Studia Ceranea 10, 2020, p. 415–424
DOI: 10.18778/2084-140X.10.20

ISSN: 2084-140X
e-ISSN: 2449-8378

C O P E
Member since 2018
JM13709

Georgi Minczew (Łódź)
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2068-533X

John the Water-Bearer (Иѡаннъ Водоносьцъ) Once Again on Dualism in the Bosnian Church*

Franjo Rački published his book *Bogomili i patareni* 150 years ago[1]. Since then, there has been unceasing debate over the Bosnian Church, its organization, liturgical practice and dogmas. One of F. Rački's most frequently disputed theses concerns the genealogical connection between Balkan neo-Manichean heresies and the teachings of the Bosnian dissidents – particularly the question as to the direct influence of Bulgarian and Byzantine Bogomilism on the cosmology, dogmatics and social doctrine of the Bosnian Christians, or "patarenes", as Rački called them[2]. Further below, I will consecutively use the terms "Christians", "Bosnian Christians", and "Bosnian Church", with variants "Bosnian dissidents/heterodox". All these designations have been used in the more recent studies that oppose the terminological "Latinization", which is not only outdated but also suggests a certain ideological bias. The term "Bogomils", occurring in the older literature, I find likewise imprecise: despite the obvious influence exercised by Balkan Bogomilism on religious life in medieval Bosnia and Herzegovina, the doctrine, ecclesiastical organization and liturgical practice of Bosnian Christians differed in some respects from the doctrine of Bulgarian and Byzantine neo-Manichean communities.

* This article has been written under the research project financed by the National Science Centre (Poland). Decision number: DEC-2016/22/M/HS3/00212 (Dualist Heresies in the History of South-East Europe, 9th–15th century).

[1] F. Rački, *Bogomili i patareni*, Zagreb 1869–1870. Further citations are from the edition: F. Rački, *Borba južnih Slovena za državnu neodvisnost. Bogomili i patareni*, Beograd 1931.

[2] The designation "patareni", by which F. Rački refers to the "Bosnian dissidents", is taken from Latin literature: as early as the beginning of the 17th century, Mauro Orbini wrote about the "Patarini": *erano in Bosna molti heretici, specialmente i Patarini* (M. Orbini, *Il Regno degli Slavi*, München 1985, p. 352). Regarding the etymology and meaning of the lexeme, see: I. Dujčev, *I bogomili nei paesi slavi e la loro storia*, [in:] idem, *Medioevo bizantino-slavo*, vol. I, Roma 1966, p. 251–282; Д. Драгојловић, *Богомилство на Балкану и у Малој Азији*, vol. I, *Богомил родоначалници*, Београд 1974, p. 80–82.

This article aims to demonstrate that Balkan Bogomilism did indeed exercise direct influence on the Bosnian Church, but that this does not imply the latter was *sensu stricto* Bogomil in character. The refusal of some scholars to acknowledge the presence of certain dualist elements in the doctrine of the Bosnian heterodox is often marked by religious and ideological bias connected with political attitudes that have nothing to do with scientific discourse but rather concern the ethnic and national identity (or lack of such identity) of the Bosniaks and their religion, language and culture. Here I would quote the opinion of Piotr Wróbel, a scholar well versed in Bosnian history:

> The history of the Bosnian Manicheans, the Ottoman conquest of Bosnia, and the subsequent Islamization are important elements of the construction of a national identity of the Bosnian Muslims, that is, of the so-called Bosniaks. These events in the distant Middle Ages acquire surprisingly great importance in a present-day perspective. As such, they become the object of what has recently been designated by the resonant but rather enigmatic term "historical politics" (German – Geschichtspolitik)[3].

