – early 14th centuries an abridged version of the *ML* had been in use⁹⁰.

Nevertheless, Meyvaert's and Devos's hypothesis about the time interval in which the *ML* was composed aroused interest⁹¹. To determine the *terminus ante quem*, they used the oldest extant manuscript in which it appeared and analyzed its content. Codex 12 from the Metropolitan Chapter of Olomouc, used for the first time by J. Dobrovsky's edition of the *ML*, has a vine-leaf initial on fol. 1, which resembled the decoration on several manuscripts belonging to the Bishop of Prague, Jan IV of Dražice (1301–1343). The *ML* was copied on unpaginated folios at the end of the manuscript. The additions at the end of the manuscript also included the *Life of St Cordula* and an edict of certain Johannes. Czech editors have suggested that the edict may be attributed to either Jan VII Volek from 1349 or Jan of Středa from 1380⁹². For this reason, P. Meyvaert and P. Devos believed that, in the absence of more definitive evidence for a *terminus ante quem*, it was acceptable to point to the second half of the 14th century.

Despite their desire to define a more precise *terminus post quem*, we must agree with them and J. Ludvikovský that their attempts remain merely a hypothesis⁹³. P. Meyvaert and P. Devos attempted to link the appearance of the *Moravian Legend* to the Prague copy of Leo of Ostia's version of the *IL* and the cult of St Clement in Prague. They suggested the Dominicans in Prague, whose monastery's patron was St Clement of Rome, as the possible intermediaries

riam Missionis Byzantinae ante XI saecula in Moraviam adventus, ed. J. Macárek, Pragae 1965, pp. 525–566.

89 J. Ludvikovský, *Tempore Michaelis...*, p. 256.

90 Ibidem, p. 257.

91 P. Meyvaert, P. Devos, *La "Légende morave"...*, pp. 461–466.

92 Meyvaert and Devos cited V. Chaloupecký and R. Urbánek – cf. P. Meyvaert, P. Devos. *La "Légende morave"...*, p. 461 and 463.

93 Ibidem, pp. 468–469; J. Ludvikovský, *Tempore Michaelis...*, pp. 256–257.

for the arrival of the *IL* text. They even risked pointing to a single potentially accurate historical moment when this had happened, as well as a specific mediator. The quality of the text preserved in NXXIII encouraged them to suggest a direct connection with not just Italy, but even more specifically – with Velletri. Meyvaert and Devos believed that the very start of the fourteenth century was an opportune historical moment. In 1301–1302, the titular cardinal of Ostia and Velletri and former master general of the Dominican Order, Niccolò Bocassino (1240–1304), was sent by pope Boniface VIII as papal legate to Hungary. N. Bocassino had to persuade Vaclav II, king of Bohemia and Poland to withdraw his consent to the coronation of his son Vaclav III as king of Hungary. Meyvaert and Devos noted that the copious correspondence between the pope, his legate, the king of Bohemia and the bishop of Cracow attested to the events⁹⁴.

The exploration of the correspondence cited in the bibliography provides no information about N. Bocassino's stay in Prague⁹⁵. J. Ludvikovský objected to Meyvaert's and Devos's hypothesis and added that the correspondence proved Bocassino's stay in Hungary and Austria, but not in Bohemia. On the other hand, he stressed that the cult of St Clement was widespread all over Bohemia even in earlier times⁹⁶. Therefore, it seems reasonable to concede that establishing the exact time for the *IL*'s appearance in Prague is a complex task with an inconclusive result.

Despite the difficulty in establishing a precise chronology, the fine details specified in this final joint paper in terms of the textual relationships and manuscript tradition as well as the achievement of a general dating of the *ML*, are all among P. Meyvaert and P. Devos's more modest contributions.

As a result of this historiographical overview, we can summarize that the three articles published in 1955–1956 by P. Meyvaert and P. Devos represent a comprehensive study in which the Cyrillo-Methodian hagiographic dossier is situated in the context of the activities of Leo of Ostia and the effects of the dissemination of his redaction of the *IL*.

