

B O G O M I L I S M  
A STUDY OF  
THE "BULGARIAN HERESY"  
AS AN EXPRESSION OF  
THE PRINCIPLE OF PURITANISM

BIBLICAL SCHOOL OF  
THEOLOGY LIBRARY  
HATFIELD, PA.

18580

N 589 TH

BOGOMILISM  
A STUDY OF  
THE "BULGARIAN HERESY"  
AS AN EXPRESSION OF  
THE PRINCIPLE OF PURITANISM

BY

Nicholas Nikoloff

B.R.E., The Biblical Seminary in New York

235  
17

A THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for  
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION  
in  
The Biblical Seminary in New York

New York, N. Y.  
April, 1940

BIBLICAL SCHOOL OF  
THEOLOGY LIBRARY  
HATFIELD, PA.

18580

To

DEAN GREER McKEE

My Teacher-Friend  
Who inspired me to love Church History  
and whose  
Guidance and Practical Help  
in this study  
was a  
Constant Inspiration

This Thesis is Gratefully Dedicated.

T A B L E   O F   C O N T E N T S

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	2
A. The Subject . . . . .	3
1. The General Field of Inquiry . . . . .	4
2. The Subject Delimited . . . . .	6
3. The Value of the Study . . . . .	8
B. The Plan of Procedure . . . . .	10
C. Sources and Materials . . . . .	12
1. Writings of Bogomils . . . . .	12
2. Writings of Their Enemies and Others . . . . .	14
 <u>PART ONE</u> 	
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE BOGOMILIAN PROTEST	
II. POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS DEVELOPMENTS ON THE BALKAN PENINSULA PRIOR TO THE RISE OF BOGOMILISM . . . . .	17
A. Introduction . . . . .	18
B. Slav and Bulgarian Migrations . . . . .	19
1. The Slav Settlers . . . . .	19
2. The Early Bulgarians . . . . .	26
C. Bulgaria and Christianity . . . . .	34
1. National Conversion . . . . .	36
2. Consequences of the Conversion . . . . .	39
D. Summary and Conclusion . . . . .	43
III. ORIGIN AND ESTABLISHMENT OF BOGOMILISM . . . . .	46
A. Introduction . . . . .	47
B. Precursors of the Bogomils . . . . .	51
1. Heretical Colonization in Bulgaria . . . . .	52
2. Manicheans . . . . .	54
3. Euchites or Messalians . . . . .	58
4. Paulicians . . . . .	61

RR558 Gift of author April 21/1942.

Chapter	Page
III (Continued)	
C. Bogomilism and Its Origins . . . . .	74
1. The Generally Accepted View . . . . .	74
2. The More Logical View . . . . .	75
D. Conditions Which Favored Bogomilism . . . . .	80
1. Conditions under the First Bulgarian Kingdom (679-1018 A.D.) . . . . .	80
2. Conditions under the Byzantine Yoke (1018-1186 A.D.) . . . . .	87
3. Conditions under the Second Bulgarian Kingdom (1186-1393 A.D.) . . . . .	90
E. Summary and Conclusion . . . . .	92

PART TWO

DEVELOPMENT AND SPREAD OF THE BOGOMIL MOVEMENT

IV. BOGOMILISM AS A NATIONAL MOVEMENT . . . . .	96
A. Introduction . . . . .	97
B. Its Name . . . . .	99
1. The Two Theories . . . . .	99
2. The Proper Solution . . . . .	100
C. Its Founder . . . . .	101
1. The Various Theories . . . . .	101
2. The Logical Conclusion . . . . .	101
D. Its Development . . . . .	103
1. The Early Stages . . . . .	103
2. The Conflicting Teachings . . . . .	105
3. The Establishment of Two Bogomil Churches	106
E. Its Organization . . . . .	107
1. The Pattern . . . . .	107
2. The Two Classes of Members . . . . .	108
3. The Leadership . . . . .	110
F. Summary and Conclusion . . . . .	110
V. BOGOMILISM AS AN INTERNATIONAL MOVEMENT (On next page)	

Chapter	Page
V. BOGOMILISM AS AN INTERNATIONAL MOVEMENT . . . . .	113
A. Introduction . . . . .	114
B. Bulgaria, Crossroad of Nations . . . . .	115
1. A Geographical Bridge . . . . .	115
2. A Theological Melting Pot . . . . .	116
C. Reasons for the Spread of Bogomilism . . . . .	118
1. Persecutions in Bulgaria . . . . .	118
2. Favorable Conditions in Other Lands . . . . .	118
3. Commercial Intercourse between Nations . . . . .	119
4. The Crusades and Their Contribution . . . . .	120
D. Spheres of Diffusion . . . . .	120
1. Constantinople and Asia Minor . . . . .	120
2. Macedonia . . . . .	122
3. Serbia and Bosnia . . . . .	122
4. Dalmatia and Italy . . . . .	123
5. Southern France . . . . .	123
6. Germany and Moravia . . . . .	123
7. Russia . . . . .	123
E. Successors of the Bogomils . . . . .	125
1. The Cathari . . . . .	126
2. The Albigenses . . . . .	127
3. Bulgaria the Seat of Authority . . . . .	127
F. Summary and Conclusion . . . . .	129

PART THREE

THE LIFE AND TEACHINGS OF THE BOGOMILS

VI. THE LIFE AND TEACHINGS OF THE BOGOMILS AS RELATED TO THE PRINCIPLE OF PURITANISM . . . . .	132
A. Introduction . . . . .	133
B. Their Manner of Life and Worship . . . . .	138
1. Their Puritanism . . . . .	138
2. Their Rules of Life . . . . .	138
3. Their Standards . . . . .	139
4. Their Zeal and Endurance . . . . .	139
5. Their Form of Worship . . . . .	139
6. Their Private Devotional Life . . . . .	140

Chapter	Page
VI (Continued)	
C. Their Teachings . . . . .	140
1. About God . . . . .	140
2. About Christ . . . . .	141
3. About the Holy Spirit . . . . .	141
4. About the Trinity . . . . .	141
5. About the Church . . . . .	142
6. About the Scriptures . . . . .	142
7. About Creation . . . . .	142
8. About the Virgin Mary . . . . .	144
9. About Prophets and Saints . . . . .	144
10. About the Orthodox Ceremonies . . . . .	144
11. About Relics and Icons . . . . .	144
12. About the Priesthood . . . . .	145
D. Summary and Conclusion . . . . .	145
VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION . . . . .	147
A. Summary of the Bogomilian Protest . . . . .	148
B. The Contribution of Bogomilism . . . . .	150
1. In the Field of Literature . . . . .	151
2. In the Field of Sociology . . . . .	151
3. In the Field of Religion . . . . .	151



A P P E N D I C E S

A. The Letter of Patriarch Theophylact to Tsar  
Peter of Bulgaria . . . . .Page 156

B. Presbyter Kozma; A Sermon against the  
Bogomilian Heresy . . . . . Page 159

C. The Biography of the Noted Saint Hilarion . Page 170

D. Sinodik Tsaria Borisa . . . . . Page 172

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

(Pages 176-182)

**B O G O M I L I S M**

**A STUDY OF**

**THE "BULGARIAN HERESY"**

**AS AN EXPRESSION OF**

**THE PRINCIPLE OF PURITANISM**

**CHAPTER I**

**I N T R O D U C T I O N**

## CHAPTER I

### I N T R O D U C T I O N

#### A. The Subject

In studying the history of the Christian Church, a careful observer cannot but notice the periodic recurrence of spiritual revolutions which have resulted in great suffering and the loss of many lives. The most remarkable thing about these revolts within the organized church is the fact that powerful ecclesiastical leaders have done their best to suppress these upheavals with all available means, sometimes using the most inhuman ways of torturing the revolters--tortures occasionally surpassing in cruelty those of the heathen Roman emperors during the early day of Christianity.

Those who wish to discover the causes for the revolts mentioned above need not search long, as they are rather obvious. They may be summed up as lack of spiritual freedom, lowering of spiritual standards, deadly formality, superstition, and moral depravity within the borders of the official church. Of course, the accusing finger of the revolters has pointed always to the ecclesiastical leaders who by virtue of their office were chiefly responsible for such situations.

## 1. The General Field of Inquiry

As early as the latter part of the second century we read of a spiritual revolt headed by a Phrygian presbyter by the name of Montanus who "protested strongly against the laxity of Church discipline and especially the readmission, even after penitence, of those who had lapsed into apostasy or other deadly sin."<sup>1</sup> Tertullian of Carthage (160-220 A.D.), the brilliant defender of Christianity against Gnosticism, was also a prominent Montanist.

"His Puritanism appears in his denunciation of flight from persecution, and his opposition to the restoration of the lapsed; in his condemnation of second marriage and commendation of excessive fasting; in his warnings against female adornment, and deprecation of military service as incompatible with Christian fidelity."<sup>2</sup>

Hippolytus, a church leader near Rome not connected with the Montanists, during the early part of the third century "headed a Puritan revolt against two successive Roman bishops on account of their loose discipline and unworthy character."<sup>3</sup> This Puritan movement led in 251 A.D. to the famous Novatian schism which spread widely and lasted, especially in north Africa, down to the fifth century.

The Montanist and Novatian revolts were followed

. . . . .

1. Henry Cowan: Landmarks of Church History, pp. 29-30
2. Ibid., p. 30
3. Loc. cit.

by similar upheavals which crystalized in the establishment of strong and well-organized sects. Some of these were associated with a greater or lesser degree of heresy, like the Euchites, Messalians, Paulicians, Bogomils, Albigenses, and other similar groups under the general designation of Cathari or Puritans. They were "found in various lands of Southern Europe from the Bosphorus to the Atlantic,"<sup>1</sup> from the seventh century up to the fourteenth. Others were extremely orthodox, such as the Waldenses, the Puritans of Savonarola's day, and the great Puritan movements of the Reformation and post-Reformation times.

The following remark of Cowan is very fitting:

"The Puritan principles of the Montanists and Novatianists have been frequently reproduced, in association sometimes with heresy, oftener with extreme orthodoxy; and they have exerted a one-sided, yet, on the whole, salutary influence, as a needful counteractive to the stronger tendency towards undue laxity of discipline and life."<sup>2</sup>

To the above we add a statement by McKee:

"There have been times when the Church for various reasons has lost its spiritual freedom and has become the servant of form, or dogma, or of rule of life. From the midst of such a situation there has often come a reaction. Sometimes such a counter movement from a doctrinal standpoint has not been founded upon what the church holds to be orthodox faith, but from a practical and moral point of view has been essentially puritan."<sup>3</sup>

. . . . .

1. Cowan, op. cit., p. 115
2. Ibid., p. 30
3. Dean Greer McKee; A Study of the Albigenses in the Light of the Principle of Puritanism (A Thesis), p. 2

Careful analysis of these spiritual revolts brings us to the conclusion that due to certain unwholesome conditions manifesting themselves in the organized church during certain periods and in certain localities, a peculiar urge for purity and religious freedom has become very prominent, not only among the spiritually minded religious leaders, but also among large groups of the laity. Motivated by this puritanistic principle, determined individuals have taken the lead in proclaiming a break with traditional Christianity and have inaugurated movements which, now and then, have shaken the established church to its very foundation. In support of this statement McKee says:

"We believe that there is this essential principle which lies dormant in the bosom of mankind, such that when the forms of religion bring upon mankind a spiritual bondage, and religion is deprived of the reality of spiritual values, retaining only the forms of religion, so polluted and rendered incapable of satisfying the longings of the human soul, this spirit then arises in the human heart which revolts against this bondage and demands a higher and better life, seeking to lay hold on that which does satisfy its inmost needs."

## 2. The Subject Delimited

Our purpose is not to enter into a thorough investigation of the principle of Puritanism as it has been manifested in all the Puritan movements from the

. . . . .

1. McKee, op. cit., p. 3

second century down to our day. We shall restrict our research to one only of these movements, called Bogomilism, under the thesis that this so-called "Bulgarian heresy" (Bulgarorum haeresis),<sup>1</sup> which originated in southern Bulgaria during the tenth century and soon spread throughout the Balkan countries and western Europe, was a reform movement motivated and propelled in its terrific task by the urge for purity, as well as for religious and social freedom. More concisely, it was an expression of the principle of Puritanism. In other words, our study will endeavor to portray the sect, in its relation to the Greek Orthodox and Catholic churches of medieval times, as a strong reaction demonstrating the principle of Puritanism.

Others have made more detailed studies of the history, doctrines, and literature of the Bogomils.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, we shall not enter into extensive research in these matters, but shall enter into the field of history insofar as this will help us to develop our subject. The same is true also regarding the doctrines of the sect; we

. . . . .

1. Cf. Boyan Boeff: *Missiata na Bogomilstvoto v Svrska s Missiata na Slavianstvoto*, p. 7; Fr. Racki: *Bogomili i Patareni*, p. 345; Janko Lavrin: *The Bogomils and Bogomilism*, in Slavonic Review, Vol. VIII (1929-30), p. 269
2. Cf. Victor N. Sharenkoff: *A Study of Manichaeism in Bulgaria*; Jordan Ivanoff: *Bogomilski Knigi i Legendi*; Ivan G. Klincharoff: *Pop Bogomil i negovoto vreme*; Racki, *op. cit.*; K. Radchenko: *Edui po Bogomilstvo*; Augustus Neander: *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, Vol. IV; etc.



shall study them insofar as is necessary to the better understanding of these so-called heretics. In our treatment of the subject we purpose also to be as unbiased as possible; we shall not endeavor to defend or to attack the Bogomils and their doctrines, but shall do our utmost to set forth a true picture of this movement basing our description on the available sources.

### 3. The Value of the Study

We believe a study of this kind is important, especially at this particular time, for reasons suggested in the following paragraphs.