The resistance against the thesis of Bogomil influence unites different scholars from ex-Yugoslavia regardless of their ethnic, ideological or religious affiliation, and is an element of their shared Yugoslav and post-Yugoslav *Geschichtspolitik*. In other words, Yugoslav, and especially post-Yugoslav, historians are divided internally (as Serbs, Croatians, Bosnians), but they are all united against the disadvantageous concept of an *external*, in this case Bulgarian, influence, supported not only by Bulgarian but also by Western scholars, and more recently by researchers from Bosnia-Herzegovina, influenced by "the classical Bulgarian perspective on medieval heresies"[4]. According to the deniers of the term Bogomilism, the Bosnian Church, when "pressed between" the Bulgarian (Bogomil-based) and the Western (Cathar-based) interpretation of medieval dualism, loses its identity.

* * *

Analyzing the dogmatics and ecclesiology of the Bosnian Church is a particularly difficult task. The Latin sources are tendentious and often ascribe to the Bosnian Christians features typical of the West European dualists. Few domestic,

[3] P. WRÓBEL, *Kontrowersje wokół podboju i islamizacji Bośni. Przyczynek do tzw. „polityki historycznej"*, BP.AS 19, 2012, p. 92.

[4] They criticize not only the views expressed in classical studies on Balkan neo-Manicheism (S. RUNCIMAN, *The Medieval Manichee. A Study of the Christian Dualist Heresy*, Cambridge 1947; D. OBOLENSKY, *The Bogomils. A Study in Balkan Neo-Manichaeism*, Cambridge 1948), but also some more recent books and anthologies that argue in support of the connection between medieval dualist doctrines in the Balkans and in Western Europe. See the critique of the anthology of sources on Bogomilism by J. HAMILTON, B. HAMILTON, Y. STOYANOV, *Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World, c. 650 – c. 1450*, Manchester–New York 1998 in: Dž. DAUTOVIĆ, *Crkva bosanska: moderni historiografski tokovi, rasprave i kontroverze (2005–2015)*, HTra 15, 2015, p. 127–160.

Bosnian-Slavic sources contain theological information. From a methodological viewpoint, the naturally correct scientific reflex would demand seeking some direct influence or parallels between the doctrine of the Bosnian Christians and other medieval heterodox doctrines.

The lack of Slavic sources is partially compensated for by the discovery made by the Russian Slavist Mikhail N. Speranskij, who published in 1902 the marginal glosses to the so-called *Srećković Gospel*, a Cyrillic monument from the 14th century (which was destroyed during the bombardment of Belgrade in 1941). In his article, he defined the manuscript as a "bosnischen Evangelium" and published the marginalia that had been added later (in the 15th–16th centuries), which according to him, testified that the manuscript had been for some time in a dualist environment[5]. Since then and to this day, disputes have continued *pro* and *contra* the neo-Manichean, Bogomil content of the marginal glosses. The most ardent supporter of the view that they hold a concealed Bogomil message was Alexandar Solovjev, who further developed F. Rački's thesis as to the moderate dualism of the Bosnian "patarenes"[6]. Among the more recent defenders of the view as to the text's heterodox content is Sima Ćirković[7], while its opponents include Dragoljub Dragojlović[8]. Lejla Nakaš also argued against the supposed Bogomil content of the marginalia[9].

I would express some doubts about the categorical conclusions of supporters and opponents alike of the "Bogomil connection"; to do so, I will comment on two of the marginal glosses (5 and 9 according to the numeration of M.N. Speranskij). Here are the texts:

> F. 75, opposite Luke 10: 30–35 (the Parable of the Good Samaritan): **Ѡнь чв҃кь есть плѣнници, а ер҃лемь жилище св҃тихь, а ериха мирь, а ѣзви грѣси, а ер҃х моиси, а левгить иванъ водоносьць, а самарианїнь и҃сь, а олѣи и вино милость бж҃иѣ, а скоть законь, а гостинница цр҃ква, а гостинникь петарь, а два пѣнеза вѣра идина.**

> F. 91' opposite Luke 16: 1–11 (the Parable of the Householder): **ѡнь чл҃вкь кнезь вѣка, а їконобь старешина цркве его, а дльжникь законици иже по все дни грѣхе ѿпѹщаю҃ чл҃комь и тако гѹбе дш҃е чл҃вке.**

[5] M.N. Speranskij, *Ein bosnisches Evangelium in der Handschriftensammlung Srećković's*, ASP 24, 1902, p. 172–182. The text of the marginal glosses, a sort of explanation of some Gospel fragments, is on p. 176–178.