The appearance of these studies in a periodical such as the “*Analecta Bollandiana*” ensured their rapid and broad dissemination. P. Meyvaert and P. Devos' discoveries concerning the hagiographical record of Sts Cyril and Methodius are among the most significant ever made. P. Meyvaert and P. Devos supported E. Georgiev's hypothesis that the *IL* is an early work by Johannes Hymmonides and Gauderic of Velletri. They also refined the chronology proposed by E. Georgiev and narrowed the limits of *IL*'s composition most likely

94 P. Meyvaert, P. Devos, *La “Légende morave”*..., p. 468.

95 J. Emmler, *Regesta diplomatica nec non epistularia Bohemiae et Moraviae*. Vol. 2, Pragae 1892, pp. 811–843; A. Potthast, *Regesta pontificum Romanorum*. Vol. 2, Berolini 1875, pp. 2002–2021.

96 J. Ludvikovský, *Tempore Michaelis*..., *ibidem*.

between 876 and 880. This first version of *IL* has not reached us. Thanks to the Prague Metropolitan Chapter's manuscript NXXIII discovered by P. Meyvaert and published jointly with P. Devos, the existence of a second redaction of the *IL* by Leo of Ostia was established. Meyvaert and Devos researched and created the stemma of the main witnesses and the transcripts of A. Duchesne and J. Sirmond. Based on the Prague manuscript they clarified that the *Italian Legend* does not contradict the Slavonic hagiographies concerning the rank of St Cyril and St Methodius, who were not consecrated bishops when they first visited Rome. The scholars explained the influence of Leo of Ostia's works dedicated to St Clement and Sts Cyril and Methodius on the literary production in the benedictine monastery at Casauria – on the one hand, the *Translatio in insulam Piscariae* and, on the other – the *Chronicon* by Johannes Berardi. P. Meyvaert and P. Devos drew attention to research on the resumes of the *IL* included in the collections of *legendae novae* and the *Dominican lectionaries* of the 13th century.

Their outstanding achievements in the first two studies were due to their excellent knowledge of the historiography on the subject. The critical reading of J. Martinov's studies was particularly useful to them. They also relied on the catalogues of manuscripts and the achievements of the Bollandist A. Poncelet. The most controversial part of their effort is their third joint study, pertaining to the hagiographic part of the dossier of Sts Cyril and Methodius, formed in Bohemia. P. Meyvaert and P. Devos offered their interpretation of the links between the *ML*, the second redaction of the *IL* by Leo of Ostia and other Latin legends from this geographical area. Thus, they built a more comprehensive account of the hagiographical dossier of the holy brothers Cyril and Methodius, which improved on previous efforts, but remained inconclusive in some respects. The shortcomings were in large part due to the complex textual relationships and the unexplored manuscript tradition of the late legends of the saints.

P. Meyvaert and P. Devos's joint studies are a milestone in Cyrillo-Methodian studies because they closed the debate about the historical significance of the *IL*, its age and its relation to the Slavonic lives of Sts Cyril and Methodius.

In 1969, Ihor Ševčenko used a metaphor for the two ways of writing history⁹⁷. He likened some historians to butterflies and other to caterpillars. I. Ševčenko posited that the difference between the two types of historians was in how they viewed the subject of their research, their approach to their work, and the breadth of their horizon. In his view P. Meyvaert and P. Devos are among the historians whom he likened to caterpillars because they put together the facts and sought new contributions in restoring the past. Creating vivid history would be impossible was there not a solid amount of facts that could be proved.

97 I. Ševčenko, *Two Varieties of Historical Writing*, "History and Theory" 1969, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 332–345.

Continuing the metaphor, it can be argued that P. Meyvaert and P. Devos's work is indeed instructional for scholars in any age – for they exemplified the complex interplay between meticulous research and discovery, which remains a challenge at the hearth of our trade.