According to various writers<sup>1</sup> Bogomilism first appeared during the reign of the Bulgarian king Peter, somewhere between 927 and 950 A.D. Recently, commemorating the millenium of this movement, many Bulgarians published articles and books regarding it, while others delivered lectures on the sect. It is noteworthy that there is a great change in the attitude of the modern Bulgarian, although nominally Greek Orthodox, toward the Bogomils, compared with the ultra-hostile attitude of the Orthodox ecclesiastical leaders of medieval Bulgaria. For example, in 1936 the well-known Bulgarian author,

. . . . .

1. Cf. Sharenkoff, op. cit., p. 36; also Boeff, op. cit., p. 6; Const. Jirecek: Dejiny naroda bulharskeho (Bulgarian translation), p. 128; Klincharoff, op. cit., pp. 24-26

Stilian Chilingiroff, while speaking on the subject, "What Has the Bulgarian Given to the Other Nations?" emphasized the fact that Bogomilism has had great influence upon the awakening in western Europe and the Reformation.<sup>1</sup>

Even among the socialist leaders of Bulgaria there are men who pay tribute to the Bogomils. Janko Sakuzoff in his "Bulgarite v svojata istoria" ("The Bulgarians in Their History") says that the Bulgarian nation can be proud because she produced that reform movement (Bogomilism) which a few centuries ago saved the European nations from the feudal church's teaching and decadence. "It gave birth to the renaissance with its blossoming philosophy, science, and morals."<sup>2</sup>

The Bulgarian Protestants have not failed to recognize the great influence of Bogomilism upon European civilization. The late Stoyan Vatralsky, a well-known Protestant author, graduate of a leading American university, is quoted by Boeff:

"The greatest Bulgarian has been and is priest Bogomil. He alone from among our nation, through his life-giving teaching, has made a valuable contribution to universal culture. Priest Bogomil was a forerunner of all great reformers of whom civilization prides itself today."<sup>3</sup>

Not only Bulgarian but also other Slavic and

. . . . .

1. Cf. Boeff, op. cit., p. 27
2. Ibid., p. 23
3. Ibid., p. 27

western European authorities agree that Bogomilism was a movement which influenced directly or indirectly with its Puritanistic tendencies and social ideals the life and thought of medieval Europe. If so, a study of this movement should present a special interest to the student of history and also to those engaged in religious and social work.

The time has come to ascertain with as great clarity as possible what our views should be regarding the Bogomils and their kindred sects who had the moral courage to raise a strong voice of protest against a back-slidden church and who were ready to die for their convictions and Puritanistic ideals.

#### B. The Plan of Procedure

In order to obtain a clear picture of the Bogomil movement we shall make a study, first of all, of political developments on the Balkan peninsula prior to Bogomilism. This will necessitate a description of the genesis of the Bulgarian kingdom in the Balkans. Secondly, we shall briefly consider several Asiatic sects which were vitally related one way or another to the Bogomils. We shall then give a description of the various conditions which gave birth to Bogomilism and helped it to get established.

In the third place, before considering the doctrines and ethics as well as the life of the Bogomils, we shall give a general description of them as a national movement; and then endeavor to portray the sect as an international movement. In doing this we shall describe the persecution which the Bogomils endured in Bulgaria and which was one of the main causes for their scattering throughout the Balkan countries, western Europe, and even Asia Minor, where they became the progenitors of various Cathari or Puritan sects.

The fourth step in the development of this subject will be a brief study of the life and teaching of the Bogomils. Here, as well as in the former discussions, we shall endeavor to emphasize our central thought regarding the principle of Puritanism, which we consider to be the motivating power of this movement in its struggle for existence and which, we believe, was a factor of paramount importance in the tremendous success it enjoyed for several centuries.

In our concluding chapter we shall summarize our findings and seek to estimate the contribution which the Bogomilian movement has made in the fields of literature, sociology, and religion.

In view of the fact that certain valuable sources written by enemies of the Bogomils, written in Slavic and Greek languages, are not accessible to the average English-

speaking student, except perhaps in works like the one by Dr. Sharenkoff which has come out in a rather limited edition,<sup>1</sup> we have decided to reproduce the appendices of Dr. Sharenkoff's book for the benefit of our readers.

### C. Sources and Materials

As we study the struggle between various reform or Puritan movements and the established churches of medieval times, Orthodox and Catholic, we discover one common fact; namely, that after destroying or crushing the "heretics" the ecclesiastical leaders seem to have taken special measures to destroy all their writings, no doubt fearing that the great propagating power of these writings might become the means of resurrecting the teaching of their dreaded enemies.<sup>2</sup> What McKee says about the Albigenses and the other Cathari in southwestern Europe is also very true of the "Bulgarian heresy."<sup>3</sup>

#### 1. Writings of Bogomils

Today there is very little extant of what can be termed real Bogomilian literature. Ivanoff, an authority on the subject, states that many historians on Bulgarian and Slav literature in general, in their desire to give a

. . . . .

1. Cf. Sharenkoff, op. cit.
2. Cf. Klincharoff, op. cit., pp. 10, 141
3. Cf. McKee, op. cit., pp. 5-7

special place to Bogomilian literature, make the mistake of confusing apocryphal writings with those that may be termed purely Bogomilian, since the Bogomils made good use of apocryphal literature in their teaching.<sup>1</sup>

Ivanoff says: "Most of the known Bogomilian works are anonymous. Priest Bogomil, no doubt, must have been one of the first Bogomilian authors; however, we lack information from which to decide exactly which works have been left by him."<sup>2</sup>

It is not known whether the leading followers of Bogomil mentioned in the Sinodik Tzaria Borisa,<sup>3</sup> Michael, Theodore, Dobri, Stefan, Basil, and Peter, have written anything.<sup>4</sup>

We quote again from Ivanoff:

"We know only that the Bogomilian bishop (dedetz) Nazarius in the twelfth century carried away from Bulgaria the Bogomilian 'Secret Book' and that he delivered it to his partisans (adherents) in Lombardy; it is possible that this same Nazarius may have made one of the two translations of this book into Latin, . . . As a Bulgarian author of apocryphal books we find more often mentioned the name of priest Jeremiah, a contemporary of priest Bogomil."<sup>5</sup>

Concerning the "Secret Book" Ivanoff states that "from beginning to end the view of moderate dualism is maintained, which received a rounded form first in Bul-

. . . . .

1. Cf. Ivanoff, op. cit., pp. 49-50

2. Ibid., p. 50

3. Cf. Sharenkoff, op. cit., p. 83; Appendix D, p.

4. Cf. Ivanoff, op. cit., p. 51

5. Loc. cit.

garia during the tenth century and received the name Bogomilism."<sup>1</sup> Ivanoff considers this "Secret Book" to be the catechism of the Bogomils.<sup>2</sup>

Generally speaking, "the study of Bogomilian literature is hindered not only by the anonymity of its authors; it itself is still very little known; it is an unknown land which must be discovered."<sup>3</sup>

Because genuine Bogomil literature is very scarce, almost non-existent, we must turn to other sources in the effort to determine what the Bogomils believed and taught.

Ivanoff seems to place considerable value as sources upon the "Bulgarian fables," "Bogomilian fables," as well as on oral legends and parables, through which the Bogomil teaching has been spread especially among the simple and uneducated people. Some of these legends and fables are preserved to our day.<sup>4</sup>

## 2. Writings of Their Enemies and Others

Two other possible sources from which we can draw information are the historians, sometimes disposed to be friendly toward the sect; and the enemies of these people, who, as can be expected, are very biased in their writings.

. . . . .

1. Ivanoff, op. cit., p. 65

2. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 55

3. *Ibid.*, p. 51

4. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 55; also cf. Klincharoff, op. cit., pp. 22-23

On this point we quote Sharenkoff:

"There have been preserved works of those writers who were hostile to Bogomilism and they naturally give us a one-sided view of the Bogomil doctrines. Chief among such writings are: The 'Letter of Theophylactus, Patriarch of Constantinople, to Peter, Tzar of Bulgaria,' likewise the 'Sermon of Presbyter Kozma against the Bogomils' (Kozmi Prezvitera Slovo na eretiki i pouchenie ot bozhestvenikh knig); furthermore the 'Panoplia dogmatica,' the 'Confutatio et eversio impiae et multiplicis execrabilium massalianorum sectae,' and the 'Contra haeresim haereticorum qui phundagiatae dicuntur' by Euthymius Zygabenus. From a later date are the 'Biography of Hilarion, Bishop of Maglen' (Zhitie i Zhizn prepodobnago otza nashego Iilariona, episkopa Maglenskago . . . supisano Evtimiem patriarkhom Trnovskim), the 'Sinodik of Tzar Boril' (1211), and the 'Biography of Theodosius of Tirnovo' by Kalistus, patriarch of Constantinople. The 'Alexidis' of Anna Comnena may also be used for the study of the development of Bogomilism in Constantinople and Thrace."<sup>1</sup>

Notwithstanding the difficulty which the above problem of sources presents, we believe there is sufficient information available to substantiate our thesis that the Bogomilian movement was an expression of the principle of Puritanism.

. . . . .

1. Sharenkoff, op. cit., pp. 35-36; cf. Klincharoff, op. op. cit., p. 10



PART ONE

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

OF

THE BOGOMILIAN PROTEST

CHAPTER II

POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS DEVELOPMENTS

ON

THE BALKAN PENINSULA

PRIOR TO

THE RISE OF BOGOMILISM

## CHAPTER II

### POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS DEVELOPMENTS

ON

THE BALKAN PENINSULA

PRIOR TO

THE RISE OF BOGOMILISM

#### A. Introduction

In order to understand clearly any great religious or social movement it is of paramount importance, first of all, to get acquainted with the background of this movement. Only by following such a procedure will one safeguard himself against prejudice and the formation of wrong views regarding the movement. This is especially true of Bogomilism because of the variety of circumstances which gave it birth, and from which we cannot divorce it.

Bulgaria, where Bogomilism was born, because of its geographic position has been a crossroad of the nations. It has been the object of conquests and migrations time and again, crusading multitudes have passed through it, and colonizations by various religious groups have taken place within its borders on several occasions. All these have left impressions of one kind or another

upon the cultural, social, and religious life of its population, and have exerted tremendous influence in shaping the thought of the masses.

In view of this, we shall now undertake a brief study of the political and religious developments which took place on the Balkan peninsula prior to the appearance of Bogomilism—the medieval protest of the Balkans which left indelible traces not only in those regions but practically throughout Europe.

### B. Slavs and Bulgarian Migrations

For our purpose we need not go very far back in the study of Balkan history, i.e. we need not consider events which took place in the territory of present-day Bulgaria earlier than the third century of the Christian Era. First we shall make a study of the Slavs in the Balkans, and then consider the establishment of the Bulgarian state.

#### 1. The Slav Settlers

Between the third and seventh centuries the Slavonic migration into the Balkans gradually expelled or absorbed the Thraco-Illyrian race inhabiting the district between the Danube and the Aegean Sea.<sup>1</sup> The Roman em-

. . . . .

1. Cf. Elinor F. B. Grogan: "Bulgaria"; The Encyclopaedia Britannica (14th ed.), Vol. IV, p. 361; Iv. Pastouhoff

perors were not able to check the invaders. By the middle of the seventh century the Balkan peninsula became Slavonic and the Roman population of this section of the Empire was more or less isolated and "remained as oases here and there among the strong agricultural people."<sup>1</sup>

It is very important that we get a clear picture of the beliefs and customs of the Slavs, as well as of their traditions and social institutions, because, as we shall notice later, these composed the rich soil from which sprang the Bogomilian movement during the first Bulgarian kingdom.

The Slavs, who as a whole were agricultural people, were governed by democratic local institutions. They had no national leaders or a central government of any kind. The "pleme" or tribe was the only political unit of the Slavs.<sup>2</sup> They disliked being ruled by any person and therefore could not be united under a ruler.<sup>3</sup> In fact, being divided into numerous tribes, they often were at enmity among themselves, a situation well utilized by their external enemies, who managed at times to defeat them and rule over them, as did the Byzantians and others

. . . . .

and Iv. Stoyanoff; *Istoria na Bulgarskia Narod*, pp. 22-23; Jirecek, *Dejiny naroda bulharsceho*, p. 71;

Sharenkoff, *A Study of Manichaeism in Bulgaria*, p. 23

1. Sharenkoff, loc. cit.; cf. Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, op. cit., p. 24

2. Cf. Grogan, loc. cit.; Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, op. cit., p. 27; Jirecek, op. cit., p. 67

3. Cf. Jirecek, loc. cit.

who were well organized.<sup>1</sup> If their extraordinary love for freedom and independence, which has remained a trait of the Slavic people to this day, had been used properly, doubtless the Slavs would always have triumphed over their enemies. An Arabian writer says that if the Slavs had overcome their tribal divisions and lived among themselves in unity, no nation in the world would have been in a position to match its strength with them.<sup>2</sup> A demonstration of these principles was observed during the first World War when a number of Slavic peoples fought valiantly for freedom and national independence, and also during the recent developments prior to the present war when certain central European Slavs quarreled among themselves and thus became prey to the invading Germans.

The Byzantine emperors took advantage of the lack of unity among the various Slavic tribes and gradually subdued many of them, thus facilitating their own rule over the Slavs; in fact, the emperors recruited their army from among these people, while certain individual Slavs "rose to high rank and office in the Byzantine State and church."<sup>3</sup> Necetas, patriarch of Constantinople (766-780 A.D.), Damian, the treasurer of emperor Michael III,

. . . . .

1. Cf. Jirecek, loc. cit.; Sharenkoff, loc. cit.
2. Cf. Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, op. cit., p. 25
3. Sharenkoff, loc. cit.; cf. Klincharoff, Pop Bogomil i Negovoto Vreme, p. 13; Kenneth Scott Latourette: The Thousand Years of Uncertainty, p. 238

emperor Basilius of Macedonia, and others were of Slavic origin.<sup>1</sup>

The character of the ancient Slavs, according to Byzantine witnesses, was commendable. They were kindly disposed and open-hearted. Malice and treachery were foreign to them. Extreme hospitality was a notable characteristic of the Slavs.<sup>2</sup> They preferred quiet life to warfare, and only when forced to fight did they become hard-hearted and cruel as their contemporaries.