[6] A. Solovjev, *Vjersko učenje bosanske crkve*, Zagreb 1948.

[7] С. Ћирковић, *Глосе Срећковићевог јеванђеља и учење босанске цркве*, [in:] *Богомилството на Балканот во светлината на најновите истражувања. Материјали од симпозиумот одржан во Скопје на 30, 31 мај и 1 јуни 1978*, Скопје 1982, p. 207–221.

[8] Д. Драгојловић, *Крстјани и јеретичка црква босанска*, Београд 1987, p. 193–199.

[9] L. Nakaš, *Zapadnoštokavski pisani idiom u srednjem vijeku*, BJez 5, 2008, p. 199–212.

The supporters of F. Rački's hypothesis find in these marginalia some traces of moderate or radical dualism. Aleksandar Solovjev seeks in the expression **кнєзь вѣка** the image of Satan, who has enslaved human souls in the material world he created (moderate dualism)[10]. Sima Ćirković also finds some traces of dualism, radical in this case, in the marginal glosses: according to him, the texts in the *Srećković Gospel* exemplify a radical dualist opposition between the soul (the divine principle) and the body (the material creation of the demiurge)[11]. The most categorical opponent of the thesis as to the presence of dualist, Bogomil influences in the doctrine of the Bosnian Christians seems to be D. Dragojlović. In his opinion, the marginal glosses in the *Srećković Gospel* have a "seeming dualist content", whereas, *the domestic sources convincingly confirm that the Bosnian Christians were not familiar with Cathar or Manichean dualism*, *but accepted the mystic dualism of the Eastern Church*, *which was rejected in the works of some mystics of the Eastern Church*[12].

I can partially agree with Dragojlović's view. Indeed, from the marginal glosses, we cannot draw positive conclusions as to some dualist content – whether moderate or radical. Dualism – the opposing of the celestial to the earthly – is typical for the orthodox Churches as well, especially (here the Belgrade scholar is right again) for monastic communities, whose mysticism was not always acceptable to the official Church. I would add that A. Solovjev (criticized by Dragojlović), who was perhaps the most ardent supporter of the Bogomil theory, contradicts himself. In his analysis of the sources, he correctly points out that there is no trace of a dualist cosmology in the Serbian anti-heretical texts or in the doctrine of the Bosnian Christians; the issues there are mostly related to ritual practices[13]. Why then, in his later work, does he find "sure traces" of a Bogomil cosmogony in the marginalia?

The text of these marginal glosses do not permit such categorical assertions in either direction. In them, we find dualist elements similar to the ecclesiology and theology of the Balkan neo-Manicheans; these elements, however, concern not so much cosmology but rather the concept of the church, the attitude to the sacraments and to the Patristic tradition. In marginal gloss № 5, the Church is likened to an inn, and St. Peter, to an innkeeper (**а гостинница цр҃ква, а гостинникь петарь**). In marginal gloss № 9, the **їконобь** (the housekeeper) is the "elder" of the prince of this world (**кнєзь вѣка**), the debtor is the lawyers, i.e., the clergymen, who **по все дни грѣхе ѿпꙋщаюⷮ чл҃комь и тако гꙋбе дш҃е чл҃вкⷭе**.

That the official Church and the material temple is a crossroads, a hangout, of unclean forces, is not a new idea in the teachings of Balkan dualists. Cosmas

[10] A. SOLOVJEV, *Vjersko učenje bosanske crkve*…, p. 22–26.

