




Piotr Czarnecki (Kraków)

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4155-4918>

## THE DOCTRINE OF THE *ORDO SCLAVONIAE* IN LIGHT OF WESTERN SOURCES AND THE ISSUE OF THE ORIGINS OF THE DUALIST HERESY IN BOSNIA

**Abstract.** The issue of the Bosnian church – or more precisely the dualist heresy in Bosnia – has caused serious controversies among scholars since the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The main aim of this paper is to shed new light on this controversial issue, through the analysis of the doctrine of Slavonic dualism (*ordo Sclavoniae*) based on Western sources. The subject of the analysis will be the sources concerning the contacts of the Cathars from France and Italy with the heretics from *Sclavonia* and especially the sources containing information on the doctrine, such as the 13<sup>th</sup>-century Italian sources presenting the doctrines of the Cathars belonging to *ordo Sclavoniae* (Cathar churches of Bagnolo and March de Treviso) and later, 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup>-century sources presenting the teachings of the heretics from Bosnia.

The aim of the analysis will be to reconstruct the doctrines of Slavonic dualism (*ordo Sclavoniae*) in order to find its distinctive features (especially comparing with two main forms of Bogomil-Cathar dualism – Bulgarian and Drugunthian) and to answer the following question: which doctrinal conceptions had the most significant influence on its formation? Knowledge concerning the sources of inspiration for the dualist doctrine of the *ordo Sclavoniae* will enable us to draw conclusions concerning the origins of Slavonic dualism, its evolution and to assume an attitude towards scholars' conceptions concerning the character of the Bosnian heresy.

**Keywords:** Bosnian Church, Medieval dualism, Catharism, Bogomilism

The issue of the Bosnian Church has caused serious controversies among scholars for a long time. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the Croatian historian Franjo Rački – based on Eastern and Western sources – concluded that this church was dualistic and emerged under the Bogomil influence<sup>1</sup>. Such an approach was later accepted in the 20<sup>th</sup> century by many other scholars from the Balkans and from Western Europe, such as Konstantin Jireček, Franjo Šanjek or Jean Duvernoy, who gathered many new source arguments to support their arguments for a dualist

<sup>1</sup> F. RAČKI, *Bogomili i patareni*, RJAZU 7, 1869, p. 84–179; 8, 1869, p. 121–187; 10, 1870, p. 160–263.

interpretation<sup>2</sup>. This interpretation also has its supporters today. Contemporary scholars like Zdenko Zlatar, Thomas Butler or Georgi Minczew, for example, still uncover dualist elements in vast source material concerning the Bosnian Church, both from Bosnia and from the Cathar West<sup>3</sup>. The interpretation proposed by Franjo Rački – apart from its supporters – has also found an equally numerous group of detractors, who deny the dualist character of the Bosnian Church, claiming that its origins were Eastern Orthodox (for example, V. Glušac, M. Miletić, D. Dragojlović)<sup>4</sup> or Catholic (for example, J. Šidak, C. Truhelka, L. Petrović)<sup>5</sup>. Undoubtedly, the most commonly known and influential adversary of the dualistic interpretation of the Bosnian Church is the American scholar John V.A. Fine. In his work *The Bosnian Church*, published for the first time in 1975, he tried to prove a thesis according to which the Bosnian Church was a schismatic monastic community with Catholic origins. He not only denied the dualistic character of the Bosnian Church but also downplayed the significance of Bogomilism in Bulgaria and, more broadly, in the Balkans<sup>6</sup>. Between these two opposing interpretations we can also find scholars (such as D. Mandić, M. Lambert or T. Mudry), who promote the middle way. Although they do not perceive the Bosnian Church as a dualist community, they do not deny the existence of the dualist heresy in Bosnia<sup>7</sup>.

The issue of the character of the Bosnian Church is not the only source of controversy among the scholars. The supporters of the dualist option propose many different conceptions concerning the issue of the origins of this dualism, i.e. various answers to the question: where did these dualistic ideas come from? According to the first conception, formulated in the 1860s by Franjo Rački – later shared by Dimitri Obolensky and Dominik Mandić, and nowadays by Paul Louis Thomas

<sup>2</sup> K. JIREČEK, *Istoriya Srba*, vol. IV, trans. J. RADONIĆ, Beograd 1922, p. 182; F. ŠANJEK, *Les Chrétiens bosniaques et le mouvement cathare XII<sup>e</sup>–XV<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paris 1976; J. DUVERNOY, *L'histoire des cathares*, Toulouse 1979, p. 47–72.

<sup>3</sup> Z. ZLATAR, *The Haeresis of the Bosnian Church: une question mal posee*, Here 46–47, 2007, p. 81–120; T. BUTLER, *Les chretiens bosniennes*, [in:] *1209–2009 Cathares. Une histoire à pacifier?*, ed. A. BRENON, Loubatieres 2010, p. 109–116; G. MINCZEW, *John the Water-Bearer (Иванъ Водоносьць)*. *Once Again on Dualism in the Bosnian Church*, SCer 10, 2020, p. 415–424.

<sup>4</sup> В. ГЛУШАЦ, *Средњовековна 'босанска црква' била је православна*, Београд 1924; М. МИЛЕТИЋ, *I krstjani di Bosnia alla luce dei loro monumenti di pietra*, Roma 1957; Д. ДРАГОЈЛОВИЋ, *Krstjani u jeretичка црква босанска*, Београд 1987.

<sup>5</sup> J. ŠIDAK, *Problem bosanske crkve u našoj historiografiji od Petranovića do Gluša. (Prilog rješenju tzv. Bogomilskog pitanja)*, RJAZU 259, 1937, p. 37–182; Ć. TRUHELKA, *Bosanska narodna (patarenska) crkva*, [in:] *Povijest hrvatskih zemalja Bosne i Hercegovine od najstarijih vremena do godine 1463. Knjiga prva*, Sarajevo 1942, p. 767–793; L. PETROVIĆ, *Kršćani bosanske crkve*, Sarajevo 1999, p. 15.

<sup>6</sup> J.V.A. FINE, *The Bosnian Church. A New Interpretation*, New York–London 1975. On the criticism of Fine's interpretation cf., for example, Z. ZLATAR, *The haeresis...*, p. 91–96; F. ŠANJEK, *Chrétiens bosniens: un amalgame de catharisme et de valdéisme*, SIOc 16, 2003, p. 95.

<sup>7</sup> D. MANDIĆ, *Bogomilska crkva bosanskih krstjana*, Chicago 1962; M. LAMBERT, *Le probleme des chretiens bosniaques*, "Heresis" 23, 1994, p. 29–50; T. MUDRY, *Histoire de la Bosnie-Herzegovine – Faits et controversies*, Paris 1999, p. 257–263.

– the Bogomil dualist ideas were brought to Bosnia by the heretics expelled from Serbia by Stephen Nemanja at the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> century<sup>8</sup>. A different direction of the flow of dualistic ideas was proposed in the 1970s by the Croatian scholar F. Šanjek who claimed that Bogomil dualism first came from Byzantium to Dalmatia, where the heretical church of Dalmatia (*Ecclesia Dalmatiae*) was formed, and at the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> century, the Dalmatian heretics expelled by the church authorities brought the dualist heresy to Bosnia<sup>9</sup>. Also in the case of the origins of Bosnian dualism, apart from the supporters of the Serbian and Dalmatian theories we also have scholars who propose the middle way (such as M. Lambert, T. Butler or M. Lorenz), and claim that the dualist ideas may have arrived in Bosnia from these two directions independently<sup>10</sup>.