Slavery was not practiced by them as it was among other nations. This proves that they had a rather high regard for human life and personality. They did not keep their war prisoners in a permanent state of slavery as did other nations. They retained the prisoners for a while and then permitted them either to redeem themselves and return to their own people or to remain among their captors in liberty and fellowship.<sup>3</sup> As a rule they were considerate to the peoples they subdued and did not exact heavy tribute from them.<sup>4</sup>

The form of government prevalent among the Slavs, as already mentioned,<sup>5</sup> was democratic or rather communal-democratic, with the family union (zadruga) as

. . . . .

1. Cf. Jirecek, op. cit., p. 105; Klincharoff, loc. cit.; Latourette, op. cit., pp. 238-9
2. Cf. Jirecek, op. cit., p. 66
3. Cf. ibid., p. 68
4. Cf. Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, op. cit., p. 26
5. Cf. ante, p. 20

its fundamental unit. The family unit or fellowship consisted of a few closely related families who worked and lived together under the supervision of the oldest member of the fellowship. The latter acted as a sort of monitor and was elected by the group. Generally, this leader was either the father or oldest brother and bore the title "stareishina" (elder). Among the various members of the family union full equality reigned; and as the real estate and fields belonged to this unique communal fellowship, no one among them was poor. Immorality was not tolerated in their midst. Those who did not conduct themselves according to the moral standards of the fellowship were excluded.

The position of the women in the Slavic family union was respectable, the oldest of them being the supervisor of the rest. She allotted work to each female member of the large family, and acted as general supervisor of the community in the absence of the men. This is a rather unique example of woman suffrage in an age when elsewhere women were treated as inferior to men.<sup>1</sup>

Before concluding our brief study of the Slavs we must consider also their religious beliefs. It is a very difficult matter to ascertain their mythology.

. . . . .

1. Cf. Jirecek, op. cit., pp. 66-67; Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, op. cit., pp. 27-8



There have been many speculations regarding this. However, serious investigators inform us that there is positive data only about the belief of the Polabian Slavs, who remained pagan longer than any other branch of the race. Little is known as to the original beliefs of the southern Slavs, since they began to accept Christianity at a rather early date.

Jirecek, quoting Procopius, who seems to be the oldest source regarding the religion of the Slavs, says: "They acknowledge as Creator of all things a god-thunder-carrier, to whom they offer bulls and other animals" . . . they also honor rivers, nymphs, and other deities to whom they also make offerings."<sup>1</sup>

The Slavs pictured the whole of nature as full of beings subordinate to the supreme God. They distinguished between gods and demons; the former were friendly to man, the latter unfriendly. The supreme god was called Svarog, whose two sons were said to be the sun and the fire. The sun was called Dazhdbog or Hrus. It does not appear that the Balkan Slavs worshipped Peroun, the god of thunder, who was highly honored among the Russians.<sup>2</sup> Sharenkoff makes a statement that the Slavs held something similar to the dualism of the Bogomils. He says: "The 'Black God' (Tzrn or Cherni Bog) in the Slavonic Mythol-

. . . . .

1. Jirecek, op. cit., p. 69  
2. Cf. ibid.

ogy corresponded to Evil in the Bogomilian theogony and the 'White God' (Beli Bog) to the Good or God of Light."<sup>1</sup> But Ivanoff disagrees with Sharenkoff on this point. He states:

"The dualistic borrowings in the system of priest Bogomil are not due to native Slavic influence, as many of the investigators of Bogomilism have supposed. Now it is known . . . that the belief of the pagan southern Slavs was not dualistic and that the tidings regarding the White God and Black God among them are late literary additions."<sup>2</sup>

The Slavs prayed to the gods under the open sky, in the brush, under trees, or even atop mountain crags. While offering to the gods they sang. Before battle, or when nearing death, they made vows to the supreme God that if he would deliver them they would offer a thank-offering to him. However, they were not fatalists--they had no conception of fate.<sup>3</sup>

The cosmogony of all the Slavs was very simple. They believed that the visible world came out of the sea sand, "which God took from the bottom of the sea and sprinkled upon its surface in order to create the solid ground (earth). Accordingly, the Slavs pictured the earth as floating on the surface of the sea."<sup>4</sup>

The Slav nations abound with legends and songs about female supernatural beings, some of them kindly

. . . . .

1. Sharenkoff, op. cit., p. 37
2. Ivanoff, Bogomilski Knigi i Legendi, p. 23
3. Jirecek, loc. cit.
4. Ibid.

disposed toward men, like the "roussalki" (a sort of nymph); others hostile to most men, but friendly toward heroes, like the "samovili" (samodivi) or "iudi." In many songs no distinction is made between the "samodivi" or "iudi." These were women similar in appearance to the "roussalki" and were supposed to live in the deep lakes and in the river whirlpools.<sup>1</sup>

Belief in all kinds of evil spirits, vampires, and the like, was very common among the Slavs.<sup>2</sup> Traces of this belief can be found even today among some Slavic nations.

The pagan Slavs believed that the soul was a being altogether different and separate from the human body, which lives within the breast of man and manifests itself through the process of breathing. "They believed in life after death. The words heaven and paradise are common to all Slavs."<sup>3</sup>

## 2. The Early Bulgarians

Many historians agree that the early Bulgarians were a Turanian race, closely related to the Huns and Avars. They belonged to that wave of migrants which followed the Huns in their westward march.<sup>4</sup> Jirecek agrees

. . . . .

1. Cf. Jirecek, op. cit., p. 70

2. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 70-71

3. *Ibid.*, p. 71

4. Cf. Grogan, "Bulgaria"; Encyclopaedia Britannica, 14th ed., Vol. IV, p. 361; Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, op.

with the statement of Safarik in his "Sebrane spisy" (II, 176) that the old Bulgarians were Finns from the region of the Ural Mountains in Russia.<sup>1</sup> These people were hordes of wild, fierce, and barbarous horsemen who were ruled despotically by their chiefs, called "khans" and their retinue of nobles, called "bolyars"; in other words, the old Bulgarian state had an aristocratic structure in its form of government. The khan was the supreme ruler. He had a council of nobles. They enforced a very rigid system of laws and capital punishment was a usual thing for those who misbehaved, those who tried to run away, or those who fled from battle.<sup>2</sup>

The old Bulgarians practiced polygamy. Those who could not afford a large harem had at least two wives. The status of the women in the old Bulgarian state was not very high.<sup>3</sup>

It is believed that the religion of at least some of the old Bulgarian tribes was polytheistic, while some of them had embraced Islam.<sup>4</sup> Khan Koubrat, who together with his uncle Orkan reestablished the old Bulgarian kingdom, heading the Unugunduri tribe, is reported to have accepted Christianity as a child while visiting

. . . . .

cit., pp. 32-33

1. Cf. Jirecek, op. cit., p. 92

2. Cf. ibid., pp. 90-91; Grogan, loc. cit.; Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, op. cit., pp. 37-38

3. Cf. Jirecek, p. 90

4. Cf. Grogan, loc. cit.

Constantinople. This experience and the visit of his uncle Orkan to the Byzantian capital, where he and his family were treated royally, helped greatly to cement the friendship between Koubrat's kingdom and Byzantium.<sup>1</sup>

Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff hold the view that the old Bulgarians originally lived in the neighborhood of China and that around 147 A.D. they arrived in the Russian steppes between the Ural Mountains and the Caspian Sea.<sup>2</sup> Others believe that during the fourth century the old Bulgarians settled in the steppes between the Volga River and the Ural Mountains. For a hundred years one of the Bulgar groups, the Kutriguri, established a very strong state north of the Black Sea; but their state was annihilated by the Avars, the strong Turko-Tatar tribes, who absorbed the survivors into their ranks. The second group of the Bulgars, called Utiguri, for a few years were also under the Avars and for a while were subjects to the Turks. According to Lady Grogan, this tribe regained its independence in 582 A.D. and thus the Great (Black) Bulgarian state was founded, which in the opinion of some survived to the thirteenth century.<sup>3</sup> However, Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff claim that the Great Bulgarian state was established by Orkan and Koubrat, who headed

. . . . .

1. Cf. Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, *Istoria na Bulgarskia Narod*, pp. 33-34
2. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 32
3. Cf. Grogan, *loc. cit.*

not the Utiguri, but the Unugunduri tribe; and that it lasted only until the tenth century, when it was subdued by a Turkish tribe, the Khasar.<sup>1</sup>

The second son of Koubrat, with a group of Bulgarians, after the breaking up of the Great Kingdom moved to the Volga valley and there established around the tenth century the Volga Bulgarian state with its capital Bulgar. This state was demolished in the thirteenth century by the Tartar invasion.

Of the other sons of Koubrat, Alcek went as far as Italy; another, named Kouver, settled in Macedonia; while Isperich (Asparuch) under the pressure of the expanding Khasar state, entered Bessarabia and established himself there in the neighborhood of Bolgrad, as the head of a new kingdom, his nation numbering around forty thousand Unugunduri, Kutriguri, and Utiguri. It seems that for a while Isperich continued the policy of friendship which his father, Koubrat, had established with Constantinople; but later the emperor of Byzantium attempted to conquer the Bulgarians north of the Danube. This attempt was unsuccessful and caused Isperich to move permanently to northeastern Bulgaria where he subjugated the Slavonic population. By his repeated attacks on Byzantium he caused the emperor to conclude a peace treaty with him,

. . . . .

1. Cf. Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, op. cit., pp. 33-34

according to the terms of which the emperor obligated himself to pay yearly tribute to Isperrich. This happened in 679 A.D. which is considered the year of the founding of the Balkan Bulgarian kingdom.<sup>1</sup>

The history of the newly established Balkan kingdom, from 679 A.D. until the time of king Boris (853-888) during whose reign Bulgaria became nominally Christian, is very interesting, but we cannot enter into a detailed study of it. However, it is of great importance to the treatment of our subject to emphasize several facts. Although the Bulgarians conquered the Slavs of the Balkans, they did not change materially the customs and conceptions of these people. They only gave their name to the new state and enforced their rigid form of government on the country, whereby they gave unity and coherence to the scattered Slavic tribes. On the other hand the invaders, Bulgarians, who were comparatively few in number, were gradually absorbed by the much larger group of conquered Slavs and adopted their language, local institutions, and customs.<sup>2</sup> This assimilation of the conquerors by those whom they subdued took over two hundred years for its completion, i.e. to the time of king

. . . . .

1. Cf. Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, op. cit., pp. 34-36; Grogan, loc. cit.
2. Cf. Jirecek, Dejiny naroda bulharskeho, pp. 92-93; Grogan, loc. cit.; The New International Encyclopedia, Vol. IV, p. 139

Boris. Accordingly, when we speak today of the forefathers of the Bulgarians, we must not consider as such the handful of Bulgars who in 679 A.D. conquered the northeastern corner of Bulgaria, but the old Slavs who much earlier had migrated into this country.<sup>1</sup>

The relations between the Bulgarian khans and the Byzantine emperors are of value to us in our discussion. The successor of Isperich, Tervel (700-720), who was of the same Doulo dynasty, came to a real understanding with Constantinople and a permanent border was fixed between the two states. During the entire reign of the Doulo dynasty, rather friendly relations existed between the empire and Bulgaria; in fact, the Bulgarians helped defend the Byzantians on several occasions when the latter were threatened by enemies. However, in the year 753 A.D. the Doulo dynasty came to an end. Khan Kormish (Kormisosh) (753-760 A.D.) of the Vakil (Oukil) dynasty took the Bulgarian throne. This was during the time of the heated iconoclastic controversy. The energetic iconoclastic emperor, Constantine V Copronimus, planned to free himself from the danger of the Bulgarians. For the purpose he brought Armenian Paulicians to Bulgaria and various Syrian colonists to Thrace and placed them along the Bulgarian border as guards against Bulgarian invasions.

. . . . .

1. Cf. Jirecek, *op. cit.*, p. 92; *New International Encyclopaedia*, *loc. cit.*



Khan Kormish endeavored to attack Constantinople and thus force Copronimus to keep the pledge of the 716 A.D. treaty, but his effort was in vain. This unsuccessful campaign caused the Bolyars to decide that all future rulers of Bulgaria should be under their control. In this way a long struggle began between the nobles representing various tribes, because each one wanted a man of his particular tribe to sit on the throne. These internal difficulties were more than welcome to Copronimus. He waged war on the Bulgarians, and by means of spies working within the kingdom managed to fan the party spirit among the Bulgarians and thus weakened their state. Now and then deposed Bulgarian khans and their friends fled to Constantinople seeking shelter at the emperor's palace. The emperor received them gladly, because he intended to use them as tools in forming a strong Byzantian party among the relatives of these refugees who remained in Bulgaria, and through it eventually to subjugate that country. However, during the reign of Telerig (Tzerig) (772-777 A.D.), Kardam (777-802 A.D.), and especially Kroum (802-814 A.D.) unity was once more achieved among the ruling Bulgarian classes and the purpose of Byzantium was defeated.<sup>1</sup>

Kroum is a notable figure in Bulgarian history,

. . . . .