Bibliography

- Acherius L., *Veterum aliquot scriptorum qui in Galliae Bibliothecis, maxime Benedictorum latuerunt Specilegium*. Vol. 5, Parisiis 1661.
- Barlieva S., *Agiografskite tvorbi za sv. Kiril i Metodiy v Legenda aurea na Yakov Voraginski*, Sofia 1998.
- Barlieva S., *Kirilometodievski motivi v latinskata i gratskata knizhnina*, Sofia 2021.
- Barlieva S., *Latinsko stihotvorenje ot XII v. – oshte edin kirilo-metodievski izvor*, “Starobalgarska Literatura” 1998, Vol. 30, pp. 1–15.
- Batalova S., *Po sledite na bolandistite, ili za parvite prinosi v nauchnoto izsledvane na izvorite za zhivota i deloto na sv. Kiril i sv. Metodiy*, “Palaeobulgarica” 2022, Vol. 46, No. 1, pp. 95–162.
- Bil'basov V.A., *Kirill i Mefodij po zapadnym legendam*. Vol. 2, S. Peterburg 1871.
- Bodânskij O.M., *O vremeni proishozhdeniâ slavânskikh pismen*, Moskva 1855.
- Bodânskij O.M., *Slovo o prenesenii mošej sv. Klimenta Rimskago*, [in:] *Kirillo-Mefodievskij sbornik v pamât' o soveršeniâ tysâçiletii slavânskoj pis'menosti*, ed. M.P. Pogodin, Moskva 1865, pp. 319–326.
- Bollandus J., Henschenius G., Papebrochius D., *De sanctis Episcopis Slavorum Apostolis Cyrillo et Methodio Olomucii in Moravia*, [in:] *Acta Sanctorum. Martii tomus secundus*, Antverpiae 1668, col. 12–25.
- Bollandus J., Henschenius G., Papebrochius D., *Vita cum Translatione Sancti Clementis ex Ms. Francisci Duchesne V. CL*, [in:] *Acta Sanctorum. Martii tomus secundus*, Antverpiae 1668, col. 19–22.
- Boyle L., *Dominican Lectionaries and Leo of Ostia's Translatio S. Clementis*, “Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum” 1958, Vol. 28, pp. 362–394.
- Chaloupecký V., *Prameny X. století; Legendy Kristiánovy o Svátem Václavu a Svaté Ludmile*, Praha 1939.
- Devos P., *La Passion de S. Liévin de Gand, source principale inattendue de “Beatus Cyrillus”*, “Analecta Bollandiana” 1971, Vol. 89, pp. 371–385.
- Devos P., Meyvaert P., *La date de la première rédaction de la “Légende italique”*, [in:] *Cyrillo-Methodiana. Zur Frühgeschichte des Christentums bei den Slaven 863–1963*, eds. M. Hellmann, R. Olesch, B. Stasiewski, F. Zagiba, Köln–Graz 1964, pp. 57–71.
- Devos P., *Pourquoi l'Occident a-t-il si longtemps considéré Saint Constantin-Cyrille comme un évêque?*, “Kirilo-Metodievski Studii” 1987, Vol. 4, pp. 96–104.
- Devos P., *Textes dérivés de la “Légende italique”*, “Analecta Bollandiana” 1975, Vol. 93, pp. 261–268.