[11] С. ЋИРКОВИЋ, *Глосе Срећковићевог јеванђеља*…, p. 220–221. More on the various concepts regarding the dualism of the Bosnian Church in: Д. ДРАГОЈЛОВИЋ, *Крстјани и јеретичка црква босанска*…, p. 193–199.

[12] Д. ДРАГОЈЛОВИЋ, *Крстјани и јеретичка црква босанска*…, p. 199.

[13] A. SOLOVJEV, *Svedočanstva pravoslavnih izvora o bogomilstvu na Balkanu*, GIBH 5, 1953, p. 29.

Presbyter severely condemns such views in the Bogomils: the heretics designated the churches as crossroads: **цр҃къви во распѫтна мѣнѧтъ сѫщѧ**[14]; the temples belong to the devil: **цр҃кви кр҃стъı** and **вьсѣ божиѧ диаволоу̀ пр҃ѣдаѭтъ**[15]. The Greek sources also provide many examples of the neo-Manichean negative attitude to the holy temples. Euthymius of Peribleptos writes, "…οἱ τοιοῦτοι Θεὸν ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς οὐ σέβονται, οὔτε Θεοτόκον, οὔτε τίμιον σταυρόν, οὔτε ἅγιον, οὔτε εἰκόνας, οὔτε θείους ναούς, οὔτε ἅγιον βάπτσμα"[16]. Euthymius Zigabenus specifies that the Bogomils believed the churches were inhabited by demons: "Λέγουσιν ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἱεροῖς ναοῖς κατοικεῖν τοὺς δαίμονας διαλαχόντας αὐτοὺς ἀναλόγως τῆς ἑκάστου τάξεως καὶ δυνάμεως"[17]. In a Greek text of the 14th century, an abridged version of the epistle of Euthymius of Peribleptos, preserved in the Vatican Apostolic Library (Vat. gr. 604), it is even noted that the heretics seemingly built churches, but immediately desecrated them, converting the altar into a latrine[18].

Even assuming the words of the Byzantine controversialist were a "monk's invention" aimed to blacken the adversary, many other sources confirm the negative attitude of the Messalians to material temples[19]. Hence, we may assume with a considerable degree of certainty that the Bogomils inherited this aversion from their predecessors. The Bosnian Christians adopted these views; this becomes evident from marginal gloss № 5 and from most of the scant archeological data on sacral construction and icon painting in medieval Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The depiction of the official church as an inn, and St. Peter, as an innkeeper (**гостинникь**), is a summary image of the Roman Catholic Church. There is an established view among scholars (J. Šidak, D. Dragojlović) that the members of the Bosnian Church believed themselves to be direct descendants of the Christian communities of the time of the Apostles. This religious exclusiveness precluded rivalry: the dissidents viewed the orthodox Churches as "disloyal" to the tradition, as "tainted" by innovations, as devilish. All the more so when one of these Churches would lay claim to religious leadership over territories inhabited by "true Christians" and would be powerful enough to organize the persecution of dissidents.

---

[14] Cosmas Presbyter, *Homily Against the Bogumils*, ed. J. Sampimon, S. van Halsema, ПК 34, 2005 (cetera: Cosmas Presbyter), p. 61.

[15] Cosmas Presbyter, p. 48.

[16] F. Osti, *L'Epistola invettiva di Eutimio della Peribleptos (1050 ca.) nei codici vaticani 840 e 604. Una versiona breve e un rimaneggiamento*, [in:] *Vie per Bisanzio. VII Congresso Nazionale dell' Associazione Italiana di Studi Bizantini*, vol. I, ed. A. Rigo, A. Babuin, M. Trizio, Bari 2013, p. 260.

[17] M. Berke, *An Annotated Edition of Euthymios Zigabenos "Panoplia dogmatikē", Chapters 23–28*, Belfast 2011, p. 166.

[18] F. Osti, *L'Epistola invettiva*…, p. 270.

[19] Д. Драгојловић, *Богомилство на Балкану и у Малој Азији*…, p. 114–115.