1. Cf. Jirecek, op. cit., pp. 96-99; Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, op. cit., pp. 38-42

because during his time the Bulgarian kingdom extended its borders as far as Serbia and Hungary, thus coming into close contact with the great Frankish kingdom. The Byzantine emperor, Nicephorus I, attempted to destroy Kroum's kingdom; in fact, he proceeded in 811 A.D. to attack Kroum's capital, Pliska, north of the Balkan mountains. For doing this he paid with his life and those of many of his soldiers; Kroum surrounded Nicephorus and his soldiers in the Balkan passes and killed a large number of them, including the emperor himself, from whose skull he made a wine cup, overlaid it with gold, and served wine to his nobles from it.<sup>1</sup>

Although Kroum is best known as a great warrior, he is known also as the first Bulgarian reformer and law-giver. His four chief laws were aimed against false witnesses, against robbers, against drinking (he commanded all vineyards to be uprooted!) and in favor of compulsory support of the needy.<sup>2</sup>

Kroum attempted to bring down the heathen Bulgarian nobles to the level of the conquered Slav leaders, and for the purpose appointed some of the latter to high government positions. It seems that he was not a fanat-

. . . . .

1. Cf. Jirecek, *op. cit.*, pp. 99-100; Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, *op. cit.*, pp. 41-42; Grogan, *loc. cit.*; Latourette, *The Thousand Years of Uncertainty*, p. 240
2. Cf. Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, *op. cit.*, p. 42

ical pagan, as he tolerated the Christian Slavs of whom there were not a few. He is credited with helping greatly toward the final amalgamation of Bulgars and Slavs.<sup>1</sup>

Omurtag, Kroum's successor, was a very successful ruler in many ways, but in contrast to Kroum he persecuted the Christians because he was alarmed by the rapid spread of their teaching. He deprived his two older sons of inheritance because of their leaning toward Christianity and appointed as his successor, against the rule prevalent among the Bulgars, his youngest son, Malamir. Like his father, Malamir persecuted the Christians and even executed his own elder brother, Enravot (Nravot) because the latter had accepted Christianity.<sup>2</sup>

Before we come to the famous khan Boris, we should mention Malamir's successor, Pressian (836-853 A.D.), who is noted for his conquests in Macedonia. His position regarding Christianity is not clear.<sup>3</sup>

### C. Bulgaria and Christianity

From the foregoing discussion we glean that when the Bulgars invaded the Balkan peninsula they came into contact with some Christians. This shows that some

. . . . .

1. Cf. Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, op. cit., p. 44; Jirecek, op. cit., p. 101
2. Cf. Jirecek, op. cit., pp. 100-101; Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, op. cit., pp. 45-47
3. Cf. Jirecek, op. cit., p. 101; Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, op. cit., pp. 47-48

of the earlier settlers in these parts, the Slavs, either through the missionary effort of the Byzantine church in Constantinople, or through the activities of the Macedonian churches which were established in the first century by the apostle Paul and his successors,<sup>1</sup> had embraced Christianity willingly and had formed Christian communities here and there. However, it is clear that in general the territory occupied by the Bulgars was not evangelized.<sup>2</sup>

Before Boris became khan, i.e. during the early part of the ninth century, "there were two Slavonic groups in the peninsula: a larger, which formed the Bulgarian kingdom, and a smaller under Byzantium. The majority of this latter group were Christians, while the first still remained pagan."<sup>3</sup> We are told that not only the ancient Christian colonists, but also the Christianized Slavonic prisoners captured by the Bulgarian khans and carried into Bulgaria, spread the Christian religion there.<sup>4</sup> "There were likewise Christians among the nobles (bolyars) but the khans were opposed to Christianity and persecuted its followers."<sup>5</sup>

. . . . .

1. See Acts xvi; also the Epistles to the Thessalonians and Philipians.
2. Cf. Klincharoff, *Pop Bogomil i Negovoto Vreme*, pp.12-13
3. Sharenkoff, *A Study of Manichaeism in Bulgaria*, pp.24-25
4. Cf. Jirecek, *loc. cit.*, Latourette, *op. cit.*, p. 241
5. Sharenkoff, *loc. cit.*

The baptism of Boris opened widely the doors of Bulgaria for the introduction of the Christian doctrines on a large scale; he, therefore, deserves a more detailed study.

#### 1. National Conversion

Boris is considered by some the son of Pressian, and by others the son of Zvinitza whose father was Omortag. He ascended the throne about 852 A.D. and his name stands out boldly on the pages of both secular and church history, because it was he who, for certain reasons which we shall discuss later, took the initiative to "convert" his pagan nation to Christianity.<sup>1</sup>

During the first half of Boris' long reign, from 852 to 888 A.D., we find the Bulgarian khan constantly at war with Greeks, Serbs, Croats, and Franks. His kingdom at that time was bordered on the northwest by the Croatians and the Franks, while on the south and southeast his neighbors were the Byzantines. Naturally the strategic position and strength of the Bulgarian kingdom were considered important politically by both the Franks and the Byzantines, as well as by the other Slavic nations, all of whom desired to be on good terms with Boris.<sup>2</sup>

. . . . .

1. Cf. post, pp. 37-39; Jirecek, op. cit., p. 104

2. Cf. Jirecek, loc. cit.; Sharenkoff, op. cit., p. 25

Regardless of his important position on the Balkans, khan Boris seemed to have realized that he was handicapped in a sense because the Byzantines and the Franks were Christian and because many of the Slavs subject to him had already accepted Christianity or leaned strongly toward it—a fact which tended to break up the unity of the state ruled by him, a pagan, and by his pagan nobles. "According to medieval conceptions the people looked down upon pagan rulers and their pagan nations, considering them barbarians."<sup>1</sup> Boris evidently wanted to be on equal footing with the sovereigns of his two great Christian neighbors, Byzantium and Germany. According to some, he had a natural inclination toward the Christian faith. However, he postponed accepting Christianity time and again while both Orthodox Byzantium and Catholic Germany made overtures to him, suggesting that he accept their form of Christianity and thus fall under the one or other sphere of influence. Back of these moves, of course, we see not so much the temporal rulers of the respective empires, but the ecclesiastical leaders of East and West; namely, the patriarch of Constantinople and the pope of Rome.<sup>2</sup>

Although Boris may have had personal convic-

. . . . .

1. Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, *Istoria na Bulgarskia Narod*, p. 50; cf. Klincharoff, *op. cit.*, pp. 16-17
2. Cf. Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, *loc. cit.*

tions favorable to Christianity as hinted above, most serious historians believe that purely personal considerations of this sort did not motivate Boris' "conversion" and that of his nation. The real reasons for his acceptance of Christianity were, no doubt, of a political and economic nature;<sup>1</sup> Boris expected by accepting Christianity to derive some substantial material benefits for his country, believing that the longer he remained undecided, the higher bid he would receive from the authorities at Rome or Constantinople. However, by force of circumstances he was obliged to make his final decision sooner than he had contemplated. This happened during the autumn of 865 A.D., after his defeat by emperor Michael III. The famine raging in Bulgaria at that time forced Boris to act quickly and he asked the emperor for peace.<sup>2</sup> The latter not only agreed readily to conclude a peace treaty, but ceded to Boris a section of present-day southeastern Bulgaria. The price for this was Boris' acceptance of Orthodox Christianity and the annulment of his military aggressive pact with the German emperor Lewis, substituting for it a mere non-aggression pact.<sup>3</sup>

Some claim that Boris was "frightened" into accepting Christianity by beholding a picture of the last

. . . . .

1. Cf. Klincharoff, op. cit., pp. 16-19
2. Cf. Latourette, op. cit., p. 241
3. Cf. Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, loc. cit.; Jiricek, op. cit., p. 106; Sharenkoff, loc. cit.

judgment painted by St. Methodius, the brother of St. Cyril (or Constantine), both of whom are considered the apostles of the Slavs. This view has been discarded in recent years because it was discovered that the picture was painted not by Methodius, but by a Greek monk, a painter bearing the same name and who did the work some time after Boris became Christian.<sup>1</sup>

The story that Boris' sister, who had accepted Christianity as a war prisoner in Constantinople, influenced her brother to accept Christianity too, is now considered untrustworthy.<sup>2</sup>

## 2. Consequences of the Conversion.

The Christian religion cannot be forced upon people if it is to be a vital factor in the lives of individuals and communities; its acceptance must be a voluntary act. However, Boris pursuing his aims and political ambitions did not heed the great principle of human free will. He wanted to have a united nation and a strong one, and wanted to have it quickly. Not possessing a deep personal Christian experience, he used force to attain his aim. "The nation altered its religion in obedience to its sovereign, and some of the Bolyars, who

. . . . .

1. Cf. Jirecek, loc. cit.; Grogan, "Bulgaria"; Encyclopaedia Britannica, 14th ed., Vol. IV, p. 361

2. Cf. Jirecek, loc. cit.



resisted the change, paid with their lives for their fidelity to the ancient belief."<sup>1</sup>

According to Jirecek, Boris, after his own baptism, tried to force all his subjects to accept Christianity; but many of the nobles, for personal reasons, bitterly opposed this effort and, in fact, instigated a large revolt against him. Nevertheless, Boris managed to subdue his opponents and ordered the execution of the leading nobles who had rebelled against him, together with their wives and children—all together fifty-two people. Whole families were annihilated in this way—an action very unworthy of a newly-converted person. As far as the ignorant people who took part in the revolt were concerned, most of them were not punished.<sup>2</sup>

It stands to reason that through the conversion of Boris, Bulgaria would fall into the orbit of Byzantine influence, and in fact it "became subject to Constantinople."<sup>3</sup> The Greek clergy now had a free hand in Bulgaria and sent numbers of missionaries there to baptize, teach, and preach.<sup>4</sup> As might be expected, there was a wave of wholesale "conversion," similar to the large-scale national "conversions" effected by Catholic

. . . . .

1. Grogan, op. cit., p. 362; cf. Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, op. cit., p. 51; Jirecek, loc. cit.; Latourette, op. cit., p. 242
2. Cf. Jirecek, op. cit., pp. 106-7
3. Cf. Sharenkoff, p. 25; cf. pp. 25-27
4. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 26

missionaries in various European regions. There were cases of unscrupulous men who took advantage of the situation and, moved by mercenary motives, went to Bulgaria to baptize people.<sup>1</sup>

We learn from Jirecek that many of the Orthodox were not true Christians and that the Greek priests who came to Bulgaria as missionaries preached all kinds of superstitious ideas and thus were introducing a Christianity which did not have much in common with that of the apostles.<sup>2</sup>

It is important to note that Boris, like Kroum, aimed at unlimited ruling power, and in order to attain his goal he tried to free himself from the power of the Bulgar bolyars by trying to keep in close contact with the subjugated Slav leaders. He followed Kroum's example in giving important posts in the government to Slavs. In accepting Christianity, Boris obtained the support of those Slavs who had already become Christian.<sup>3</sup>

Besides the danger which the pagan nobles presented for Boris, there was a new and greater menace in the Byzantine religious and political influence. The Byzantine religious emissaries, besides introducing formal Christianity, "spread Byzantine culture, and Bulgaria was

. . . . .

1. Cf. Jirecek, op. cit., p. 107; Latourette, loc. cit.
2. Cf. Jirecek, loc. cit.
3. Cf. Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, loc. cit.; cf. Sharenkoff, op. cit., pp. 24-25

in danger of losing her independence."<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, the Bulgarian nobles felt that through the newly-introduced Christianity, the Byzantine emperor could influence and subjugate Bulgaria. No doubt this fear was one of the main factors which brought about the revolt against Boris. This may have been also the chief reason for the khan's leaning toward Rome for quite a while, until Constantinople granted an autonomous Bulgarian church.<sup>2</sup>

It is well known to the student of history that for a time Boris was inclined to accept the ecclesiastical rule of Rome. He desired an autonomous national church, of which the Greeks did not approve for obvious reasons. The correspondence between pope Nicholas and Boris is very interesting. Especially noteworthy are the questions which Boris sent to the pope, from which we can learn some details as to the mentality of the Bulgars, their life, and related matters.<sup>3</sup>

The pope sent Catholic bishops to Bulgaria, but did not appoint a patriarch for that country. Disappointed, Boris, taking advantage of the ecumenical council convened in Constantinople in 870 A.D., sent delegates there, and after some struggle a resolution was drawn up which pleased him. "The first Bulgarian archbishop was

. . . . .

1. Sharenkoff, op. cit., p. 26

2. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 26-27

3. Cf. Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, op. cit., p. 52; Sharenkoff, op. cit., p. 26; Jirecek, loc. cit.

ordained and the first Bulgarian national church was established at Preslav, the Bulgarian capital."<sup>1</sup> Of course, this church was not altogether independent "because the archbishop of Preslav was to be appointed by the patriarch of Constantinople and to be dependent upon him."<sup>2</sup> It was Simeon, the son of Boris, who at the close of the ninth century proclaimed the independence of the Bulgarian church "and thereupon the archbishop became a patriarch."<sup>3</sup>

We have seen that soon after Isperich's death, two parties began to form in Bulgaria, the Slavic and the Bulgarian.<sup>4</sup> The first was pro-Byzantine, which tended to bring the new Bulgarian state entirely under the rule and influence of Byzantium; and the other anti-Byzantine, which championed the cause of a strong and fully independent Bulgarian state. As we proceed with this study, we shall see increasingly the rôle these two parties played in the social and religious life of the Bulgarians and their contribution toward the rise of Bogomilism.<sup>5</sup>

#### D. Summary and Conclusion

So far we have described the two rather differ-

. . . . .

1. Sharenkoff, loc. cit.; cf. Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, loc. cit.; Jirecek, op. cit., p. 108
2. Sharenkoff, loc. cit.
3. Ibid.
4. Cf. ante, pp. 30-31, 37.
5. Cf. Klincharoff, op. cit., pp. 14-15

ent peoples, the old Bulgarians and the Slavs, who through a process of amalgamation formed a new nation in which the predominant characteristics were Slavonic; namely, a democratic spirit, high regard for human life and personality, love of liberty and independence, high respect for woman, love of truth, sincerity, great hospitality, dislike for slavery, and other such traits.

We have found also that in their early religious beliefs the Slavs held ideas regarding nymphs and evil spirits. These conceptions of the Slavs are of importance to us because they formed the soil from which Bogomilism arose.