As we can see, there are many controversies concerning the Bosnian Church. The Bosnian sources are not especially numerous, and they do not provide any precise information concerning both controversial issues: the character of the Bosnian church and the origins of the Bosnian dualism. In such a situation, it is not surprising that scholars have used Western sources since the 19<sup>th</sup> century (beginning with Rački), which contain many important testimonies about the Bosnian Church, with which the Cathars had contacts. Nevertheless, the scholars rather rarely focus their attention on the doctrinal issues and do not make attempts to reconstruct the doctrine of the dualist heresy in Bosnia. Such a reconstruction could shed new light on the above-mentioned controversial issues and give answers to many important questions. Therefore, it is worth taking another look at the sources – both Western and Bosnian – containing information about the doctrine of the dualist heresy in Bosnia to find the answers to important questions: first, was there a specific doctrine of the Bosnian dualism and secondly, if so, can we find then in it the influences of the earlier Bogomil or Cathar doctrinal conceptions? A closer analysis of the Bosnian doctrines and especially a comparison with other dualist conceptions will also let us to answer the question of whether the sources describing the Bosnian dualism are credible, i.e. if their authors indeed present some specific version of the dualistic doctrine, characteristic only to Bosnia, or if they only repeat the concepts contained in the polemical sources – anti-Cathar and anti-Bogomil. Answering this question will let us determine how probable the existence of the heresy in Bosnia was. The comparison of the doctrines, on the other hand, will also let us discover the sources of Bosnian dualism, and to verify the above-mentioned conceptions of the scholars.

<sup>8</sup> F. RAČKI, *Bogomili...*, p. 377–378; D. OBOLENSKY, *The Bogomils*, Cambridge 1948, p. 283–284; D. MANDIĆ, *Bogomilska...*, p. 130–132; P.L. THOMAS, *L'église médiévale de Bosnie était-elle dualiste?*, *SlOc* 16, 2003, p. 118.

<sup>9</sup> F. ŠANJEK, *Les Chrétiens bosniaques...*, p. 39–45.

<sup>10</sup> M. LAMBERT, *The Cathars*, Oxford 1998, p. 299; T. BUTLER, *Les chrétiens...*, p. 110–113; M. LORENZ, *Bogumili, katari i bosanski krstjani. Transfer dualističkih hereza između istoka i zapada (11–13 stoljeće)*, *HTra* 15, 2015, p. 46–48.

From the beginning, it should be underlined that from the point of view of the Western sources, the existence of the dualism in Bosnia is obvious and beyond any doubt. At the beginning of the 13<sup>th</sup> century, the *De heresi catharorum in Lombardia*, which describes the events in Italian Catharism that took place between the Saint-Felix council in 1167 and the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> century, says that the newly elected bishops of two Italian Cathar churches – that of Bagnolo (Caloianes) and that of the March of Treviso (Nicola) had gone to *Sclavonia* for ordination<sup>11</sup>. This information is very important because it shows that *Sclavonia* was one of the crucial centers of medieval Bogomil dualism, exactly like Bulgaria and Drugonthia. Another significant source, which speaks about the contacts of the Cathars (this time from France) with Bosnia is the letter of the papal legate – cardinal Conrad of Porto from 1223. He writes about the heretical pope who acts in the regions of Bosnia, Croatia and Dalmatia, where the Cathars escape. This anti-pope established his representative in Languedoc, a certain Bartholemew of Carcassone, whose authority was recognized by one of the southern French Cathar bishops – Vigorosus de Baconia<sup>12</sup>.

Around 1250, the church of *Sclavonia* was mentioned by a well-informed Italian inquisitor, Rainer Sacchoni (a former Cathar perfect for 17 years) who in his polemical work mentions all the dualist communities in existence at that time<sup>13</sup>. *Tractatus de hereticis*, written in the 1260s, most probably by another experienced Italian inquisitor – Anselm of Alessandria – presents a short history of medieval

<sup>11</sup> *De heresi catharorum in Lombardia*, ed. A. DONDAINE, AFP 19, 1949 (cetera: *De heresi*), p. 308: *Item quidam de mantua cum suis sequacibus elegerunt quemdam nomine Caloianem sibi in episcopum et, eo in Sclavenia misso, post receptionem ordinis, episcopatus officio super eos functus est. Eodem itaque modo, quidam alius, Nicola nomine, a congregatione vincentiorum electus et in Sclavania ad ordinem recipiendum missus, post reditum ab eis, episcopus teneretur.*

<sup>12</sup> *Archiepiscopi Rotomagensis ad suffraganeos, quibus mandatum Conradi Portuensis episcopi & A.S.L. significat conveniendi senonas adversus Bartholomeum, Albigenium episcopum*, ed. J.D. MANSI, [in:] *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et amplissima collectio*, vol. XXII, ed. IDEM, Venetiis 1778, col. 1204: *Ecce quod vidimus in finibus Brunarum, Croatie et Dalmatie, juxta Hungariam nationem, ut per antipapam moras antichristi de cetero breviores esse minime dubitetur, dum novus lucifer novae arrogantiae fellibus intumescens sedem suam contendit ponere in lateribus aquilonis, non tam ut sit similis altissimo apostolorum principis successori, quam ut ipsum cum universali ecclesia deprimat et annullat. Hinc est quod papa perfidiae, qui maceram vineae Domini sabaoth jam pro magna parte dedit in direptionem et singularis ferus stineam depascitur et conculcat: ad eum confluent Albigenes, ut ad eorum consulta respondeat, ejus inhiantes doctrinis et eius damnati sectae judicia complectentes. Iste satanas quemdam sue perversitatis hominem usque in Agenum diocesim diffamavit, nomine Bartholomaeum Carcensem. Est enim de Carcassona oriundus, vices illius agentem, ut illis corruptis partibus propinetur uberius fel draconis in calicis Baylonis. Cui Bartholomaeo Vigorosus de Bathona haereticorum episcopus funestam exhibendo reverentiam, sedem et locum suum concessit in villa quae dicitur Pojors et seipsum transtulit in partes Tholosanas.*

<sup>13</sup> *Summa Fratris Raineri de ordine fratrum praedicatorum, de Catharis et Pauperibus de Lugduno*, [in:] *Un Traité Neo-Manicheen du 13 siècle, Le Liber de duobus principiis suivi d'un fragment de Rituel Cathare*, ed. A. DONDAINE, Roma 1939 (cetera: *Summa Fratris Raineri*), p. 70.

dualism, where Bosnia is also mentioned<sup>14</sup>. The author of this work says that the dualist heresy was brought from Constantinople by the Bosnian merchants who, after the return to their homeland, had established the heretic church of *Sclavonia*, or of Bosnia<sup>15</sup>.

As the sources show us, the contacts of the Cathars with the *Ecclesia Sclavoniae* lasted till the end of Catharism. From the letter of Pope John XXII to the Bosnian ban Stefan Kotromanić from 1325, we learn that the heretics (as we may suppose – Cathars) escape to Bosnia in significant numbers<sup>16</sup>. This information is also confirmed by the testimony of the Piedmont heretic Jacob Bech, from 1388, who told the inquisitors that Bosnia was the last center of heresy, where one could learn the dualist doctrine<sup>17</sup>. It seems that the heresy in Bosnia indeed survived much longer than in the West because it was mentioned by the popes of the 15<sup>th</sup> century who underlined that it was dualistic in nature. Eugene IV in a letter to Thomas, bishop of Hvar, says openly that the Bosnians believed in two principles – good and evil – perceived the devil as equal to God and rejected the Old Testament<sup>18</sup>. A similar account can be found in the scriptures of Pius II (1458–1464), who calls the Bosnian heretics Manichaeans<sup>19</sup>.

Of course, one may ask a question: do all the above-mentioned sources indeed tell us about Bosnia because some of them use a much less obvious name – the Church of *Sclavonia* (*Ecclesia Sclavoniae*)? The solution to this problematic issue,

<sup>14</sup> More on this source cf.: A. DONDAINE, *La hiérarchie cathare en Italie II*, AFP 20, 1950, p. 235–239.