- Devos P., *Une mosaïque: la Légende morave des saints Cyrille et Méthode*, “Analecta Bollandiana” 1963, Vol. 81, pp. 229–251.
- Dobrovský J., *Cyrrill Und Method Der Slawen Apostel: Ein Historisch-Kritischer Versuch*, Prag 1823.
- Dobrovský J., *Mährische Legende von Cyrille und Method*, Prag 1826.
- Dujčev Iv., *La solution de quelques énigmes Cyrillo-Méthodiennes*, “Byzantion” 1954, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 303–307.
- Duychev I., *Devos P.*, [in:] *Kirilo-Metodievska entsiklopediya*. T. 1: A–Z, Sofia 1985, pp. 380–381.
- Elevterov S., “*Italianska legenda*” – neynata rakisna i istoricheska sadba, [in:] *Godishnik na Sofiyskiya universitet “Kliment Ohridski” Fakultet po slavyanski filologii*. Vol. 2: *Literaturoznanie*, Sofia 1989, pp. 1–63.
- Emmler J., *Regesta diplomatica nec non epistularia Bohemiae et Moraviae. Pars 2*, Praeae 1892.
- Friedrich J., *Ein Brief des Anastasius bibliothecarius an den Bischof Gaudericus von Velletri über die Abfassung der “Vita cum translatione s. Clementis Papae”*, [in:] *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse, Historische Klasse, Sitzung vom 2. Juli 1892*, München 1893, pp. 393–442.
- Fros H., *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina: Antiquae Et Mediae Aetatis: Novum Supplementum*, Bruxelles 1986.
- Georgiev E., *Italienische Legende*, Sofia 1939.
- Gorskij A.V., *O sv. Kirille i Mefodii*, “Moskvitânin” 1843, Vol. 6, pp. 405–434.
- Grégoire H., *Le mémoire des PP. Meyvaert et Devos sur la «Légende italique» des ss. Cyrille et Méthode*, “Byzantion” 1954, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 295–301.
- Grivec F., *Cyrrillo-Methodiana (1. Drêvo prahnêho – jagoda izgnila; 2. O Metodovem nomokanonu; 3. Praški rokapis Italske legende)*, “Slovo” 1957, No. 6–7–8, pp. 24–53.
- Grivec F., *Staroslovanski viri Italske legende Sv. Cirila in Metoda*, “Slavistična Revija” 1955, Vol. 8, pp. 261–264.
- Havlinka A., *Vlašská legenda o sv. Cyrillu a Methodu*, “Vlast” 1889, Vol. 11, No. 6(2), pp. 114–123.
- Ivanova M., *Tekstologicheski problemi v Prostrannoto zhitie na Konstantin-Kiril Filosof: Kirilo-Metodievski izvori*. T. 1. (= “Kirilo-Metodievski Studii”, Vol. 22), Sofia 2013.
- Jagič V., *Die neuesten Forschungen über die slavischen Apostel Cyrill und Methodius*, “Archiv für Slavische Philologie” 1880, Vol. 4, pp. 97–128, 297–316.
- Kliment Ohridski. Sabrani sacheninija*. Vol. 3, eds. B. Angelov, H. Kodov, Sofia 1973.
- Laehr G., *Die Briefe und Prologe des Bibliothekars Anastasius*, “Neuers Archiv der Gesellschaft für Ältere Deutsche Geschichtskunde” 1928, Vol. 47, pp. 416–468.
- Lavrovskij P., *Italianskaâ legenda*, “Žurnal Ministerstva Narodnogo Prosvâšeniâ” 1886, iul'-avgust, No. 246, pp. 17–59, 234–275.