We have discovered that, chiefly for political reasons, Bulgaria was forced by her ruler, Boris, to accept Orthodox Christianity. This, being fundamentally different from the belief of the masses, was not adopted willingly by them.<sup>1</sup> Had pure, apostolic Christianity been presented to them, the story no doubt would have been entirely different.<sup>2</sup> But since the majority of teachers and missionaries sent to Bulgaria from the Greek church brought an adulterated Christian religion with all kinds of empty ceremonies and much superstition, introducing at the same time a system of hierarchy and feudalism which was not acceptable to the democratic Slavs, the

. . . . .

1. Cf. Sharenkoff, op. cit., p. 25

2. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 28

masses took a more or less hostile position against everything that came from Constantinople, the seat of the officially established church. "Because of the difference which thus arose in the political, cultural, and social life of the people,"<sup>1</sup> the ground was prepared for the seeds of other teachings and religious systems, among which was the system of priest Bogomil, the religious and social Bulgarian reformer.

. . . . .

1. Sharenkoff, loc.cit.

CHAPTER III

ORIGIN AND ESTABLISHMENT  
OF  
BOGOMILISM

## CHAPTER III

### ORIGIN AND ESTABLISHMENT OF BOGOMILISM

#### A. Introduction

"That which hath been is that which shall be; and that which hath been done is that which shall be done: and there is no new thing under the sun. Is there a thing whereof it may be said, 'See, this is new'? It hath been long ago, in the ages which were before us."<sup>1</sup> So spoke the ancient king-philosopher, and one cannot help but agree with him when studying the march of history. Indeed, the old saying seems to hold good that history repeats itself.

When one considers the birth, rise, and spread of important movements in the world, for a while he is apt to conclude that this or that movement is something entirely new; but when he begins to examine the matter thoroughly, he certainly comes to the conclusion that the apparently "new" movement is an old one, revived and enhanced by some peculiar characteristics which give it

. . . . .

1. Ecclesiastes 1:9-10



but the appearance of freshness and novelty.

So it is with the various reform or Puritan movements which spring up within the church from time to time, or run parallel with it. Bogomilism is no exception to this rule. It is difficult to accept the claims to originality which are made in behalf of some movements, because a careful analysis so often reveals a strong interdependence between one movement and another, at least along certain lines. True enough, some new characteristics are bound to appear with the birth of a movement; however, regardless of this, the scrutinizing observer will always detect resemblances to something that has existed previously, just as a child resembles his parents or ancestors.

A river flows through all kinds of strata, and although it is the same river from its head to its delta, bearing one name, yet at different stages of its long journey it appears to be somewhat different; when the stream passes through rocky sections its waters are sparkling and boisterous, but when it runs through the valleys it changes its color, because of clay and sand deposits, as well as relaxing its speed. In like manner, apostolic Christianity as a stream has been flowing on ever since the Lord Jesus Christ completed His work on the cross and through it opened the way for personal communion between sinful man and his Creator. Christ's dis-

ciples propagated His Gospel; their converts continued the great work. But in the course of time various conditions appeared which now and then gave peculiar coloring to the stream of Christianity.

Pharisaic forms and traditions prior to Christ had made personal communion with God a difficult and perhaps impossible task, but the heart of man longed for its Maker. Christianity came as a tremendous protest against the deadly forms of the Jews and their ritualism. It triumphed, and at last man could enjoy fellowship with God and could bathe in His purity and love.

Time went on. The original Christian protest began to die out because of circumstances which tended to check and destroy it. But these very hindrances, at certain points, gave it an impetus and the stream of apostolic faith continued flowing. This process has been repeated time and time again, as we mentioned in our introduction.<sup>1</sup> On its journey the ever-increasing stream of Christianity picked up elements foreign to itself as it passed through different countries with varying social and religious strata, just as the pure mountain stream, on its journey to the ocean, at certain points and because of environmental conditions, absorbs some sand or clay

. . . . .

1. Cf. ante, pp. 3-5; Paul C. Warren: *The Principle of Puritanism and the Significance of Its Recurring Manifestations* (A Thesis), pp. 2-5

and even carries along dead timber.

During the ninth century, nominal Christianity triumphed over raw paganism in Bulgaria. However, this victory brought about conditions which obstructed the normal flow of the already depleted stream of apostolic Christianity, which continued its course obscurely, as it were, hidden under the rocks and rubbish of outward pomp on which the so-called Orthodox church prided itself.

As time went on, the young Bulgarian church became a victim of the negative influences of Constantinople. Formalism, moral depravity, and injustice, manifested by many of the clergy in the nationalized church which was copying everything from Constantinople, began to dam the flow of the weak stream of pure Christianity. But this very obstruction caused the tide to rise higher and higher. A great contribution was made by the influx of spiritual energy resulting from the vigorous activity of various Asiatic Puritan groups. Most of them, however, were tinted with elements foreign to the apostolic faith, but whose teachings found fertile soil in the hearts and minds of the democratic and freedom-loving Slavonic population of Bulgaria.

During the reign of Tzar Peter (927-968 A.D.) the pent up stream of Puritanism broke the dam which obstructed its flow and the result was a veritable flood

which swept through the Balkans in the form of a tremendous protest, known in history as Bogomilism.<sup>1</sup> Soon it overflowed and its influence reached central and western Europe, as well as Asia Minor and Russia.

Although Bogomilism can be truly termed a Bulgarian reform movement, it cannot claim for itself full originality. It cannot be severed altogether from the stream of Puritanism which came from Asia Minor, Syria, and Armenia through the Manicheans, Euchites or Messalians, and the Paulicians, who settled on the Balkan peninsula as colonists or otherwise. In a sense the various Puritan sects from the Near East, branded by the official church without discrimination as "heretical," may rightfully be considered spiritual ancestors of the Bogomils. In view of this and in order better to understand the Bogomilian protest it is necessary that we include at least a brief study of the "heresies" mentioned above to gain a clearer picture of the background of Bogomilism.

#### B. Precursors of the Bogomils

There exists among authorities no unanimous opinion regarding the antecedents of Bogomilism. Harnack

. . . . .

1. Cf. Sharenkoff, A Study of Manichaeism in Bulgaria, p. 36

and Sharenkoff represent the group who believe that we must trace Bogomil's teaching to that of Mani.<sup>1</sup> Gieseler, Neander, Schaff, Newman, and others hold that the Euchites or Messalians were the direct ancestors of the Bulgarian heretics<sup>2</sup>; while a third group, including men like Conybeare and Gibbon, advocates the idea that the Bogomils were descendants of the Paulicians.<sup>3</sup> In fact, Gibbon does not make a clear distinction between Bogomils and Paulicians.

We shall express our own opinion regarding this matter in the latter part of this chapter, giving additional information. At this point we shall refrain from making any comments inasmuch as our immediate purpose is to get acquainted first of all with the alleged predecessors of Bogomilism mentioned above.

#### 1. Heretical Colonization in Bulgaria

About the middle of the eighth century, emperor Constantine V, Copronymous (741-775 A.D.), probably a

. . . . .

1. Cf. Adolph Harnack: *History of Dogma*, Vol. III, p. 336; Sharenkoff, *op. cit.*, pp. 31-32
2. Cf. John C. L. Gieseler: *A Compendium of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. II, pp. 490-2; Neander: *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, Vol. IV, p. 552; Albert Henry Newman: *A Manual of Church History*, Vol. I, p. 544; Philip Schaff: *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. IV, p. 579; N. A. Weber: "Bogomili," *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. II, p. 612
3. Cf. Fred C. Conybeare: *The Key of Truth*, pp. cxxxvii, cl; Edward Gibbon: *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Vol. VII, pp. 56-57

member of the Paulician church, transplanted a large number of Paulicians "from the banks of the Euphrates to Constantinople and Thrace; and by this emigration their doctrine was introduced and diffused in Europe."<sup>1</sup> Constantine's successor, Leo IV (775-780), transferred another group of colonists from Syria to Thrace.<sup>2</sup> In 970 still another body of about a hundred thousand Paulicians was transported from the Chalybian hills to the valleys of the Balkan mountains by John Zimisce, <sup>3</sup> an Armenian emperor.<sup>4</sup> A large group of these colonists settled in ancient Philippopolis (present Plovdiv) where for a while they enjoyed religious freedom.<sup>5</sup> Thrace became a haven of rest or an asylum for all parties persecuted elsewhere, among whom were the Euchites or Messalians<sup>6</sup>; here, along with the Paulician colonists, they could enjoy comparative religious liberty among the democratic Slavs.

Sharenkoff advocates the opinion that a number of Manicheans also settled in Bulgaria and began to spread their teaching, especially a certain Santabarenus, who "spread his faith into Bulgaria where Christianity was not yet strong."<sup>7</sup> It is quite possible that Sharen-

. . . . .

1. Gibbon, op. cit., Vol. VII, p. 55; cf. Conybeare, op. cit., p. lxxiii; Sharenkoff, op. cit., pp. 29-30
2. Cf. Sharenkoff, op. cit., p. 30
3. Cf. Gibbon, loc. cit.
4. Cf. Conybeare, op. cit., p. cxxxvii
5. Cf. Gieseler, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 488-9
6. Cf. *ibid.*
7. Sharenkoff, op. cit., p. 31

koff bases his view of Manichean settlers in Thrace on the supposition which a number of authorities hold; namely, that the Paulicians were more or less direct successors of the Manicheans, and therefore can be termed "Manicheans"; or perhaps he accepts the generalization used by Orthodox medieval authors, who labeled most opponents to the state church with the convenient name of the most dreaded heresy, Manicheism. All things considered, it is possible that among the thousands of colonists in Thrace there might have been some real Manicheans.

Now we shall proceed with the brief study of the three heresies mentioned above, which have been suggested as ancestors of the Bogomils.

## 2. Manicheans

Many works have been written as to who the Manicheans were and what they taught.<sup>1</sup> A number of these have been written by enemies of the sect, including

. . . . .

1. Those interested in a more detailed treatment of MANICHEISM will find valuable information in Harnack, *History of Dogma*, Vol. III, pp. 316-336; Albert Henry Newman: *Introductory Essay on the Manichaeian Heresy*, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church (First Series)*, Vol. IV, pp. 3-39 (which volume contains Augustine's work on the subject); Sharenkoff, *A Study of Manichaeism in Bulgaria*, pp. 1-22. The articles on Manicheism in the following encyclopedias will prove helpful: *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, *Hastings' Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, *The New International Encyclopaedia*, *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge*.

men like St. Augustine. Our purpose is not to enter into any detailed study of this heresy, as this does not bear directly on our problem. We shall give only a brief summary concerning its founder and his teaching.

Mānī, the founder of the sect, was born in the Babylonian village of Mardin in 215 or 216 A.D., during the reign of the last Parthian king, Artabanus V. His father, a descendant of a well-known Persian family of the Hashkanians, gave up the Zoroastrian creed after arriving in Babylonia and associated himself with the Mugh-tasilah sect. Mani was educated in the doctrines of his father's eclectic religion. However, in his twelfth year tradition tells us he had a revelation of some kind and left the religion of the Mandians. When he reached his twentieth year, after having had a second revelation he began preaching publicly his new religion. The date when Mani began his public ministry is given as March 20, 242 A.D. "He proclaimed himself the Paraclete, the last messenger of the God of Truth after Zoroaster, Buddha, and Jesus, and unfolded his gospel, dualistic in its philosophy, imaginative in its speculation, highly moral in its ethics, and ascetic in its tendencies."<sup>1</sup>

For about a decade Mani met with success, but ultimately the opposition of the Persian Magian priest-

. . . . .

1. Sharenkoff, op. cit., p. 6



hood caused his banishment from Iran. He traveled widely through India, Tibet, and China and, after twenty years of exile, decided to return to Persia. Soon thereafter he was apprehended and put to death; he was flayed alive and then beheaded. His skin was "stuffed with straw and hung up over the city gate."<sup>1</sup> The approximate date of Mani's death is 273 or 274 A.D. His disciples were killed and the preaching of his teaching was forbidden.

Mani embodied in his teaching elements from various religions, which he borrowed freely. His whole system rested on a radical and materialistic dualism. He taught that there were two opposite original domains, the one of light (good) and the other of darkness (evil). The kingdom of light is ruled by God (the good spirit) and is composed of a heaven and an earth. Angels (aeons) guard the latter. God had ten virtues.

From the kingdom of darkness sprang Satan and his horde of demons. Corresponding to the earth of light there is also an earth of darkness with five evil qualities: mist, heat, the sirocco, darkness, and vapor.

Satan invaded the realm of light. In order to oppose him, the Good Spirit (God) created "primal man" who should fight against the powers of darkness, the demons. This happened long before mankind appeared on the

. . . . .

1. Sharenkoff, loc. cit.

scene.

Man was created by Satan who placed in him all the light elements which he controlled and thus imprisoned them. Long before man and our present world were created the elements of light and darkness were in a terrific conflict; but when human beings came into existence, the conflict became fierce and tragic.

When the light particles of the human race become liberated, the lost cosmic order in the universe will be restored. There is to be a great catastrophe at the end, which will abruptly bring the whole process to a conclusion.

There were two classes among the Manicheans, the perfecti and the auditors. The former were the full-fledged members of the sect. They placed upon themselves heavy restrictions. They lived an ascetic life and avoided all defilement through evil speech, animal food, contact with the material world, marriage, and sexual indulgence. The auditors lived more or less like other people. St. Augustine, before his conversion to Christianity, was a Manichean auditor for a number of years.

The Manicheans had a strict organization and in a sense there was among them a hierarchy similar to that of the Roman Catholic system. Their worship was rather simple. It consisted of prayer, song, initiation by a sort of baptism in which oil was used instead of

water, and a eucharistic meal.

The Manichean elect fasted very much, this being considered of great importance. Once a year they commemorated Mani's death. This festival was called bema.