<sup>15</sup> *Tractatus de Hereticis*, ed. A. DONDAINE, AFP 20, 1950 (cetera: *Tractatus de Hereticis*), p. 308: *Postea quidam de Sclavonia, scilicet de terra que dicitur Bossona, iverunt Constantinopolim causa mercationis; reversi ad terram suam predicaverunt et multiplicati constituerunt episcopum, qui dicitur episcopus Sclavonie sive Bossona.*

<sup>16</sup> *Stephanum principem Bosnensem, catholicum, rogat ut ex partibus regni sui haereticos expellat, haeresim extirpet*, [in:] *Acta Ioannis XXII (1317–1334)*, vol. VII, ed. A.L. TAUTU, Vaticano 1952, p. 160: [...] *magna haereticorum caterva de multis et variis partibus congregata ad principatum Bosnensem, sub fiducia ibi seminandi obscoenos errores tuteque ibidem moriandi, confluit, qui antiqui hostis imbuti versutia ac veneno suae falsitatis armati, catholicorum animas, sub simplicitatis simulatae fallacia, praetensa sed falsa christiani nominis professionie corrumpunt [...].*

<sup>17</sup> *Processus contra valdenses in Lombardia superiori anno 1387*, ed. G. AMATI, ASI 39, 1865, p. 53: *Item dicit dictus Iacobus deponens quod modo sunt decem anni vel circa quod fuit missus per Petrum Patritii predictum in Sclavonia pro doctrina predicta integraliter addiscenda et perfecte a magistris ibidem commorantibus in loco qui dicitur Boxena [...].*

<sup>18</sup> *Thomas ep. Phariensis XVIII*, [in:] *Illyricum Sacrum*, vol. IV, ed. D. FARLATI, Venetiis 1769, p. 257–258: *Hi sunt qui Diabolo parem omnipotenti Deo exhibent principatum, duo ponentes prima principia, unum malorum, alterum bonorum: hi sunt damnatores veteris testamenti, mutilatores et corruptores novi; hi sunt qui nuptias damnant, qui cibos a Deo ad usum hominum creatos immundos affirmant [...].*

<sup>19</sup> *Cosmographia Pii Papae in Asiae & Europae eleganti descriptione*, Parisiis 1509, p. 103: *In hac regione quam plurimi heretici possunt quos vocant Manicheos pessimum genus hominum, qui duo principia rerum produunt: alterum malorum alterum bonorum. Nec primatum Romanae ecclesiae tenent, neque Christum aequalem consubstantiali patri esse fatent [...].*

based on the testimony of solid source material, was proposed in the 1970s by Franjo Šanjek. He noticed that in the account of the Cathar council in St-Felix-de-Caraman in 1167 – so it is older than all the above-mentioned sources – the Bogomil bishop of Constantinople, Nicetas, did not mention the Church of Bosnia or *Sclavonia* in his sermon concerning the organization of the dualist communities in the East<sup>20</sup>. He mentioned only the Church of Dalmatia, which – according to Šanjek – was later transferred to Bosnia because the name *Ecclesia Dalmatiae* disappears in the later sources for the name *Ecclesia Sclavoniae*<sup>21</sup>. What should be underlined here is that this conception is not only a hypothesis, but it is based on convincing source arguments. Based on the letters of Innocent III, Šanjek noticed that in 1200 Bernard, the archbishop of Split, expelled heretics from his city who were called Patarenes or the Cathars; they were later received in Bosnia by ban Kulin who, according to the sources, accepted the heresy with his subjects<sup>22</sup>. The abjuration of the heresy by ban Kulin at Bilino Polje in 1203 in the presence of the papal legate John de Casamaris is another argument confirming the existence of the dualist heresy in Bosnia, according to scholars<sup>23</sup>. In this document the Bosnians promise that they would read the Old Testament alongside the New, that they would have altars and crosses in their churches, that they would receive the Holy Communion, and that they would not accept Manichaeans<sup>24</sup>.

<sup>20</sup> *Charte de Niquinta, antipape des heretiques surnommés d'Albigeois*, ed. D. ZBIRAL, [in:] *1209–2009 Cathares...*, p. 47: *Post haec vero Papa Niquinta dixit ecclesie Tolosane: Vos dixistis mihi ut ego dicam vobis consuetudines primitivarum ecclesiarum sint leves aut graves et ego dicam vobis: Septem ecclesie Asiae fuerunt divisas et terminatas inter illas et nulla illarum faciebat ad aliam aliquam rem ad suam contradicionem. Et ecclesia Romanae et Drogometie et Melenguie et Bulgarie et Dalmaciae sunt divisas et terminatas [...]*.

<sup>21</sup> F. ŠANJEK, *Les Chrétiens bosniaques...*, p. 20–27.

<sup>22</sup> INNOCENTIUS III PAPA, *Hemmerado, regi Hungarorum*, [in:] *PL*, vol. CCXIV, ed. J.P. MIGNE, Paris 1890, col. 872: *Accepimus autem, quod cum nuper venerabilis frater noster Spalatensis archiepiscopus Patarenos non paucos de Spalatensi et Traguriensi civitatibus effugasset, nobilis vir Culinus banus Bossinus iniquitati eorum non solum tutum latibulum, sed et presidium contulit manifestum, et perversitati eorundem terram suam et se ipsum exponens ipsos pro catholicis, immo ultra catholicos honoravit, vocans eos antonomasice christianos. INNOCENTIUS III PAPA, B. Spalatensi archiepiscopo et I. Capellano pontificio, ut de fide catholica in terra Culini Bani Bossini inquirant et reformanda reformant*, [in:] *Vetera Monumenta Slavorum Meridionalium historiam illustrantia*, vol. I, ed. A. THEINER, Roma 1863; p. 15: *Cum igitur in terra nobilis viri Culini Bani, quorundam hominum multitudo moretur, qui de damnata catharorum heresi sunt vehementer suspecti et graviter infamati.*

<sup>23</sup> F. ŠANJEK, *Les Chrétiens bosniaques...*, p. 43–44; D. KNIEVALD, *Vjerodostojnost latinskih izvora o bosanskim krstjanima*, RJAZU 270, 1949, p. 129; J. HAMILTON, B. HAMILTON, *Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World, c. 650 – c. 1450*, Manchester–New York 2013, p. 47–48; T. BUTLER, *Les chretiens...*, p. 112–113.

<sup>24</sup> *Abiuracija na Bolinu Polju 1203*, ed. D. KNIEVALD, [in:] *IDEM, Vjerodostojnost latinskih izvora... (ce-tera: Abiuracija na Bolinu Polju)*, p. 127: *Nos priores illorum hominum, qui hactenus singulariter Christiani nominis prerogativa vocati sumus, in territorio Bosne [...]; Abiuracija na Bolinu Polju*, p. 128: [...]  
*libros tam novi, quam veteris testamenti, sicut facit Ecclesia Romana, legemus. [...]* *In omnibus ecclesis*



The combination of the rejection of the Old Testament and Catholic sacraments and of the iconoclasm together with the whole context of the abjuration as described by the sources convinces us that we are dealing with the dualist heresy here. The problem is that we do not know exactly which form of dualism it was; it means we do not know if the Bosnian heretics professed a radical dualism of two opposed principles or the moderate one and we also do not know to what extent this dualism was similar to the Bogomil and Cathar doctrines. It should be noted that this is a problem of all the Bosnian sources; the situation looks similar in the case of the collection of Radoslav the Christian, known from the 15<sup>th</sup> century manuscript, the prototype of which emerged at the turn the 13<sup>th</sup> century<sup>25</sup> (according to Rački and Šajek). This source shows us that we are dealing with the Bogomil-Cathar type of dualism because it contains the first part of the heretical baptism with the Holy Spirit. Nevertheless, we also do not find any additional information here concerning the type of dualism<sup>26</sup>.