Exclusiveness was not a feature of the Bosnian Church alone: every heresy asserts its exceptional status in relation to the dominant religion; this is a natural reaction of dissidents against the repressive ideological and legal pressure exercised by the official ecclesiastic and secular institutions. All medieval neo-Manichean movements condemned the orthodox Churches, accusing them of apostasy from the teachings of Christ and the Apostles. The Bogomils' desire to claim similarity to the early Christian communities has long been noted and commented on in scholarly literature[20]. Many examples may be adduced in support of these observations. I will cite only two:

In *Sermon against the Bogomils*, Cosmas Presbyter writes,

> …покѹшаѫ сѧ оборити црькъвъ божиѭ юже естъ вѣра хрьстиıаньскаıа и не възмогоша; …преданъıѩ законъı свѧтѣи божии црькъви похоѹлıаѭще, своıа си оѹчениıа чьстно творѧтъ[21].

Euthymius Zigabenus also censures the negative attitude of the Bogomils of Constantinople towards the official Church and its prelates based on their veneration of icons: Τοὺς ἱεραρχας δὲ καὶ τοὺς Πατέρας ὁμοῦ πάντας ἀποδοκιμάζουσιν ὡς εἰδωλολάτρας διὰ τὴν τῶν εἰκόνων προσκύνησιν[22].

It is hard to draw unambiguous conclusion regarding direct Bogomil influence in the Bosnian Christians' claim that their community – in contrast with the orthodox Churches – is the true heir to ancient tradition. Other unorthodox doctrines of the early Christian era and neo-Manichean teachings in the Balkans and Western Europe have likewise had such pretensions. But even assuming the similarities are typological rather than a result of direct influence, two other phrases in the marginal glosses refer directly to the Bogomil doctrine: законици иже по все дни грѣхе ѿпȣщаю̑ чл҃комь и тако гȣбе дш҃е чл҃вк҃е; левгить иванъ водоносьць.

The "lawyers" in question are orthodox priests who, by confessing the faithful and giving them absolution for their sins, bring about the perdition of their souls. Confession is linked to Holy Communion, and since both the Bogomils and the Bosnian Christians rejected the canon of the Eucharist, they also repudiated the sacrament of confession to a priest. Cosmas Presbyter notes that the Bogomils made confessions to one another, and even that women could act as confessors:

> еретици же сами въ себѣ исповѣдь творѧтъ и решѧтъ сами сѫще съвѧзани диıаволıами ѫзами не же тъчиѭ мѫжи то творѧтъ нъ и женъı юже рѫгоѹ достоино юсть[23].

[20] See, for instance, S. BYLINA, *Bogomilizm w średniowiecznej Bułgarii. Uwarunkowania społeczne, polityczne i kulturalne*, BP.AS 2, 1985, p. 133–145; J. SPYRA, *Wspólnoty bogomilskie jako próba powrotu do form życia gmin wczesnochrześcijańskich*, ZNUJ.PH 84, 1987, p. 7–21.

[21] COSMAS PRESBYTER, p. 31, 42.

[22] M. BERKE, *An Annotated Edition*…, p. 160.

[23] COSMAS PRESBYTER, p. 69.

The Bosnian Christians also rejected this sacrament (and most other sacraments for that matter). For them, a confession made to a priest was a sin leading to the perdition of the divine soul.