- Ludvikovský J., *Great Moravia tradition in the 10th century Bohemia and Legenda Christiani*, [in:] *Magna Moravia. Commentationes ad memoriam Missionis Byzantinae ante XI saecula in Moraviam adventus*, ed. J. Macůrek, Pragae 1965, pp. 525–566.
- Ludvikovský J., *Legenda Beatus Cyrillus*, “Sbornik Prací Filosofické Faculty Brněnské University” 1961 [1962], Vol. 10, No. 8, pp. 94–104,
- Ludvikovský J., *Tempore Michaelis imperatoris – Legenda Moravica*, [in:] *Magnae Moraviae fontes historici*. Vol. 2, Brno 1967, pp. 255–268.
- Martinov J., *A propos de la légende dite italique*, “Revue des Questions Historiques” 1887, No. 41, p. 220–232.
- Martinov J., *La légende dite italique des saints Cyrille et Méthode*, “Revue des Questions Historiques” 1884, No. 36, pp. 110–166.
- Meyvaert P., Devos P., *Trois énigmes cyrillo-méthodiennes de la “Légende Italique” résolues grâce à un document inédit*, “Analecta Bollandiana” 1955, Vol. 73, pp. 375–461.
- Meyvaert P., Devos P., *Autour de Léon d’Ostie et de sa Translatio S. Clementis (Légende italique des ss. Cyrille et Méthode)*, “Analecta Bollandiana” 1956, Vol. 74, 1–2, pp. 189–240.
- Meyvaert P., Devos P., *La “Légende morave” des SS. Cyrille et Méthode et ses sources*, “Analecta Bollandiana” 1956, Vol. 74, pp. 441–470.
- Meyvaert P., *Jeffrey’s Story: The Autobiography of Paul J. Meyvaert*, Tempe 2005.
- Milev A., *Dva latinski izvora za zhivota i deloto na Konstantin Kiril Filosof*, [in:] *Konstantin Kiril Filosof. Yubileen sbornik po sluchay 1100 godishninata ot smartta mu*, ed. B. Angelov et al., Sofia 1969, pp. 181–201.
- Milev A., *Italianskata legenda v nova svetlina*, “Istoricheski Pregled” 1956, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 74–79.
- Muratori L.A., *Chronicon Casauriense, sive Historia monasterii Casauensis Ordinis S. Benedicti, a Ludovico II imperatore anno D. 866 conditi auctore Iohanne Berardi eiusdem coenobii monacho, ab eius origine usque ad annum MCLXXXII quo scriptor florebat, deducta, atque antea partim a Du-Chesnio, et Ughellio, partim a Dacherio edita, nunc autem in unum collecta, et ordinata, atque insigni mole Chartarum nondum editarum, e Christianissimi Regis Bibliotheca depromptarum locupletata. Additamentum ad Chronicon Casauriense nunc primum edita ex manuscripto codice Regiae Parisienses Bibliothecae*. [in:] idem, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*. Vol. 2. 2, Mediolani 1726, col. 767–1018.
- Ommundsen Å., *A New Manuscript Source for the Legend of Saint Clement in Denmark*, “The Journal of Medieval Latin” 2020, Vol. 30, pp. 227–256.
- Pekář J., *Die Wenzels-und Ludmila-Legenden und die Echtheit Christians*, Prag 1906.
- Perels E., Laehr G., *Anastasio Bibliothecarii epistolae sive praefationes 15*. [in:] *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*. Vol. 7: *Epistolae Karolini aevi 5*, Berlin 1928, pp. 436–438.
- Podlaha A., *Soupis rukopisů Knihovny Metropolitní kapitoly pražské*. Vol. 2: *F–P*, Praha 1922.

- Poncelet A. and Bollandists, *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina Antiquae Et Mediae Aetatis*. Vol. 1: A–I., Bruxelles 1898.
- Poncelet A., *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum Latinorum Bibliothecae Vaticanae*, Bruxelles 1910.
- Poncelet A., *Le Légendier de Pierre Calo*, “*Analecta Bollandiana*” 1910, Vol. 29, pp. 5–116.
- Potthast A., *Regesta pontificum Romanorum*, Vol. 2, Berolini 1875.
- Rondinini Ph., *De S. Clemente papa et martyre ejusque basilica in urbe Roma libri duo*, Romae 1706.
- Ševčenko I., *Two Varieties of Historical Writing*, “*History and Theory*” 1969, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 332–345.
- Snopek F., *O působnosti slovanských apoštolů v Čechách a o křestu Bořivojově*, “*Časopis Katolického Duhovenstva*” 1921, No. 3–4, pp. 71–77.
- Tadin M., *La Légende intitulée Translatio corporis sancti Clementis*, Paris 1955.
- Teodorov-Balan A., *Kiril i Metodi*. Vol. 2, Sofia 1934.
- Urbánek R., *Legenda t. zv. Kristiána ve vývoji předhusitských legend Ludmilských i Václavských a její autor*, Praha 1948.
- Viktorov A., *Kirill i Mefodij. Novye istočniki i učenye trudy dlâ istorii slavânskih apostolov*, [in:] *Kirillo-Mefodievskij sbornik v pamât' o soveršeniâ tysâčiletii slavânskoj pis'menosti*, ed. M.P. Pogodin, Moskva 1865, pp. 343–440.
- Voronov A., *Glavnejšie istočniki dlâ istorii sv. Sv. Kirilla i Mefodiâ*, Kiev 1877.
- Zanetti U., *Le Père Paul Devos*, “*Analecta Bollandiana*” 1995, Vol. 113, pp. 241–257.