As we can see, based on the joint testimony of the Western and the Bosnian sources, we can conclude that dualism in Bosnia undoubtedly existed. Trying to determine what kind of dualism it was (and this is necessary when we want to say something about its origins), we have to focus on the Western sources, especially those which describe the doctrines of the Cathars professing "Slavonic" doctrines. Such sources can be found mainly in Italy, where – as it was mentioned above – the leaders of two Cathar churches went to *Sclavonia* for ordination at the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> century. In the case of France, the relations with *Sclavonia* are not mentioned before the letter of Conrad of Porto. Moreover, the relations of the French Cathars with Bosnia not only emerged late, but were also very limited. Meanwhile, in the Italian sources, we can find many important mentions about the doctrines of the Cathars belonging to the *ordo Sclavoniae*. But what exactly was this *ordo Sclavoniae*? Rainer Sacchoni, the best-informed Italian inquisitor, who knew Catharism from the perspective of an insider, enlists all the dualist communities (Bogomil and Cathar), which existed in his times, and at the end he says that all of them have roots in one of two crucial churches – the church of Bulgaria and the church of Drugonthia<sup>27</sup>. Indeed, if we take a look at the other sources we will find many mentions about two opposing orders – *ordo Bulgariae* and *ordo Drugonthiae*, whose representatives openly competed and even condemned one

---

*habebimus altaria et cruces [...] Per singula loca habebimus sacerdotes, qui dominicis, et festivis diebus adminus missas secundum ordinem ecclesiasticum debeant celebrare, confessiones audire et penitentias tribuere. [...] Septies in anno ad minus Corpus Domini de manu sacerdotis accipiemus [...].*

<sup>25</sup> F. RAČKI, *Dva nova priloza za poviest bosanskih patarena*, Star 14, 1882, p. 23; F. ŠANJEK, *Les Chrétiens bosniaques...*, p. 193.

<sup>26</sup> F. ŠANJEK, *L'initiation cathare dans l'Occident médiéval*, Here 5, 1985, p. 23; IDEM, *Les Chrétiens bosniaques...*, p. 192–193.

<sup>27</sup> *Summa Fratris Raineri*, p. 70: [...] *Ecclesia Bulgariae et Ecclesia Drugonthiae. Et omnes habuerunt originem de duabus ultimis.*

another<sup>28</sup>. *Ordo Bulgariae*, represented in Italy by the church of Concorezzo was a Bulgarian doctrinal order, moderately dualistic, which assumed the existence of only one God – the creator of the angels and of four material elements. In this option, Satan, the fallen angel, was only a maker, a demiurge, who formed the visible world from the matter created by God because he himself did not have the power of creation<sup>29</sup>. *Ordo Drugonthiae* – in Italy professed by the church of Desenzano – was a radical form of the Bogomil dualism, which emerged under the Paulician influence, according to Bernard Hamilton<sup>30</sup>. Its foundation was the belief in two equally powerful and co-eternal gods: the good one who was the creator of the angels and the whole spiritual world; and the evil one, the creator of matter<sup>31</sup>. The doctrines of the two main orders – *ordo Bulgariae* and *ordo Drugonthiae* – are presented very precisely in the sources, but in the case of the *ordo Sclavoniae* the situation looks completely different. The descriptions of this doctrine in the sources are imprecise, ambiguous and it is usually described by the relations to the two main orders, which may suggest that the doctrine of the *ordo Sclavoniae* was an eclectic mix of the Bulgarian and Drugonthian elements, rather than original theological conception<sup>32</sup>. The additional problem is that although the sources identify the adherents of the *ordo Bulgariae* with the members of the church of Concorezzo (*Concorezzenses*), and the adherents of the *ordo Drugonthiae* with the members of the church of Desenzano (also called *Albanenses*), the adherents of the *ordo Sclavoniae* are identified with the *Bagnolenses*. This creates chaos because from the above-mentioned *De heresi*, we learn that the faith from *Sclavonia* was professed not only by the bishop Caloianes of Bagnolo, but also by Nicola, the bishop of the March of Treviso. Thus, trying to reconstruct the

<sup>28</sup> More on the competition between the *Ordo Bulgariae* and *Ordo Drugonthiae* in France cf.: DURANDUS DE HUESCA, *Liber contra manicheos*, [in:] *Une somme anti-cathare. Le Liber contra Manicheos de Durand de Huesca*, ed. C. THOUZELLIER, Louvain 1964 [= SSLo, 32], p. 138–139: *Nonnulli enim eorum obediunt Grecis hereticis, alii autem Bulgaris et alii Drogovetis. Et ita capita divisa gerentes caudas habent ad invicem colligatas, et ita regnum eorum divisum est et corruptum, et ita teste Christo desolatione dignissimum, et ideo non est Christi*. For Italy cf., for example, *De heresi*, p. 306; *Tractatus de hereticis*, p. 309; *Summa Fratris Raineri*, p. 77: *Item omnes ecclesiae Catharorum se recipiunt ad invicem licet habeant diversas et contrarias opiniones, praeter Albanenses et Concorezzenses, qui se damnant adinvicem*.

<sup>29</sup> On the doctrine of the church of Concorezzo cf.: *De heresi*, p. 310; *Summa Fratris Raineri*, p. 76; MONETA DE CREMONA, *Adversus Catharos et Valdenses libri quinque*, ed. T.A. RICCHINI, Roma 1743 (cetera: MONETA DE CREMONA), p. 109–110; JACOBUS DE CAPELLIS, *Disputationes nonnullae adversus haereticos*, ed. D. BAZZOCCHI, [in:] *L'eresia catara. Appendice*, Bologna 1920 (cetera: JACOBUS DE CAPELLIS), p. XVII.

<sup>30</sup> B. HAMILTON, *The Origins of the Dualist Church of Drugunthia*, ECR 6, 1974, p. 115–124.

<sup>31</sup> On the doctrine of the church of Deseznano cf.: *De heresi*, p. 309; *Summa Fratris Raineri*, p. 71; MONETA DE CREMONA, p. 3–4.

<sup>32</sup> Cf.: *Tractatus de Hereticis*, p. 313: *Opinio begnolensium triplex est. Nam aliqui tenent cum illis de Concorezzo, aliqui tenent quod tenent Albanenses, aliqui tenent mediam viam*; cf. also: *Brevis Summula*, ed. A. MOLINIER, AMi 22, 1910 (cetera: *Brevis Summula*), p. 213–216; *Summa Fratris Raineri*, p. 77.



doctrine of the *ordo Sclavoniae*, we should analyze the doctrines of two Italian Cathar churches: that of Bagnolo and that of the March of Treviso.

In the case of the church of Bagnolo, important information is provided by one of the oldest sources – the *De heresi catharorum in Lombardia*. It does not describe the most distinctive elements of the doctrine such as the theology and cosmology, but nevertheless tells us that the church of Bagnolo professed faith in only one God, as did the church of Concorezzo, which is a consequence of the fact that the first bishop of Bagnolo, Caloiannes made peace with Garattus, the bishop of Concorezzo<sup>33</sup>. This description of the doctrine of the church of Bagnolo brought from *Sclavonia* confirms the opinion of scholars such as F. Šanjek or B. Hamilton who claim that, at least in the first period, the doctrine of the Slavonic dualists from Dalmatia and Bosnia was moderately dualistic<sup>34</sup>. The subsequent description of the *De heresi* (and other Italian sources) shows us that it was not a clear version of the *ordo Bulgariae*. The specificity of the *ordo Sclavoniae* manifested itself on the level of anthropology and Christology. In the doctrine of the church of Bagnolo, there were three versions of the anthropological doctrine, out of which only one was common with the church of Concorezzo (and consequently, with the Bogomil *Interrogatio Iohannis*). According to it, the bodies of Adam and Eve were animated by the angels cast down from heaven, while the souls of all their offspring (i.e. all people) emerged as the result of the act of procreation<sup>35</sup>. Two other versions assumed that people are animated by souls created by God to replenish the empty places in heaven after the fall of the angels. The first of them assumed that all the angels who sinned in heaven will be damned, while the second differentiated between the angels who sinned voluntarily and those who were somehow forced (*quasi coacti*)<sup>36</sup>. Another specific element of the

<sup>33</sup> *De heresi*, p. 308: [...] *garattus cum complicibus suis, omnes predictos episcopos cum suis sequacibus de promissione sibi prius ab eis facta astrictos fore causantur nisi ab eo solvantur, et contra deum et contra rationem illos ordinem episcopatus accepisse iudicat. Et ob hoc aliquem illorum episcoporum non vult in communicatione orationum suarum et in reverentis faciendis suscipere nisi caloiannem, quem nuper absolvit et cum eo pacem fecit. De heresi*, p. 310–311: *Caloiannes, episcopus unius partis hereticorum, qui habent ordinem suum de Sclavania, et Garattus, episcopus alterius partis adulteratorum doctrine Christi, qui habent ordinem suum de Bulgaria credunt et predicant tantum unum bonum deum omnipotentem sine principio, qui creavit angelos et IIIIor elementa. Et dicunt, quod lucifer et complices sui peccaverunt in celo.*

<sup>34</sup> F. ŠANJEK, *Les Chrétiens bosniaques...*, p. 133–140; B. HAMILTON, *The Cathar Council of Saint-Felix Reconsidered*, AFP 48, 1978, p. 46–47.