A very interesting phrase is, "**а левгитъ иванъ водоносьцъ**", in which St. John the Baptist is compared to the Hebrew priests (the Levites) and is disparagingly called a "water-bearer". Bulgarian and Greek anti-Bogomil treatises also emphasize the dualists' contempt for the Forerunner of Christ; they avoided the designation "Baptist" (Βαπτιστής) or Forerunner (Πρόδρομος), and when they did refer to him as "Forerunner", they meant of the Antichrist, as indicated in the *Sermon against the Bogomils*: **иоана же прѣдътечѫ и зарѭ великаѥго слънца вещьствоу-жтъ антихристова предътечѫ нарицаѭще**[24]. In their view, John is an associate of Satan, and his worst "sin" was to have baptized Jesus with water. In the *Epistle of Patriarch Cosmas to the Metropolitan of Larissa*, the author anathemizes those who claim John the Baptist belongs to Satan, who are revolted by baptism with water, and perform baptism by merely reciting the Lord's Prayer:

> Τοῖς τὸν βαπτιστὴν Ἰωάννην ἐνυβρίζουσι καὶ λέγουσιν ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ Σατανᾶ ἐστι καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ τὸ δι᾽ ὕδατος βάπτισμα, καὶ τούτου ἕνεκεν τὸ δι᾽ ὕδατος ἅγιον βάπτισμα ἀποστρεφομένοις καὶ ἄνευ ὕδατος μετὰ μόνην τὴν ῥῆσιν τοῦ Πάτερ ἡμῶν <βαπτιζομένοις> ἀνάθεμα[25].

In *Panoplia dogmatica*, it is also underscored that the Bogomils of Constantinople did not accept the sacrament of baptism established, according to the Church tradition, by St. John the Forerunner: Τὸ μὲν παρ᾽ ἡμῖν βάπτισμα τοῦ Ἰωάννου λέγουσιν, ὡς δι᾽ ὕδατος ἐπιτελούμενον, τὸ δὲ παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ διὰ Πνεύματος ὡς αὐτοῖς δοκεῖ τελειούμενον[26].

These examples indicate that the medieval dualists abhorred St. John the Forerunner, as they connected him to the Old Testament tradition, which they rejected, but especially to the sacrament of baptism, also rejected by them and replaced in the heterodox communities by the so-called "spiritual baptism", a rite that has been described variously in the Slavic, Greek, and Latin sources, but with an invariable element: the absence of water (and myrrh) in the ritual.

Водоносьцъ from the Bosnian marginal gloss is absent in the Slavic texts of the classical age. The lexeme **водонось** f. occurs – in the sense of "bucket", for instance, in *Codex Supr.*: **и дотекъ свѧтааго обрѣте ѥже на рамоу ѥго водонось испльнь водъı**[27]. **Водоносьцъ** is a masculine noun, *nomina agentis* formed with the suffix *-ьсь*. The expression **иванъ водоносьцъ** literally means, "Ivan, the carrier of a bucket (of water)". The derogatory nickname indicates that the Bosnian Christians

[24] Cosmas Presbyter, p. 34.

[25] J. Gouillard, *Une source grecque du Sinodik de Boril. La lettre inédite du patriarche Cosmas*, TM 4, 1970, p. 371.

[26] M. Berke, *An Annotated Edition*…, p. 164.

[27] *Словарь старославянского языка. Репринтное изд.*, vol. II, Санкт-Петербург 2006, p. 206.

rejected the orthodox sacrament of baptism, replacing it with a "spiritual" one similar to the liturgical practices of the Balkan or West European heterodox. Most Catholic polemicists point out that the "spiritual baptism" of Christians was performed in a way similar to the Cathar ritual: without water and by raising the Gospel to the breast of the baptized person. Latin documents clearly show that Rome required rebaptism for the Manicheans forsaking the heresy and passing into the bosom of the Catholic Church. Pope Pius II insisted on this in an epistle to the last king of Bosnia, Stephan Tomašević[28]. Some scholars doubt the reliability of Western sources. Dragoljub Dragojlović believes that "spiritual baptism" was actually a monastic initiation rite, a kind of ordination in which the Gospel was placed on the head of the monk in absolution for his sins[29]. This interpretation diminishes in trustworthiness when we consider not the Latin sources, but the domestic, Slavic-Bosnian, ones. The author of the marginal glosses to the *Srećković Gospel* stated categorically that confessing to a priest was pernicious for the soul, and the baptism performed by "Ivan the water-carrier" lacked potency for mystic purification of the soul and body. The two marginal glosses clearly indicate that the Bosnian Church, similar in this to other dualist communities, rejected both the orthodox hierarchy and two of the most important sacraments: confession (and, consequently, the Eucharist connected to it) and baptism with water, established, according to tradition, by St. John the Baptist.