### 3. Euchites or Messalians

It is generally accepted that the Euchites and Messalians were the same people; therefore, we consider them under one topic. They were a Christian sect of the latter part of the fourth century which had its headquarters in Syria. Later they spread into other sections of the Near East and according to some even penetrated southern Europe. They seem to have had no connection with the gnostic Messalians or Euchites of the same century who flourished in Asia Minor.<sup>1</sup>

Neander is of the opinion that the medieval Euchites or Messalians, who are closely connected in history with Bogomilism, have nothing in common with the gnostic Euchites of the fourth century, who are considered non-Christian<sup>2</sup>; while Schaff agrees with Weingarten that they are descendants of the Syrian Christian Euchites or Messalians of the fourth and fifth centuries.<sup>3</sup> Wein-

. . . . .

1. Cf. Weingarten: "Messalians," Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge, Vol. II, p. 1478
2. Cf. Neander, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 553
3. Cf. Schaff, loc. cit.

garten considers them a branch of the Paulicians.<sup>1</sup>

Ivanoff claims that by the eleventh century the Euchites lost their identity as a separate sect and were absorbed by the Bogomils or the Orthodox.<sup>2</sup>

The name Euchite is derived from the principle of perpetual prayer practiced by the members of the sect. Sometimes they are called "Chorentae," because of their habit of dancing. Occasionally they are called after the name of some leader, and so Adelphians, Lampetians, Marcionists, Eustathians, and similar names.

The Euchites were monks who refused to work for their bread. They obtained food by begging from place to place. Some of them, according to reports, slept on the streets.

The principal points in the teaching of the Euchites were as follows. They taught that every human being is born with a demon which can be cast out or subdued only by intense prayer. Through prayer the soul can rise above all passions and carnal cravings. They placed no value on baptism and the Eucharist as administered by the official church.<sup>3</sup> They did not honor Mary the mother of Jesus, nor the cross,<sup>4</sup> and despised all

. . . . .

1. Cf. Weingarten, op. cit., p. 1479; Walter F. Adeney: The Greek and Eastern Churches, p. 224
2. Cf. Ivanoff, Bogomilski Knigi i Legendi, p. 33
3. Cf. Weingarten, op. cit., pp. 1478-9
4. Cf. Ivanoff, op. cit., p. 13

outward forms of worship.<sup>1</sup> According to Ivanoff they believed that since Adam both the Holy Spirit and Satan dwell in the heart of each individual. Some of their enemies accuse them of holding a view that Satan, the older son of the Father, is the second person of the Trinity and that he is the ruler of all earthly things; while the Father rules all invisible things in the universe, and Jesus, His younger Son, rules all the heavenly things. Some groups of Euchites are accused also of paying homage to Satan in the hope that by doing this he will not harm them. We know that similar charges of Satanism or devil worship were made against the Bogomils but we have no way of finding out how just these accusations were. It is safer to exercise some caution when we consider any and all accusations against heretics coming from their prejudiced enemies.<sup>2</sup>

The Euchites were condemned by several church councils and were severely persecuted in Syria and Asia Minor.<sup>3</sup> As might be expected, their enemies, in order to give greater impetus to the persecution, ascribed to them unbelievable crimes and filthy deeds and circulated terrible stories about them,<sup>4</sup> "but the same stories were

. . . . .

1. Cf. Schaff, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 578
2. Cf. Ivanoff, op. cit., pp. 13-14; Adeney, op. cit., p. 225
3. Cf. Weingarten, op. cit., p. 1479
4. Cf. Ivanoff, op. cit., p. 14

told of the early Christians and deserve no credit."<sup>1</sup>

#### 4. Paulicians

As we have seen already<sup>2</sup> the Paulicians, who were transplanted from Armenia into Thrace, formed by far the majority of colonists brought over by the emperors. It stands to reason that their influence was stronger in these parts than that of any other group of heretical colonists. All indications point to the fact that the Paulicians exercised great influence on the rise and development of the Bogomil movement. If so, then we must pay the Paulicians more than casual attention in our brief study.<sup>3</sup>

It is generally believed that the Paulicians were either direct descendants of the Manicheans or at least were an offshoot of them. In examining this matter

. . . . .

1. Schaff, loc. cit.
2. Cf. ante, p. 53
3. For a more detailed study of this important sect, the PAULICIANS, we highly recommend the unbiased work of Conybeare, *The Key of Truth*. One will find the following works helpful; Adeney, *The Greek and Eastern Churches*, Ch. V; Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Vol. VII, Ch. LIV; articles in the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia, New International Encyclopaedia, Encyclopaedia Britannica; Rufus M. Jones: *The Church's Debt to Heretics*, pp. 173-6; Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. IV, pp. 574-8; Newman, *A Manual of Church History*, Vol. I. Those who desire to get acquainted with the problem as presented by hostile writers may consult Petrus Siculus: *Historia Manichaeorum*; Euthymius Zygabenus: *Panoplia dogmatica*; Anna Comnena; *Alexiadis*—all in *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series Graeca*, ed. Migne.

the writer was convinced that this general belief regarding the Manichean origin of the Paulicians, as advocated by modern authorities, is based chiefly on the information obtained from medieval sources which on the whole are very unfriendly to the Paulicians.<sup>1</sup> However, there are men who have made a very unbiased study of the sect in question and as a result of their research have provided us with sufficient information from which we may conclude that the Paulicians were not Manicheans.<sup>2</sup>

We quote Conybeare:

"In their confutations of heretics the Orthodox fathers were not too scrupulous of the truth. They all carried in their bag two weights, a heavier and a lighter, and in their dealings with the so-called heretics used the latter . . . the name 'New Manichaeans,' given by the orthodox Greek and Armenian writers to the Paulicians, was (as J. Friedrich charitably puts it) a bit of schematism. Manichean was in those ages a general term of abuse for all schismatics alike; and was applied by Photius and his contemporaries no less to the Latins (because they affirmed the double procession of the Holy Ghost) than to the Paulicians."<sup>3</sup>

Conybeare's opinion in this matter regarding the stigmatizing of the Paulicians is supported by others, of whom we mention but two. Adeney says:

"Even ecclesiastics who behaved more reasonably confounded them with the hated Manichaeans, or at best with the heretical Marcionites. The simplicity of their religious faith and life, and their rejection of the extravagances and superstitions of the later (Orthodox) church, led to their

. . . . .

1. Cf. Sharenkoff, A Study of Manichaeism in Bulgaria, pp. 30-34
2. Cf. Conybeare, op. cit., pp. xliv-xlv
3. Ibid., p. xlv

history and tenets being dragged into theological controversies with which they had no immediate concern, and therefore, of course, to monstrous perversions of them."<sup>1</sup>

Following the same line, Newman comments:

"The Paulicians are commonly represented as a Manichaeian party, but the descriptions that have come down to us would seem to indicate Marcionitic rather than Manichaeian elements. Yet contemporary Catholic writers such as Peter Siculus and Photius constantly assail them as Manichaeians."<sup>2</sup>

The Paulicians were historically a Christian community which lived in the southeastern section of Armenia and which differed very much from the established Orthodox church in its discipline, rites, and doctrines. In the opinion of Adeney, "they should be regarded as representing the survival of a more primitive Christianity"<sup>3</sup> and in many respects as "Protestants before Protestantism" and "ancient Oriental Baptists."<sup>4</sup> Regarding the "heretical" element in the teaching of the Paulicians Conybeare and Adeney, as well as others, agree that it was neither Manichean nor Marcionite. They consider the Paulicians to have been Adoptionists.<sup>5</sup>

As to the name of the sect, we may mention that it was derived either from Paul the apostle, for

. . . . .

1. Adeney, op. cit., p. 216
2. Newman, Introductory Essay on the Manichaeian Heresy, p. 31
3. Adeney, op. cit., p. 217
4. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 219
5. Cf. Conybeare, op. cit., p. ix; "Paulicians," *New International Encyclopaedia*, Vol. XVIII, p. 186; Adeney, op. cit., p. 218



whom the Paulicians had great respect, or from Paul of Samosata.<sup>1</sup> There are some who favor the view that the name was derived from Paul, one of the sons of Galinica, who was a Manichean,<sup>2</sup> but this seems to be less probable.

We have already alluded on several occasions to the transplanting of Paulicians from Armenia to the Balkans where "they propagated their Protestant teaching throughout Thrace."<sup>3</sup> Though the earlier history of the sect is very interesting because of its political implications, space does not permit us to enter into this field. Adeney gives a concise treatment of the development and persecution of this so-called heresy, and we commend it to the interested reader.<sup>4</sup> Gibbon also gives a rather clear picture of this Puritanic movement.<sup>5</sup>

The problem which interests us most in our study of Paulicianism in connection with our study of the Bogomilian protest, lies in the field of doctrine and life. If the most acceptable view is that the Paulicians were the chief ancestors of the Bogomils, we must know what they actually believed, taught, and practiced.

. . . . .

1. Cf. Adeney, *op. cit.*, p. 217 (fn. 1); *New International Encyclopaedia*, *loc. cit.*; Conybeare, *op. cit.*, pp. civ-cvi, cxxix; *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia*, Vol. III, p. 1776
2. Cf. Sharenkoff, *op. cit.*, p. 30
3. Adeney, *op. cit.*, pp. 223-4
4. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 219-224
5. Cf. Gibbon, *op. cit.*, Vol. VII, pp. 50-56

During the process of our research it became more and more obvious that many historians of the last two centuries have based their comments regarding the doctrines of the Paulicians upon what their avowed enemies have written concerning them. But we should not accept the testimony of their enemies as fully authentic because of the elements of prejudice and negative propaganda which we naturally expect to find in such writings. Had Schaff had access to the "Key of Truth" when he wrote his history of the Christian church, no doubt he would have written differently regarding the teaching of the Paulicians.<sup>1</sup> This naturally applies to other writers who have had as the basis of their work the reports against the sect coming from the pens of its Orthodox opponents.

More up-to-date works take into account the testimony which the "Key of Truth" has brought to light.<sup>2</sup> We believe we shall be on the safe side if we accept what Conybeare states regarding the teaching of the Paulicians, and for practical purposes we shall quote extracts from his treatment of this matter.

Besides the "Key of Truth" and the testimony of several other Armenian writings, which form the basis of Conybeare's treatment, we must mention the Greek writ-

. . . . .

1. Cf. Schaff, op. cit., Vol. IV, pp. 576-8
2. Cf. Adeney, op. cit., p. 218; New International Encyclopaedia, Vol. XVIII, p. 186

ers who describe also the beliefs of the Paulicians. All of the opponents who wrote against the sect based their works on the Chronicle of George Monachus<sup>1</sup> in which a description of the Paulicians is presented. Conybeare says:

"This document is the nucleus of the accounts of them given by Photius (c. 820—c. 891), Contra Manicheos, liber. 1. Par. 1-10, and by Petrus Siculus, a contemporary of Photius. It was then used by Petrus Hegumenos, by Zigabenus (c. 1081-1118), by Pseudo-Photius, liber. 1.10-iv. Each of these writers, no matter what his pretensions to originality, embodies this document in his account of the Paulicians, and adds to it details from other sources."<sup>2</sup>

We must remember that in Armenia, besides the Paulicians, there were also Armenian Manicheans.<sup>3</sup> If we keep this in mind we shall avoid much confusion. It is certain that the Paulicians did not have much in common with the Manicheans<sup>4</sup>; in fact, they anathematized them.<sup>5</sup> However, it is possible that they may have adopted certain points from them, especially regarding organization; but as far as the accusation is concerned which their enemies broadcasted so widely, that the Paulicians held Manichean dualistic teachings, we should not accept this readily but instead should regard it with great reserve,

. . . . .

1. Cf. Conybeare, op. cit., p. xl
2. Ibid.
3. Cf. ibid., p. cxxxii
4. Cf. loc. cit.
5. Cf. ibid., p. xlv, cxxxi; Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia, Vol. III, p. 1777

especially in view of what Conybeare says:

"Nevertheless there are ascribed to the Paulicians . . . opinions of which we find little or no hint in the Key. First among these is a Manichaeian dualism according to which the visible universe was created by the devil . . . the Key, p. 48, asserts just the contrary. In it Satan is indeed frequently alluded to as the adversary of God himself, and the latter is usually characterized as the heavenly God or God in heaven. But there is no indication that the Paulicians went beyond the well-marked dualism of the New Testament itself, according to which (John 12:31 and 14:30) Satan is the ruler of this world, or even, as Paul expressed it (2 Cor. 4:4), the god of this world. The morbid anxiety of Augustine and of the fathers both before and after him to discount the force of these texts in their confutations of Marcion and of the Manichaeians, raises the suspicion that the latter merely rested their dualism upon St. Paul and the fourth Gospel."<sup>1</sup>

It seems that the only real point in which the Paulicians may be accused of heresy is regarding Christ, about whom they held Adoptionist views.<sup>2</sup> "There is no trace of Docetism in the Key, nor any denial of the real character of the Passion."<sup>3</sup>

We emphasize the above because we believe that the Bogomils owe more to the Paulicians than to any other sect, as far as the formation of their teaching is concerned. Accordingly, if we have a clear view of the Paulician doctrines we shall be able to establish with some certainty at least what the actual doctrines of the Bogomils were and thus come to an unprejudiced conclusion

. . . . .

1. Conybeare, op. cit., pp. xliv-xlv
2. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. ix, xxxv
3. *Ibid.*, p. xxxix; cf. post, p. 72 (28)

on the matter.