<sup>35</sup> *Tractatus de Hereticis*, p. 313: *Et dicunt quod de spiritus Ade et Eve traducuntur alii spiritus, ad supplendam et restaurandam ruinam malorum spirituum qui peccaverunt voluntarie; et fuerunt in corporibus a diabolo, spiritus scilicet Ade et Eve. Et illa traducio spiritus ex spiritu est ex natura, sicut corpus ex corpore, et planta ex planta; Interrogatio Iohannis, [in:] *Le livre secret des cathares. Interrogatio Iohannis. Edition critique, traduction commentaire*, ed. et trans. E. BOZOKY, Paris 2009 (cetera: *Interrogatio Iohannis*), p. 58–60.*

<sup>36</sup> *Summa Fratris Raineri*, p. 77: [...] *isti [...] conveniunt [...] de catharis de Concorrezo [...] excepto hoc, quod dicunt, quod anime sunt create ante mundi constitutionem et quod tunc etiam peccaverunt.*

Bagnolenses' doctrine was Christology and Mariology. The doctrine of the *ordo Sclavoniae* also differed here from the Bulgarian one, where according to the teachings expressed in the *Interrogatio Iohannis*, Christ, the son of God, came to Earth in an apparent body and his mother was an angel<sup>37</sup>. In the Slavonic doctrine, it was not only Mary who was considered an angel, but so was John the Evangelist and Christ himself<sup>38</sup>.

A close analysis of the sources shows that the doctrine of the Bagnolenses indeed was a mix of two main forms of medieval dualism – the Bulgarian and the Drugunthian. A moderately dualistic theology was taken from the *ordo Bulgariae* – angelic Christology was exactly the same as in the church of Desenzano, professing *ordo Drugonthiae*, and the alternative versions of the anthropological doctrine were very similar to the Drugunthian version<sup>39</sup>. The doctrinal analysis shows two crucial features of the Slavonic doctrine: eclecticism (a mixing of Bulgarian and Drugunthian elements) and some kind of fluidity, which means that various versions of the doctrine co-existed within one doctrinal order. Considering this, we may suspect that the doctrine of Bosnian dualists, later borrowed by the Italians, could have emerged under the influence of agents of the two main branches of Bogomilism – Bulgarian and Drugunthian – on Bosnian soil. But before we draw any final conclusions, we should also take a look at the doctrine of the second Italian Cathar community, belonging to the *ordo Sclavoniae* – the church of the March of Treviso. In this case, the sources are even more laconic than in the case of the church of Bagnolo. The only source on which we can rely is the *Disputatio inter catholicum et paterinum hereticum* (from around 1240), which according to Dondaine, presents the doctrine of the Cathars as belonging to the group of *Bagnolenses*<sup>40</sup>. However, this information is not especially precise

---

*De heresi*, p. 311: *Qui vero dicunt, omnes spiritus salvandos simul creatos, asseverant, quod illi spiritus qui ceciderunt incorporantur non salvandi, et ita de corpore in corpus procedunt. [...] Et dicunt, quod alii spiritus creati sunt a Deo omnipotente, qui debent supplere locum non salvandorum. [...] quodam illorum confirmant, quod pars illorum, qui ceciderunt, salvandi sunt, qui non voluntate set quasi coactione peccaverut, et qui cum deliberatione peccaverunt, dampnandi sunt.* Cf. also: JACOBUS DE CAPELLIS, p. XXXVIII–XXXIX.

<sup>37</sup> *Interrogatio Iohannis*, p. 68: *Quando cogitavit pater meus mittere me in mundum istum, misit ante me angelum suum per spiritum sanctum ut reciperet me qui vocabatur Maria mater mea.* In the *Interrogatio Iohannis*, Christ was not an angel, but the son of God, sitting at his right hand from the beginning, cf.: *Interrogatio Iohannis*, p. 44.

<sup>38</sup> *De heresi*, p. 311: *Sclavini tempore gratie credunt, quod filius Dei, scilicet Ihesus Christus, et Iohannes Evangelista et Maria fuerunt tres angeli apparentes in carne.* Cf. also: *Summa Fratris Raineri*, p. 77; JACOBUS DE CAPELLIS, p. CXIII.

<sup>39</sup> On the Christology of the church of Desenzano cf.: MONETA DE CREMONA, p. 5, 232; *Summa Fratris Raineri*, p. 71. The human spirits, according to the doctrine of the church of Desenzano, are identical with the angels fallen from heaven, but in this doctrine we will not find the idea that God created new souls after the fall, cf.: *De heresi*, p. 309; MONETA DE CREMONA, p. 5, 36, 38, 52.

<sup>40</sup> A. DONDAINE, *Le manuel de l'inquisiteur*, AFP 17, 1947, p. 174–180; I. DA MILANO, *Fr. Gregorio O.P., vescovo di Fano, e la 'Disputatio inter catholicum et paterinum hereticum'*, Ae 14, 1940, p. 124–125.

because, as it was said above, the label *Bagnolenses* was used in the sources to describe various Cathar groups, which belonged neither to *ordo Bulgariae* nor to *ordo Drugonthiae*. The fact that the doctrine of the *Disputatio* is radically dualistic, convinces us that we are not dealing with the doctrine of the church of Bagnolo here; it is also completely different than in the case of the Tuscan churches of Florence and Valle Spoletana, which leads us to the conclusion that this must be the doctrine of the church of the March of Treviso, so the radically dualistic version of the *ordo Sclavoniae*<sup>41</sup>. Although the *Disputatio* mentions two gods, two eternal principles with the power of creation, the type of dualism described in this source is different than in the *ordo Drugonthiae*. The distinctive element of the radical dualism of *ordo Sclavoniae* is the inequality of two principles. Different than in the Drugunthian doctrine, where the opponent of the good god is the evil god who is equally powerful, in this case, the opponent of God (written with the capital letter) is the devil (or lucifer), written with the lowercase, also called the *minor creator*<sup>42</sup>. And it is not only a matter of names because the *Disputatio* indeed presents the devil as inferior to God. It says that in the beginning, when he was a steward of the heavenly hosts (the angels of the good God), he desired to become equal with God. Therefore, he started to reduce the duties of the angels and for that, he was cast down from heaven by Michael the archangel<sup>43</sup>. The theme of Satan as the steward of the heavenly hosts, identified with the unjust steward from the gospel of St. Luke (Lc 16: 1–8) is nothing new in medieval radical dualism; it exists in an early form of the Drugunthian doctrine and is rooted in the *Interrogatio Iohannis*, but the main difference is that in Drugunthian dualism Satan never wants to become equal with the good god because he already is equal with him<sup>44</sup>. The desire to become equal with God as the motive of Satan's

<sup>41</sup> The doctrine of the churches of Florence and Valle Spoletana was completely different that the one described in the *Disputatio*, cf.: *Abiuratio Patarenorum Petri et Andrei*, ed. G. RISTORI, [in:] IDEM, *Patarini in Firenze nella prima metà del secolo XIII*, RSCST 1, 1905, p. 188–189.

<sup>42</sup> *Disputatio inter catholicum et paterinum hereticum*, ed. I. DA MILANO, Ae 14, 1940, p. 126: *Duos etiam creatores, duo eterna principia, duos Deos constituunt, unum visibilium, alterum invisibilium* (cetera: *Disputatio inter catholicum*). *Disputatio inter catholicum*, p. 130: *Deum omnia creasse, concedo, intellige bona; sed mala et vana et transitoria et visibilia ipse non fecit, sed minor creator, scilicet lucifer et idcirco dicitur a Johanne: sine ipso factum est nihil, idest transitoria*.