I am intentionally not lingering on some phrases in the marginal glosses that might be interpreted as indicating views close to the neo-Manichean dualist cosmology: about Satan as lord of this world (**кнєзь вѣка**), about man's immortal soul enclosed in the mortal body. These texts allow interpretations both in support of a moderate or radical dualism in the Bosnian Christians' doctrine (A. Solovjev, S. Čirković), and against it (D. Dragojlović). The dualist opposition between good and evil, between matter and spirit, is typical both for the neo-Manichean heresies and for the orthodox Churches. Hence, it would be questionable to look for direct influence of the Bogomil or Cathar doctrines upon this aspect of the Bosnian cosmology. But it would not be questionable as regards the phrases in the marginalia we have interpreted above: very likely, the attitude of the Bosnian Church towards the Patristic tradition (the contempt for St. John the Baptist) and the orthodox sacraments (baptism, confession, Eucharist) followed the models laid down by the Balkan Bogomils. As for the negative attitude towards the official Churches, the similarities may be typological as well, i.e., a common to all dissident movements hostility towards the dominant ecclesiastic organization. The phrase **гостинникъ пѣтарь**, however, testifies to a rejection specifically of the Roman Catholic Church, an attitude reflecting the centuries-long disagreements between the Bosnian Church, the papal power, the hierarchy, and the Catholic missionaries active in these lands.

[28] Д. Драгојловић, *Крстјани и јеретичка црква босанска*…, p. 137.
[29] *Ibidem*, p. 172.

Our analysis of certain particularities of the Bosnian Church's doctrine, based on the two marginal glosses from the *Srećković Gospel*, justifies our asserting that the doctrine and liturgical practice of the Church in question differed significantly from those of the orthodox Churches. Though not copying the Bulgarian and Byzantine Bogomil communities, the Bosnian Church was undoubtedly heretical, and the neo-Manichean influences coming from the Eastern Balkans were an integral element of the Bosnian Christians' faith.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Berke M., *An Annotated Edition of Euthymios Zigabenos "Panoplia dogmatikē", Chapters 23–28*, Belfast 2011.

Cosmas Presbyter, *Homily Against the Bogumils*, ed. J. Sampimon, S. van Halsema, "Полата книгописьнаꙗ" / "Polata knigopisnaja" 34, 2005, p. 1–133.

Gouillard J., *Une source grecque du Sinodik de Boril. La lettre inédite du patriarche Cosmas*, "Travaux et mémoires du Centre de recherches d'histoire et civilisation byzantines" 4, 1970, p. 361–374.

Nakaš L., *Zapadnoštokavski pisani idiom u srednjem vijeku*, "Bosanski jezik" 5, 2008, p. 199–212.

Orbini M., *Il Regno degli Slavi*, München 1985.

Osti F., *L'Epistola invettiva di Eutimio della Peribleptos (1050 ca.) nei codici vaticani 840 e 604. Una versiona breve e un rimaneggiamento*, [in:] *Vie per Bisanzio. VII Congresso Nazionale dell' Associazione Italiana di Studi Bizantini*, vol. I, ed. A. Rigo, A. Babuin, M. Trizio, Bari 2013, p. 251–273.

Speranskij M.N., *Ein bosnisches Evangelium in der Handschriftensammlung Srećković's*, "Archiv für slavische Philologie" 24, 1902, p. 172–182.

Secondary Literature

Bylina S., *Bogomilizm w średniowiecznej Bułgarii. Uwarunkowania społeczne, polityczne i kulturalne*, "Balcanica Posnaniensia. Acta et studia" 2, 1985, p. 133–145.