According to Conybeare, "there can be no doubt that the Key accurately reflects the opinions and rites of the Paulicians of the four centuries, 800-1200."<sup>1</sup> He adds:

"We may discount the falsehood and ferocity of the orthodox or persecuting writers in their portraiture of those with whom they differed, and yet are struck by the agreement of the contents of the Key with the rites and beliefs of the Paulician Church as we can glean them from the writings of John of Otzun in the eighth, of Narekatzı in the tenth, of Aristaces and Paul of Taron and Magistros in the eleventh, of Nerses in the twelfth centuries."<sup>2</sup>

Below we give a summary of the Paulician tenets, as presented by Conybeare.<sup>3</sup>

1. The writer and the reader of the Key did not call themselves Paulicians, still less Thonraketzi. They were the (holy, universal, and apostolic church, founded by Jesus Christ and his apostles. In describing themselves the words catholic and orthodox are sometimes, but less often, added; perhaps because they shrank from the use of titles so closely identified with their persecutors.

2. The Church consists of all baptized persons, and preserves the apostolical tradition which Christ revealed to the apostles and they to the Church, which has handed it on by unbroken transmission from the first.

3. The sacraments are three which are requisite to salvation, to wit, Repentance, Baptism, and the Body and Blood of Christ. Marriage, ordination, confirmation, extreme unction, are not necessary to salvation.

4. All true baptism in accordance with the precepts

. . . . .

1. Conybeare, op. cit., p. xxxii
2. Ibid., pp. xxxii-xxxiii
3. Ibid., pp. xxxiii-xl

of Christ, especially Mark xvi.16, must be preceded by repentance and faith.

5. Consequently infant baptism is invalid; and, in admitting it, the Latins, Greeks, and Armenians have lost their Christianity, lost the sacraments, forfeited their orders and have become a mere Satanic mimicry of the true faith. If any of them, even their patriarchs, would rejoin the true Church, they must be baptized.

The catechumen or candidate for baptism must be of mature age, as was Jesus of Nazareth, in order that he may be able to understand, recognize, and repent of his sin, which is twofold, viz.: original, and operative or effective.

6. Baptism is only to be performed by an elect or ordained member of the Church, and in answer to the personal demand of the person who seeks to be admitted into the Church.

7. On the eighth day from birth the elect one shall solemnly confer a name on the new-born child, using a prescribed form of prayer. But he shall not allow any mythical or superstitious names.

8. In doctrine the Paulicians were Adoptionist, and held that Jesus the Messiah was born a man, though a new man, of the Virgin Mary; and that, having fulfilled all righteousness and having come to John for baptism, he received in reward for his struggles the Lordship of all things in heaven and earth, the grace of the divine spirit, whereby he was anointed and became the Messiah, and was elected or chosen to be the eternal only-born Son, mediator of God and man, and intercessor.

9. They may also be called Unitarians, in so far as they believed that Jesus Christ was not creator but created, man, made and not maker. He was never God at all, but only the new-created Adam.

10. Jesus was born without original sin.

11. The Holy Ghost enters the catechumen immediately after baptism (to exclude evil spirits), when a third handful of water is, in his honour, poured out over the catechumen's head. He is also breathed into the elect one by the bishop at the close of the ordination service.

12. The word Trinity is nowhere used, and was almost certainly rejected as being unscriptural. In baptism, however, three separate handfuls of water were poured over the head in the name of the Father, in the name of the Son, and in the name of the Holy Spirit. Two or three words are erased in the baptismal formula, which would have explained more clearly the significance they attached to this proceeding, but it was clearly heretical or they would not have been erased. A 'figure' follows in the text, p. 98, shadowing forth the meaning. The king, we learn, releases certain rulers from the prison of sin; the Son calls them to himself and comforts and gives them hope; and then the Holy Spirit at once crowns them and wells in them for ever and ever. This figure is also meant to exhibit the significance of genuine baptism.

13. The Virgin Mary lost her virginity at the birth of Jesus, and is not ἀειπαρθένος, ever virgin. She was a virgin, however, till the new Adam was born. She cannot intercede for us, for Christ, our only intercessor, expressly denied blessedness to her because of her unbelief.

14. There is no intercession of saints, for the dead rather need the prayers of the living than the living of the dead.

15. The idea of Purgatory is false and vain. There is but one last judgement for all, for which the quick and the dead (including saints) wait.

16. Images, pictures, holy crosses, springs, incense, candles are all to be condemned as idolatrous, and unnecessary, and alien to the teaching of Christ.

17. The Paulicians are not dualists in any other sense than the New Testament is itself dualistic. Satan is simply the adversary of man and God, and owing to the fall of Adam held all, even patriarchs and prophets, in his bonds before the advent of Christ.

18. Sins must be publicly confessed before God and the church, which consists of the faithful.

19. The elect ones alone have the power of binding and loosing given by Christ to the apostles and by them transmitted to their universal and apostolic Church.

20. Their canon included the whole of the New Testament except perhaps the Apocalypse, which is not mentioned or cited. The newly-elected one has given to him the Gospel and Apostolicon. The Old Testament is not rejected; and although rarely cited, is nevertheless, when it is, called the God-inspired book, Astouadsashountch, which in Armenian answers to our phrase 'Holy Scripture' or 'Bible.'

21. In the Eucharist the bread and wine are changed into the body and blood of Jesus Christ through the blessing invoked. Yet when he said to his followers: 'My body is the true food and my blood the true drink,' and again, 'I am the bread of life which came down from heaven,' he spoke in figures. However, in the last supper, when he blessed the elements, i.e. prayed the Lord that the bread might be truly changed into his body, it was verily so changed by the Holy Spirit, and Jesus saw that it was so and thanked the Almighty Father for the change of it into his body and blood.

The false priests (of the orthodox Churches) either deceive the simple-minded with mere bread, or—what is worse—they change the elements into their own sinful bodies when they say 'This is my body' instead of changing them into Christ's.

22. One unleavened loaf and wine are to be offered in the eucharistic sacrifice.

23. In baptism the catechumens pass naked into the middle of the water on their knees; but beside this immersion it was necessary to pour three handfuls of water over the head.

24. Exorcism of the catechumen is performed by the elect one before baptism.

25. The sponsors in the infant baptism of the heretics (i.e. the orthodox) churches are at best mere false witnesses.

26. There is but a single grade of ecclesiastical authority, and this is that of the elect one. He bears the authority to bind and loose given by the Father to Jesus in the descent of the Holy Spirit in Jordan, handed on by Jesus to the apostles and by them to their successors.

27. But although all authority is one and the same,



the elect depositary of it may have various titles; and according to the particular function he is fulfilling he is called in the Key, priest, elder, bishop, doctor or vardapet, president or hegumenos, apostle and chief.

The word used to denote authority is ishkhanuthiun. Hence it is probable that the ishkhanq, or rulers who choose out and present to the bishop a candidate for election, and in conjunction with the bishop lay hands on him in ordination, were themselves elect ones.

The presbyters and arch-presbyter mentioned in the ordinal or Service of Election seem to be identical with these ishkhanq, or rulers. They seem to have the same duty of testing, choosing, and presenting before the bishop the candidate for election. On p. 108 the parties present at that service are summed up thus: 'The bishop, the newly-elected one, the rulers, archrulers, and congregation.' A little before we read that the presbyters and arch-presbyters bring up the candidate to the bishop and pray him to ordain. It would seem then that the rulers and presbyters are the same people.

28. There is no trace of Docetism in the Key, nor any denial of the real character of the Passion. Christ's sufferings indeed are declared to have been insupportable.

29. The office of Reader is mentioned. In the Ordination Service he is the candidate for election.

30. There is no rejection of the Epistles of Peter, nor is any disrespect shown to that apostle. It is merely affirmed, p. 93, that the Church does not rest on him alone, but on all the apostles, including Paul. In the Election Service, p. 107, the bishop formally confers upon the candidate the ritual name of Peter, in token of the authority to loose and bind now bestowed on him. There was a similar ritual among the Cathars of France.

31. Sacrifices of animals (to expiate the sins of the dead) are condemned as contrary to Christ's teaching.

32. New-born children have neither original nor operative sin, and do not therefore need to be baptized.

33. A strong prejudice against monks animates the

Key. The devil's favourite disguise is that of a monk.

34. The scriptures and a knowledge of divine truth are not to remain the exclusive possession of the orthodox priests.

35. Rejection of the Logos doctrine as developed in the other Churches. There is indeed no explicit rejection of it in the Key, but it is ignored, and the doctrine that Jesus Christ is a κτίσμα, a man and not God, leaves no room for it in the Paulician theology.

36. For the same reason they must have rejected the term θεοτόκος.

37. The elect one was an anointed one, a Christ, and the ordinal is a ritual for the election and anointing of a presbyter in the same way as Jesus was elected and anointed, namely by the Holy Spirit.

Regarding the organization of the Paulician church we may state that it was very simple. Two groups of members were recognized, the elect, who assumed the leadership of the sect,<sup>1</sup> and the ordinary members or hearers (auditors). The elect, "according to the particular function he is fulfilling, he is called in the Key, priest, elder, bishop, doctor or vardapet, president or hegumenos, apostle, and chief."<sup>2</sup> There appears to have existed among the elect a sort of hierarchy.

Although both the Manicheans and the Paulicians used the title elect, this is no indication of their relationship. The derivation of this title by both sects

. . . . .

1. Cf. Conybeare, *The Key of Truth*, p. xxxviii; cf. pp. cxxxii-cxxxiii

2. Cf. Conybeare, *loc. cit.*; cf. ante, p. 72 (27)

must be sought in some "remote early type of Christian organization, so early and so remote that the memory of it is lost."<sup>1</sup> It is important to note that there was considerable difference between the Paulician and Manichean elect: while the former were allowed to marry, live and dress like other men, and work for their living, the latter lived an ascetic life, like the "holy" men of India, were forbidden certain foods, and were not allowed to marry.<sup>2</sup>

### C. Bogomilism and Its Origins

We have asserted that Bogomilism cannot claim for itself full originality.<sup>3</sup> While it produced certain teachings which seemed to be rather original, they appeared not so much in the sphere of religion as in the field of social reform. As far as the doctrines of the Bogomils are concerned they are more or less a mixture of the doctrines of various sects who appeared previous to it.<sup>4</sup>

#### 1. The Generally Accepted View

Most writers picture the Bogomils as direct descendants of the Manicheans.<sup>5</sup> Some, like Conybeare,

. . . . .

1. Conybeare, *op. cit.*, p. cxxxix

2. Cf. *ibid.*

3. Cf. Klincharoff, *Pop Bogomil i Negovoto Vreme*, p. 63;

(See p. 75)

and Gibbon, associate them closely with the Paulicians<sup>1</sup>; while a third group attributes the rise and development of Bogomilism to the activities of Paulician, Manichean, and Euchite (Messalian) missionaries.<sup>2</sup> Practically all European and American writers, with the exception of some leading Slavic authorities, present Bogomilism only as an ascetic, otherworldly movement, having no interests in the affairs of the political world, and so akin to the Manicheans. This view has been assumed chiefly on the basis of what the enemies of Bogomilism have written about it.

## 2. The More Logical View

During the last four decades, Bulgarian and other Slavic historians have made a special study of Bogomilism, especially prior to the celebration of its millennium a few years ago. The results have been fruitful and now, with greater certainty and clarity, we may describe the sect.

It appears that in its birth and development Bogomilism adopted elements from various sources and that

. . . . .

ante, p. 51

4. Cf. Klincharoff, op. cit., p. 36; D. Mishew: The Bulgarians in the Past, p. 59
5. Cf. Sharenkoff, A Study of Manicheism in Bulgaria, p. 54; Jirecek, Istoría na Bulgarite, p. 128
1. Cf. Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff: Istoría na Bulgarskia Narod, p. 70; Conybeare, op. cit., p. cl
2. Cf. Ivanoff, Bogomilski Knigi i Legendi, pp. 20-21

the Paulician colonists in Bulgaria played the most important part in the process.<sup>1</sup> We shall make no mistake if, all things considered, we regard the Paulicians as the principal religious ancestors of the Bogomils.

However, Bogomilism was not a purely religious protest. Most Slavic authorities during the last several decades have come to the positive conclusion that, besides its religious aspects, Bogomilism was a tremendous social protest. In this sphere lies its originality. To the best of our knowledge, Bogomilism was the first large-scale social protest in Europe which gave birth to later social and democratic movements. The element which predominated in this protest was that of social equality and personal freedom "which did not predominate to such an extent in its ancestors and which makes Bogomilism a revolutionary sect."<sup>2</sup>

Klincharoff is of the opinion that due credit should be given to Bogomilism because, as he puts it,

" . . . together with the development of its mystical theogony, it developed also its own program for social transformation and united the one with the other; with priest Bogomil 'the mystical theogony' and his program for social reforms, merge into a

. . . . .

1. Cf. Conybeare, op. cit., p. cxxxvii; N. P. Blagoeff: *Besedata na Presvitera Kozma protiv Bogomilite*, p. 27; Ivanoff, op. cit., p. 18
2. Klincharoff, op. cit., p. 62; R. Karoleff: "Bogomilstvoto," *Periodichno Spisanie na Bulgarskoto Knijovno Drouzhestvo*, Book IV, pp. 119-21; Mishew, op. cit., p. 70; Ivanoff, op. cit., p. 30

solid whole, they produce a system."<sup>1</sup>

This author claims that the chief contribution and originality of Bogomilism should be sought in the blending or merging of the social with the religious element:

"This complex system, a mixture of abstract ideas concerning the creation of the world, man, and so forth, with the practical reforms in the civil and political structure of Bulgarian society . . . is a product of Bulgarian conditions."<sup>2</sup>

We believe that Mishew, a member of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, has succeeded in giving us a rather good portrait and summary of the Bogomil protest, and its antecedents, when he says:

"The full picture is this: a pagan Slavic theology, dogmas and rituals of Orthodox Christianity, alien state and church forms of administration, sectarian dogmas of Manichaeans, Paulicians, and Messalians, Roman and Byzantine rivalry and their struggle to win and spiritually subjugate the Bulgarians which effort finally ended in the separation of the two great churches, teachings, life, and works of the clerical class not conformable with the doctrine of Christianity—all this caused confusion in the mind of the Slavic people, filled it with disappointments, and prepared it for scepticism. The Slavic soul was unable to reconcile its democratic bent of mind, its love for peace, freedom, and brotherliness with the love for power and monarchical ambitions of their rulers. The result is all that mixture of creeds, dogmas, and beliefs, of theories and forms of church and state management, together with that consisting of heathen theologies sui generis, democracy and love for independence, freedom and equality, is cast into the kiln to be moulded into a new conception

. . . . .