<sup>43</sup> *Disputatio inter catholicum*, p. 132: *Villicus iniquitatis, de quo Evangelium dicit, fuit diabolus, cui omnis angelorum cura fuerat deputata; ut laudum et psalmorum pensiones Deo ab angelis reddendas ipse colligeret; sed cum angelis, pro tam dura pensione gravatis coniuravit ut similis potest esse altissimo: et de pensionibus iam dictis cotidie fraudabat dicens: quantum debes domino meo? Centum horos tritici, et ille: accipe cautionem tuam, inquit, et scribe octoginta; et similia. Hoc autem videns, altissimus Michael eum substituit et ipsum a villicatione removit, et cum suis complicitibus de celo eiecit*.

<sup>44</sup> On the theme of the unjust steward in the drugunthian Catharism cf.: MONETA DE CREMONA, p. 4: [...] <Diabolus> *caute ascendit in coelum Dei Sancti, et ibi colloquio suo fraudulento praedictis animas decepit et ad terram istam et caliginosum aerem duxit, et credunt eum villicum iniquitatis dici a Domino Luc. 16. v. 8* [...]. Cf. also: *Brevis Summula*, p. 201; *De heresi*, p. 309. On the theme of the unjust steward in the *Interrogatio Iohannis*, cf.: *Interrogatio Iohannis*, p. 50.

rebellion appears only in the moderately dualistic Bogomilism, precisely in the doctrine described at the beginning of the 12<sup>th</sup> century by the Byzantine theologian Euthymius Zigabenus<sup>45</sup>. As we can see, the radical Slavonic dualism differs seriously from the Drugunthian one; its distinctive feature is the belief in the existence of two eternal but unequal principles: God and the devil, the minor creator. The differences do not end with theology, however; they exist also in other elements of the doctrine, especially in anthropology. According to the *Disputatio*, when the devil – the creator of the transient material world – had formed the bodies of Adam and Eve and was unable to animate them, he decided to ask God for help. When God announced it in heaven, two angels, who secretly loved the devil, decided to go and help the devil voluntarily. God agreed, but warned them not to fall asleep on their way because they would forget the way back to their heavenly home. The angels did not listen to God's warnings, fell asleep on their way and finally were imprisoned by the devil in the bodies of Adam and Eve<sup>46</sup>. As we can see in the radical version of the Slavonic doctrine, we have a very problematic theme of the cooperation of God with the devil in the creation of people, which was characteristic for the moderately dualistic *ordo Bulgariae*, described by Zigabenus<sup>47</sup>.

Before drawing any final conclusions from this analysis, we should try to answer the question: how can we be sure that the doctrine presented in the *Disputatio* was indeed imported from Bosnia and was not constructed by the Italian Cathars, who combined the elements of the Bulgarian and Drugunthian doctrine on their own? This problem can be solved by another Western source, much younger, but this time describing directly the doctrine of the heretics from Bosnia. It is the *Isti sunt errores haereticorum bosnensium*, attached to the answer of the Pope Gregory XI to the letter of the Franciscan vicar in Bosnia – Bartholomew of Auvergne from 1373<sup>48</sup>. In this source we can also find specific radical dualism of two unequal principles where the opponent of God (the major god) is Lucifer, called a minor god<sup>49</sup>. Is it possible that *Isti sunt errores* was fabricated

<sup>45</sup> EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS, *Panoplia dogmatica*, [in:] PG, vol. CXXX (cetera: EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS), col. 1295. Cf. also: *Interrogatio Iohannis*, p. 44.

<sup>46</sup> *Disputatio inter catholicum*, p. 132–133: [...] ipse vero diabolus [...] duo hominum corpora fabricavit. Sed cum per XXX annos vitalem spiritum illis corporibus infundere non posset, accessit ad misericordiam altissimi, et duos angelos ab ipso quesivit. Astiterunt statim duo, qui, diabolum occulte diligebant, et rogaverunt altissimum ut cum diabolo irent, cito reverturi. Quorum fraudem Deus agnoscens dixit: ite, sed cavete, ne dormiatis, quia post soporem reverti non possitis et viam oblivioni traderetis. Sed si dormieritis, post VI milia annorum veniam ad vos. Venerunt igitur, dormierunt in corpora ista obliti celestis patrie inclusi sunt. Isti sunt Adam et Eva.

<sup>47</sup> EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS, PG, vol. CXXX, col. 1298.

<sup>48</sup> D. KNIEVALD, *Vjerodostojnost...*, p. 163–164.

<sup>49</sup> *Isti sunt errores hereticorum bosnensium*, ed. D. KNIEVALD, [in:] IDEM, *Vjerodostojnost latinskih izvora...*, p. 168: *Imprimis, quod sint duo dii et quod maior deus creavit omnia spiritualia et invisibilia, et minor, scilicet lucifer, omnia corporalia et visibilia.*

based on the Italian *Disputatio*? In my opinion, it is highly improbable considering that we will not find many doctrinal themes in it that were characteristic of the doctrine of the church of the March of Treviso<sup>50</sup>. Could it have been constructed based on other polemical anti-Cathar sources? Definitely not, because the specific radical dualism of two unequal principles can be found only in the Italian *Disputatio*. All this leads us to the conclusion that the *Diputatio inter catholicum et paterinum hereticum* contains the authentic version of the doctrine of the *ordo Sclavoniae*.

But can we conclude that this specific dualism of two eternal and independent but unequal principles was invented by the Bosnian dualists who combined the elements of the Bulgarian and Drugunthian doctrine? Of course, there is such a possibility, but it seems that it is not the only explanation because we should also draw attention to the fact that the idea of two eternal, but unequal principles existed earlier in the legend *Sea of Tiberias*, which was used by the Bulgarian Bogomils<sup>51</sup>. The issue of the origins of this legend is rather complicated, and has caused controversies among scholars who are divided into two groups: those who accept its Bogomil origins, and those who are against such a possibility. In my view, the most reasonable is the middle way (represented for example, by Y. Stoyanov), according to which – in the case of the *Sea of Tiberias* – we are dealing with two layers: the archaic one, containing the universal Earth-diver myth; and the dualistic one, which was added later by the heretics<sup>52</sup>. It should also be noted that it is the only Bogomil legend that contains radical dualism. According to this legend, in the beginning, there is only God, the Infinite Sea of Tiberias and Satanael, not created by God, who swims in this sea in the form of an aquatic bird, (usually a duck). Satanael calls himself God, but at the same time the good God is called by him the God of Gods and Lord of Lords, which shows that we are dealing here with the dualism of two independent and eternal, but unequal principles. In the *Sea of Tiberias* we can also find the theme of the cooperation of God with Satanael in the creation of the World, however this theme is probably a part of the archaic layer of the universal Earth-diver myth<sup>53</sup>. This time, it is not about the creation of people, but of the Earth. God orders Satanael to dive in the sea and bring from

<sup>50</sup> In the *Isti sunt errores* we won't find the specific doctrine concerning the creation of man, or the identification of the material being with the nihil from the prologue of the Gospel of St. John.

<sup>51</sup> More on the source and its date, cf.: *Apokryfy i legendy starotestamentowe Słowian południowych*, ed. G. MINCZEW, M. SKOWRONEK, Kraków 2006, p. 3; J. IVANOV, *Livres et legendes bogomiles. (Aux Sources di Catharisme)*, Paris 1976, p. 255–256, 267–274; *Sredniowieczne herezje dualistyczne na Bałkanach. Źródła słowiańskie*, ed. G. MINCZEW, M. SKOWRONEK, J.M. WOLSKI, Łódź 2015 [= SeCer, 1], p. 31, 40.

<sup>52</sup> For the controversies concerning the origins and content of the Sea of Tiberias cf.: Y. STOYANOV, *Islamic and Christian Heterodox Water Cosmogonies from the Ottoman Period: Parallels and Contrasts*, BSOAS 61, 2001, p. 19–33; IDEM, *The Other God. Dualist Religions from Antiquity to the Cathar Heresy*, New Haven–London 2000, p. 131–138.