Cirković S., *Glose Srećkovićevog jevanđelja i učenje bosanske crkve*, [in:] *Bogomilstvoto na Balkanot vo svetlinata na najnovite istražuvanja. Materijali od simpoziumot održan vo Skopje na 30, 31 maj i 1 juni 1978*, Skopje 1982, p. 207–221.

Dautović Dž., *Crkva bosanska: moderni historiografski tokovi, rasprave i kontroverze (2005–2015)*, "Historijska traganja" 15, 2015, p. 127–160.

Dragojlović D., *Bogomilstvo na Balkanu i u Maloj Aziji*, vol. I, *Bogomil rodonačalnici*, Beograd 1974.

Dragojlović D., *Krstjani i jeretička crkva bosanska*, Beograd 1987.

Dujčev I., *I bogomili nei paesi slavi e la loro storia*, [in:] I. Dujčev, *Medioevo bizantino-slavo*, vol. I, Roma 1966, p. 251–282.

Hamilton J., Hamilton B., Stoyanov Y., *Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World, c. 650 – c. 1450*, Manchester–New York 1998.

Obolensky D., *The Bogomils. A Study in Balkan Neo-Manichaeism*, Cambridge 1948.

Rački F., *Bogomili i patareni*, Zagreb 1869–1870.

RAČKI F., *Borba južnih Slovena za državnu neodvisnost. Bogomili i patareni*, Beograd 1931.

RUNCIMAN S., *The Medieval Manichee. A Study of the Christian Dualist Heresy*, Cambridge 1947.

Slovarʹ staroslavjanskogo jazyka. Reprintnoe izd. Репринтное изд., vol. II, Sankt-Peterburg 2006.

SOLOVJEV A., *Svedočanstva pravoslavnih izvora o bogomilstvu na Balkanu*, "Godišnjak Istorijskog društva Bosne i Hercegovine" 5, 1953, p. 1–103.

SOLOVJEV A., *Vjersko učenje bosanske crkve*, Zagreb 1948.

SPYRA J., *Wspólnoty bogomilskie jako próba powrotu do form życia gmin wczesnochrześcijańskich*, "Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Historyczne" 84, 1987, p. 7–21.

WRÓBEL P., *Kontrowersje wokół podboju i islamizacji Bośni. Przyczynek do tzw. „polityki historycznej"*, "Balcanica Posnaniensia. Acta et studia" 19, 2012, p. 86–93, https://doi.org/10.14746/bp.2012.19.7

Abstract. The article examines the debate as to the direct influence of Bulgarian and Byzantine Bogomilism upon the doctrine of the Bosnian Church. The author traces some scholarly views *pro et contra* the presence, in the Bosnian-Slavic sources, of traces of neo-Manichean views on the Church, the Patristic tradition, and the sacraments. In analyzing two marginal glosses in the so-called *Sreć-ković Gospel* in the context of some anti-Bogomil Slavic and Byzantine texts, the article attempts to establish the importance of Bulgarian and Byzantine Bogomilism for the formation of certain dogmatic and ecclesiological views in the doctrine of the Bosnian Church: the negative attitude towards the orthodox Churches, especially the Roman Catholic Church; the rejection of the sacrament of baptism and of St. John the Baptist; the rejection of the sacrament of confession, and hence, of the Eucharist. These doctrinal particularities of the Bosnian Church warrant the assertion that its teachings and liturgical practice differed significantly from the dogmatics and practice of the orthodox Churches. Without being a copy of the Bogomil communities, the Bosnian Church was certainly heretical, and neo-Manichean influences from the Eastern Balkans were an integral element of the Bosnian Christians' faith.

Keywords: Bosnian Church, Bogomilism, dualism

Georgi Minczew
University of Lodz
Faculty of Philology
Department of Slavic Philology
ul. Pomorska 171/173
90-236 Łódź, Polska/Poland
georgi.minczew@gmail.com