<sup>53</sup> Y. STOYANOV, *Islamic and Christian...*, p. 22.

its bottom soil and flint, and then from the soil scattered over the sea he creates the world, and striking half of the flint with his stick he creates the angels. Also as part of this legend, Satanael becomes the steward of the heavenly hosts (which is rather illogical because, from the second part of the flint, he had already created his own angels) and led by the desire to become equal with God, he decides to rebel and consequently is cast down to Earth by Michael the archangel<sup>54</sup>.

So what are the conclusions of this doctrinal analysis? First of all, it shows that within Bosnian dualism there were many different doctrinal conceptions that were typical either for the *ordo Bulgariae*, the *ordo Drugonthiae* or were mixes of these two types. Because of that, we cannot perceive *ordo Sclavoniae* as the third option of the Bogomil-Cathar dualism, equal to the *ordo Bulgariae* and *ordo Drugonathiae*. The doctrine of the *ordo Sclavoniae* was not a coherent and clear theological system, but rather an accidental mix of the themes borrowed from both sides, so we may say that this eclecticism was the most distinctive feature of Bosnian dualism rather than the original theology. But it should be noted that this eclecticism is a very strong argument for the existence of dualism in Bosnia because it is highly improbable that it was constructed by the Catholic polemicists. If they had constructed the dualist Bosnian doctrine, based on the polemical anti-Cathar works, it would have been either a typical radically dualistic doctrine or a typical moderately dualistic one, but surely not such a peculiar and chaotic mix of the two, which cannot be found either in French or in German sources and in Italy it appears only in the *Disputatio*. This specific eclecticism, which is distinctive for the Bosnian dualism, emerged under the influence of the missionaries representing various forms of Bogomilism, and also various Bogomil churches, and this, in turn, is an argument against the conceptions, which assume only one direction of the flow of the dualistic ideas to Bosnia. The conception of F. Šanjek, focusing on Dalmatia, is of course well founded in the source material, which shows that the dualist church of Dalmatia existed earlier than the Church of Bosnia, and that these two churches never existed in parallel, but it should not necessarily lead to the conclusion that the Bosnian church emerged under the exclusive influence of the church of Dalmatia. According to Šanjek, based on the Italian *Tractatus de Hereticis*, dualism was brought to Dalmatia from Constantinople before the Saint-Felix council, and from Zigabenus we learn that the Bogomils of Constantinople at that time professed a moderate dualism of the *ordo Bulgariae*, so if indeed Dalmatia had been the only source of the Bosnian dualism, it would have meant that it should have professed the pure Bulgarian doctrine, and the sources show us that it was not so<sup>55</sup>. It is also not especially probable that Bosnian dualism emerged as a result of the expulsion of the Dalmatian heretics

<sup>54</sup> O Morzu Tyberiadzkim, ed., trans. A. KAWECKA, [in:] *Apokryfy i legendy...*, p. 5–6; *Średniowieczne herezje dualistyczne...*, p. 31, 40.

<sup>55</sup> F. ŠANJEK, *Les Chrétiens bosniaques...*, p. 39–45.



by the archbishop of Split at the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> century. If the Bosnians and ban Kulin did not have anything in common with the dualist heresy, they would not have received the heretical refugees so openly, and would not have converted to heresy as it is presented in the sources. It also does not seem especially probable that for the spread of the heresy in Bosnia the Dalmatian missionaries were responsible. Italian goldsmiths from Zadar – Matthew and Aristodius Zorobabel – were accused of heresy at the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> century, and according to the sources spent a lot of time in Bosnia<sup>56</sup>. It is more probable that the dualist heresy was already known in Bosnia thanks to the Bulgarian and Drugunthian missionaries, and the heretics expelled from Serbia by Stephen Nemanja, and therefore the dualists from Dalmatia found refuge in Bosnia.

A precise analysis of the Bosnian doctrine (*ordo Sclavoniae*) based on the sources leads us to important conclusions. First, it confirms the existence of dualism in Bosnia, excluding the possibility of its construction by Catholic polemicists. Secondly, it shows that a specific feature of Bosnian dualism was the co-existence of various theological conceptions of different provenance and their eclectic mixes. All this, in turn, leads us to the conclusion that Bosnia was a field of activity for the missionaries of various forms of Bogomilism. Considering this, it seems that the most probable are the conceptions of the scholars who suggest more than one direction of the dualist influence in Bosnia.

## Bibliography

### Primary Sources

*Abiuracija na Bolinu Polju 1203*, ed. D. KNIEVALD, [in:] D. KNIEVALD, *Vjerodostojnost latinskih izvora o bosanskim krstjanima*, "Rad Jugoslavenske Akademije Znanosti i Umjetnosti" 270, 1949.

*Abiuratio Patarenorum Petri et Andrei*, ed. G. RISTORI, [in:] G. RISTORI, *Patarini in Firenze nella prima metà del secolo XIII*, "Rivista storico-critica delle scienze teologiche" 1, 1905.

<sup>56</sup> THOMAS ARCHIDIACONUS, *Historia Salonitanorum Pontificium*, ed. F. RAČKI, [in:] MSHSM, vol. XXVI, Zagreb 1894 (cetera: THOMAS ARCHIDIACONUS), p. 80: *Fuerunt namque eo tempore duo fratres, filii Zorobabel, quorum alter Matheus alter vero Aristodius vocabatur. Hi quamvis essent de parte Apulo, erant tamen a puertitia Jandrenses cives effecti. Conversabantur vero ex maiori parte apud Bosnam, quia erant pictores optimi et in auri fabrilis arte satis exercitati; competenter etiam latine et slavonice litterature habebant peritiam.* THOMAS ARCHIDIACONUS, p. 82: *Sed ita erant fallente diabolo, in barathrum heretice pestis immersi, ut non solum impiam heresim obcecato corde crederent, sed etiam scelestis labiis predicarent. Hoc invenit Bernardus Spalati commorantes, multosque iam pestiferi dogmatis tabe ab eis infectos. Cepit ergo paulatim ad catholicam normam miti sermone allicere, frequenter eos convocans, frequenter exhortans. Sed cum illi heretica calliditate tergiversantes dissimularent converti, statim archiepiscopus fecit omnia bona eorum diripi, eosque anathematis vinculo innodatos, cum magno opprobrio de civitate expelli.*

- Archiepiscopi Rotomagensis ad suffraganeos, quibus mandatum Conradi Portuensis episcopi & A.S.L significat coveniendi senonas adversus Bartholomeum, Albigenium episcopum*, ed. J.D. MANSI, [in:] *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et amplissima collectio*, vol. XXII, ed. J.D. MANSI, Venetiis 1778.
- Brevis Summula*, ed. A. MOLINIER, "Annales du Midi" 22, 1910, p. 212–216.
- Charte de Niquinta, antipape des heretiques surnommés d'Albigeois*, ed. D. ZBIRAL, [in:] *1209–2009 Cathares. Une histoire à pacifier?*, ed. A. BRENON, Loubatieres 2010.
- Cosmographia Pii Papae in Asiae & Europae eleganti descriptione*, Parisiis 1509.
- De heresi catharorum in Lombardia*, ed. A. DONDAINE, "Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum" 19, 1949, p. 306–312.
- Disputatio inter catholicum et paterinum hereticum*, ed. I. DA MILANO, "Aevum" 14, 1940, p. 281–333.
- DURANDUS DE HUESCA, *Liber contra manicheos*, [in:] *Une somme anti-cathare. Le Liber contra Manicheos de Durand de Huesca*, ed. C. THOUZELLIER, Louvain 1964 [= *Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense. Études et documents*, 32].
- EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS, *Panoplia dogmatica*, [in:] *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series graeca*, vol. CXXX, ed. J.P. MIGNE, Paris 1886.
- INNOCENTIUS III PAPA, *B. Spalatensi archiepiscopo et I. Capellano pontificio, ut de fide catholica in terra Culini Bani Bossini inquirant et reformanda reforment*, [in:] *Vetera Monumenta Slavorum Meridionalium historiam ilustrantia*, vol. I, ed. A. THEINER, Roma 1863.
- INNOCENTIUS III PAPA, *Hemmerado, regi Hungarorum*, [in:] *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series latina*, vol. CCXIV, ed. J.P. MIGNE, Paris 1890.
- Interrogatio Iohannis*, [in:] *Le livre secret des cathares. Interrogatio Iohannis. Edition critique, traduction commentaire*, ed. et trans. E. BOZOKY, Paris 2009.
- Isti sunt errores hereticorum bosnensium*, ed. D. KNIEVALD, [in:] D. KNIEVALD, *Vjerodostojnost latinskih izvora o bosanskim krstjanima*, "Rad Jugoslavenske Akademije Znanosti i Umjetnosti" 270, 1949.
- JACOBUS DE CAPELLIS, *Disputationes nonnullae adversus haereticos*, ed. D. BAZZOCCHI, [in:] *L'eresia catara. Appendice*, Bologna 1920.
- MONETA DE CREMONA, *Adversus Catharos et Valdenses libri quinque*, ed. T.A. RICCHINI, Roma 1743.
- O Morzu Tyberiadzkim*, ed., trans. A. KAWECKA, [in:] *Apokryfy i legendy starotestamentowe Słowian południowych*, ed. G. MINCZEW, M. SKOWRONEK, Kraków 2006.
- Processus contra valdenses in Lombardia superiori anno 1387*, ed. G. AMATI, "Archivio Storico Italiano" 39, 1865, p. 3–61.
- Stephanum principem Bosnensem, catholicum, rogat ut ex partibus regni sui haereticos expellat, haeresim extirpet*, [in:] *Acta Ioannis XXII (1317–1334)*, vol. VII, ed. A.L. TAUTU, Vaticano 1952.
- Summa Fratris Raineri de ordine fratrum praedicatorum, de Catharis et Pauperibus de Lugduno*, [in:] *Un Traité Neo-Manicheen du 13 siècle, Le Liber de duobus principiis suivi d'un fragment de Rituel Cathare*, ed. A. DONDAINE, Roma 1939.
- THOMAS ARCHIDIACONUS, *Historia Salonitanorum Pontificium*, ed. F. RAČKI, [in:] *Monumenta spectantia historiam Slavorum meridionalium*, vol. XXVI, Zagreb 1894.
- Thomas ep. Phariensis XVIII*, [in:] *Illyricum Sacrum*, vol. IV, ed. D. FARLATI, Venetiis 1769.
- Tractatus de Hereticis*, ed. A. DONDAINE, "Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum" 20, 1950, p. 308–324.

## Secondary Literature

- Apokryfy i legendy starotestamentowe Słowian południowych, ed. G. MINCZEW, M. SKOWRONEK, Kraków 2006.
- BUTLER T., *Les chretiens bosniens*, [in:] *1209–2009 Cathares. Une histoire à pacifier?*, ed. A. BRENON, Loubatieres 2010, p. 109–116.
- DA MILANO I., *Fr. Gregorio O.P., vescovo di Fano, e la 'Disputatio inter catholicum et paterinum hereticum'*, "Aevum" 14, 1940, p. 85–140.
- DONDAINE A., *La hiérarchie cathare en Italie II*, "Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum" 20, 1950, p. 234–324.
- DONDAINE A., *Le manuel de l'inquisiteur*, "Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum" 17, 1947, p. 174–180.
- DRAGOJLOVIĆ D., *Krstjani i jeretička crkva bosanska*, Beograd 1987.
- DUVERNOY J., *L'histoire des cathares*, Toulouse 1979.
- FINE J.V.A., *The Bosnian Church. A New Interpretation*, New York–London 1975.
- GLUŠAČ V., *Srednjovekovna 'bosanska crkva' bila je pravoslavna*, Beograd 1924.
- HAMILTON B., *The Cathar Council of Saint-Felix Reconsidered*, "Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum" 48, 1978, p. 23–53.
- HAMILTON B., *The Origins of the Dualist Church of Drugunthia*, "Eastern Churches Review" 6, 1974, p. 115–124.
- HAMILTON J., HAMILTON B., *Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World, c. 650 – c. 1450*, Manchester–New York 2013, <https://doi.org/10.7765/9781526112873>
- IVANOV J., *Livres et legendes bogomiles. (Aux Sources di Catharisme)*, Paris 1976.
- JIREČEK K., *Istorija Srba*, vol. IV, trans. J. RADONIĆ, Beograd 1922.
- KNIEVALD D., *Vjerodostojnost latinskih izvora o bosanskim krstjanima*, "Rad Jugoslavenske Akademije Znanosti i Umjetnosti" 270, 1949.
- LAMBERT M., *Le probleme des chretiens bosniaques*, "Heresis" 23, 1994, p. 29–50.
- LAMBERT M., *The Cathars*, Oxford 1998.
- LORENZ M., *Bogomili, katari i bosanski krstjani. Transfer dualisticich hereza između istoka i zapada (11–13 stoljeće)*, "Historijska traganja" 15, 2015, p. 9–66.
- MANDIĆ D., *Bogomilska crkva bosanskih krstjana*, Chicago 1962.
- MILETIĆ M., *I krstjani di Bosnia alla luce dei loro monumenti di pietra*, Roma 1957.
- MINCZEW G., *John the Water-Bearer (Ивань Водоносьць)*. *Once Again on Dualism in the Bosnian Church*, "Studia Ceranea" 10, 2020, p. 415–424, <https://doi.org/10.18778/2084-140X.10.20>
- MUDRY T., *Histoire de la Bosnie-Herzegovine – Faits et controversies*, Paris 1999.
- OBOLENSKY D., *The Bogomils*, Cambridge 1948.
- PETROVIĆ L., *Kršćani bosanske crkve*, Sarajevo 1999.
- RAČKI F., *Bogomili i patareni*, "Rad Jugoslavenske Akademije Znanosti i Umjetnosti" 7, 1869, p. 84–179; 8, 1869, p. 121–187; 10, 1870, p. 160–263.
- RAČKI F., *Dva nova priloga za poviest bosanskih patarena*, "Starine, na sviet izdaje Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti" 14, 1882, p. 21–29.

- ŠANJEK F., *Chrétien bosniens: un amalgame de catharisme et de valdéisme*, "Slavica Occitania" 16, 2003, p. 91–112.
- ŠANJEK F., *L'initiation cathare dans l'Occident médiéval*, "Heresis" 5, 1985, p. 19–27.
- ŠANJEK F., *Les Chrétien bosniaques et le mouvement cathare XII<sup>e</sup>–XV<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paris 1976.
- ŠIDAK J., *Problem bosanske crkve u našoj historiografiji od Petranovića do Glušca. (Prilog rješenju tzv. Bogomilskog pitanja)*, "Rad Jugoslavenske Akademije Znanosti i Umjetnosti" 259, 1937.
- STOYANOV Y., *Islamic and Christian Heterodox Water Cosmogonies from the Ottoman Period: Parallels and Contrasts*, "Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies" 61, 2001, p. 19–33, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0041977X01000027>
- STOYANOV Y., *The Other God. Dualist Religions from Antiquity to the Cathar Heresy*, New Haven–London 2000, <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt5vm3q2>
- Średniowieczne herezje dualistyczne na Bałkanach. Źródła słowiańskie, ed. G. MINCZEW, M. SKOWRONEK, J.M. WOLSKI, Łódź 2015 [= Series Ceranea, 1].
- THOMAS P.L., *L'église médiévale de Bosnie était-elle dualiste?*, "Slavica Occitania" 16, 2003, p. 113–131.
- TRUHELKA Ć., *Bosanska narodna (patarenska) crkva*, [in:] *Povijest hrvatskih zemalja Bosne i Hercegovine od najstarijih vremena do godine 1463. Knjiga prva*, Sarajevo 1942, p. 767–793.
- ZLATAR Z., *The Haeresis of the Bosnian Church: une question mal posee*, "Heresis" 46–47, 2007, p. 81–120.

**Piotr Czarnecki**

Jagiellonian University  
Institute for the Study of Religions  
ul. Grodzka 52  
31-044 Kraków, Polska/Poland  
[piotr.czarnecki@uj.edu.pl](mailto:piotr.czarnecki@uj.edu.pl)



© by the author, licensee University of Lodz – Lodz University Press, Lodz, Poland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)