1. Klincharoff, op. cit., p. 63
2. Ibid.; cf. Vasil N. Zlatarski: *Istoria na Bulgarskata Durzhava prez Srednite Vikove*, Vol. I, Part II, pp. 559-61

and theory of life and government. The elements thus brought together are smelted and after a long process of refinement a new alloy is obtained which represents the Slavic world conception composed of Christian and sectarian dogmas, but which in reality is neither Christian, such as advocated by the Church, nor Manichaeian, Paulician, or Messalian . . . . The new doctrine was a protest against the existing religions, and principally against the Byzantine church and state forms of organization. This purely Slavonic product was named Bogomilstvo, after Bogomil its founder. This forerunner of Zwingli,<sup>1</sup> Luther, and Calvin<sup>2</sup> as early as the tenth century appeals to Christians to free themselves from Rome and Constantinople and seek salvation only in the pure Gospel truths, in the moral and religious perfection of man, the citizen, and the liberation of the mind and soul from every authority. Being a protest against the state and church, the Bogomil doctrine had two sides, religious, and political and social. It also had its own theology, cosmogony, dogmatism, and ethics."<sup>3</sup>

While we have given due credit to the Paulicians and other sects for the part they played in the genesis and development of Bogomilism, and while we acknowledge the genius of Bogomil in giving birth to his great religious-socio-political system, we must not forget to take into account the multitude—that vast mass of humanity inhabiting the Balkans, in whose midst the Bogomilian protest

. . . . .

1. Zwingli saw "that the integrity of the confederation and the reform of religion must go hand in hand." He died in the battlefield as a fighting chaplain. Cf. "Zwingli," New International Encyclopaedia, Vol. XXIII, p. 887.
2. Calvin was not only a reformer of religion, but also a reformer of government. He challenged the medieval world by establishing a theocracy at Geneva, where his own authority became an absolute supremacy. Cf. "Calvin," New International Encyclopaedia, Vol. IV, p. 362
3. Mishew, op. cit., pp. 59-60

was born. Without the predisposing conditions produced among the masses, Bogomil would never have been able to accomplish what he did. We quote LeBon:

"Even with respect to the ideas of great men are we certain that they are exclusively the offspring of their brains? No doubt such ideas are always created by solitary minds, but is it not the genius of crowds that has furnished the thousands of grains of dust, forming the soil in which they have sprung up?"<sup>1</sup>

LeBon continues:

"Upheavals . . . are only possible when it is the soul of the masses that brings them about . . . The most absolute power of the most despotic monarch can scarcely do more than hasten or retard the moment of their apparition."<sup>2</sup>

Indeed, due attention should be paid to the reaction in the soul of the Slavic population, which the various untoward conditions in Byzantium and Bulgaria produced during the tenth century and which formed the fertile soil from which sprang the Bogomilian protest.

"Certain historical events . . . are not to be understood unless one has attained to an appreciation of the religious form which the convictions of crowds always assume in the long run."<sup>3</sup>

Having considered thus briefly the influence of Paulicianism and of the other sects in the creation of Bogomilism, and having noticed in a general manner the conditions which produced a soil favorable for the rise

. . . . .

1. Gustave LeBon: The Crowd--A Study of the Popular Mind, p. 9
2. Ibid., p. 87
3. Ibid., p. 86



of the "Bulgarian heresy," we now proceed with a brief study of these conditions.

#### D. Conditions Which Favored Bogomilism

##### 1. Conditions under the First Bulgarian Kingdom (679-1018 A.D.)

In the preceding chapter we made a study of the beliefs, customs, traditions, and social institutions of the Slavs.<sup>1</sup> We also noted that the Turanian Bulgars, who conquered the Slavs, were not able to change materially the customs and conceptions of the latter, and that in the course of time the conquerors were absorbed by the Slavs and adopted their language, local institutions, and customs.<sup>2</sup> Further, we found that khan Boris, chiefly for political reasons, accepted the Greek Orthodox religion and forced it upon his people.<sup>3</sup> We saw also that through Boris' act Byzantine influence swept through the Bulgarian kingdom,<sup>4</sup> clashed with the Slavic mentality and traditions, and as a result the two political parties which had been established after the death of Isperich were strengthened and their struggle became more acute.<sup>5</sup>

The pro-Byzantine party was supported by the

. . . . .

1. Cf. ante, pp. 18-26
2. Cf. ante, pp. 26-27, 30-31
3. Cf. ante, pp. 36-39, 40
4. Cf. ante, pp. 40, 41-42
5. Cf. ante, pp. 29-31, 43; Sharenkoff, op. cit., p. 38

higher Orthodox clergy in Bulgaria and by some of the ruling bolyars; the anti-Byzantine, which was a much larger party, was composed of the bulk of the Slavic population and those of the bolyars who were prejudiced toward the pro-Byzantine Bulgarian kings and clergy or were not in favor of the Orthodox church in general. To this party belonged also a number of godly priests and monks of lower rank. The conflict reached its climax during the reign of king Peter.

Orthodox Christianity was foreign to the Slavs, not only because of its pomp and its outward forms and ceremonies, but especially because the clergy supported king Peter, Boris' younger son, and his pro-Byzantine policy.<sup>1</sup> In addition to this, the low moral standard prevalent among the superior clergy and the monks, their desire for riches, elaborate living, worldly pleasures, laziness, and other habits, appeared obnoxious to the simple-living Slavs, most of whom were peasants.<sup>2</sup> However, the strongest reaction was manifested when some of the ruling clergy, backed by pro-Byzantine nobles, began to oppress the populace, to extort money from the poor,

. . . . .

1. Cf. Jirecek, op. cit., p. 128; Ivanoff, op. cit., p. 31
2. Cf. Jirecek, op. cit., p. 127; V. Sl. Kisselkoff: *Beseda Protive Bogomilite ot Prezviter Kosma*, pp. 12-14, 30-39; Ivanoff, op. cit., p. 17; Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, *Istoria na Bulgarskia Narod*, p. 65; Klincharoff, op. cit., pp. 107-8

to pronounce unrighteous court sentences, and to "offend the helpless."<sup>1</sup> The situation became so deplorable during Peter's reign, that godly men like Ivan Rilski, now a patron saint of Bulgaria, being unable to effect a reform within the church, withdrew themselves from the world and went into mountainous regions where they knew they would be away from all contamination.<sup>2</sup>

On the other hand there were good men, mostly among the lower ranks of the clergy,<sup>3</sup> who were disgusted with the situation and openly sympathized with the oppressed Slavic people. One of them was priest Bogomil, who decided to face things as they were. He raised a strong Puritan protest against the decaying church,<sup>4</sup> and against the oppressors, whether in the government or in the church.<sup>5</sup> His voice was not unheard.<sup>6</sup> Multitudes rallied around him, appreciating his sympathetic understanding of their plight.<sup>7</sup>

We have mentioned several times now the two political parties which played such an important rôle in

. . . . .

1. Cf. Jirecek, loc. cit.; Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, loc. cit.
2. Cf. Jirecek, op. cit., pp. 127-8; Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, op. cit., p. 66
3. Cf. Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, op. cit., p. 72; Ivanoff, op. cit., p. 21; Sharenkoff, A Study of Manichaeism in Bulgaria, p. 28
4. Cf. Kisselkoff, op. cit., pp. 12-13; Jirecek, op. cit., p. 128
5. Cf. Ivanoff, op. cit., p. 24
6. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 47
7. Cf. Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, loc. cit.

the history of Bulgaria.<sup>1</sup> Their struggle for supremacy cannot be overemphasized. It continued for several centuries until the Turks finally subjugated the Balkans. Blagoeff very ably discusses this phase of the problem.<sup>2</sup> He affirms that prior to Bulgaria's acceptance of Christianity the pro-Byzantine and anti-Byzantine parties carried on their warfare on purely political grounds; but after the national conversion, "the political struggles were carried also on religious soil."<sup>3</sup> Blagoeff clearly states:

"Presbyter Kozma accuses the political opponents of king Peter of heresy and ascribes to them a religious teaching which perhaps was unknown to them. The latter, also on religious ground, agitated against king Peter and his government. They roamed around among the Bulgarian population, especially among the army and bolyars, conducted secret meetings, preached inspired sermons and on the basis of the Scriptures proved that king Peter was an unlawful sovereign,<sup>4</sup> and that his pro-Byzantine policy was harmful to the Bulgarian nation and state. In the same manner political conflicts were conducted also in the beginning of the thirteenth century<sup>5</sup> during the reign of king Boril."<sup>6</sup>

. . . . .

1. Cf. ante, pp. 80-81, and note 5 on p. 80
2. Cf. Blagoeff, *Besedata na Presvitera Kozma protiv Bogomilite*, pp. 73-77
3. *Ibid.*, p. 78
4. King Simeon dethroned his elder son Michael, because the latter was inclined to conduct an anti-Byzantine policy. Simeon, against the Slav principles and traditions, unlawfully placed his younger son Peter on the throne, who was pro-Byzantine; cf. Blagoeff, *op. cit.*, pp. 56, 77; Jirecek, *op. cit.*, pp. 125-6
5. King Boril was a usurper on the throne; therefore the Bogomils opposed him; cf. Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, *op. cit.*, p. 97; Blagoeff, *op. cit.*, pp. 43-56
6. Blagoeff, *op. cit.*, p. 78; cf. Klincharoff, *Pop Bogomil i Negovoto Vreme*, pp. 118-9

The conflict between the two parties finally caused the division of the Bulgarian kingdom in 963 A.D., when a powerful nobleman, Shishman, head of the strongest Macedonian-Slavic tribe, Bursiatzi, established the Western Bulgarian kingdom and thus broke away completely from the hated Byzantines.<sup>1</sup> His son, Samuel, who began to reign in 977, extended greatly the borders of his father's kingdom and fought the Byzantine rulers until his death.<sup>2</sup> It was his misfortune to see fifteen thousand of his brave soldiers, who were captured and blinded by emperor by the emperor Basilus II, return thus to their noble king at Prilep. He could not endure the sight and died of heart failure in 1014.<sup>3</sup>

Blagoeff is of the opinion that emperor Basilus could hardly have subjugated Bulgaria in 1018 if he had not been assisted by the pro-Byzantine party in that land. This party, and not the Bogomils as is commonly believed by their enemies, was responsible for the destruction of the first Bulgarian kingdom.<sup>4</sup>

Although the deplorable condition of the Orthodox clergy and the strife between the two political parties were two very important conditions which prepared the way for the advent and development of Bogomlism, we

. . . . .

1. Cf. Jirecek, op. cit., p. 127
2. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 141-44
3. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 145
4. Cf. Blagoeff, op. cit., pp. 77-78

believe that the social structure introduced into Bulgaria by the Byzantines should be considered as the most powerful single factor in opening the way for the rise of the so-called heresy. Gradually, but surely, the original Slavonic tribal and family form of government began to give way under the rule of the oppressors. The freedom-loving, independent Slavs were overloaded with taxes<sup>1</sup> in order to replenish the royal coffers emptied by constant wars. The small farmers were so heavily burdened that finally many of them lost their property which went into the hands of large landowners and members of the upper clerical caste. Some of the disheartened peasants sought refuge in monasteries,<sup>2</sup> where they knew they would not be molested by the heartless tax gatherers. Families were broken up,<sup>3</sup> and everywhere one could hear the cries and complaints of the deserted wives and children who sank into a state of misery. On the other hand monasteries sprang up like mushrooms. Before long the monastic caste fell into a terribly low moral condition, so picturesquely described by presbyter Kozma, who deplored the unworthiness of the monks in his sermon.<sup>4</sup> In the course of time, instead of the humble Slavic farms and

. . . . .

1. Cf. Klincharoff, *op. cit.*, p. 110
2. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 105-6
3. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 107; Blagoeff, *op. cit.*, pp. 58-59, 68
4. Cf. Klincharoff, *loc. cit.*; Blagoeff, *op. cit.*, pp. 63-65; Kisselkoff, *op. cit.*, pp. 30-39

homesteads rose powerful feudal estates governed by important clergy and pro-Byzantine bolyars and army officers who had been honored by the king. A caste system of serfs and masters was established,<sup>1</sup> and thousands of hapless enslaved and oppressed Slavs began to long for a deliverer. One such did come in the person of priest Bogomil who did not remain indifferent to the cries of the helpless. The movement to which he gave rise "was a living protest against the corruption in the ecclesiastic and socio-political life in the middle ages."<sup>2</sup>

Priest Bogomil declared war on the official churches (Orthodox and Catholic) because "they had reduced Christianity to a few artificial, lifeless formulas, which were contradictory to primitive Christianity,"<sup>3</sup> and because the larger part of the higher clergy in Bulgaria, supported by king Peter, exploited the poor people and kept them in double bondage.<sup>4</sup>

During the reign of Peter, according to presbyter Kozma the ruling and oppressing clergy were in a deplorable moral condition. Therefore, the first attacks of the Puritan Bogomil protest were aimed at them. They were accused of laziness, drunkenness, and immorality. The bishops who lived in luxury and vice received ter-

. . . . .

1. Cf. Klincharoff, op. cit., p. 66
2. Ibid., p. 45
3. Ibid., p. 46
4. Cf. ibid., p. 107; Blagoeff, op. cit., p. 61

rific oral blows from Bogomil and his followers, and it was only natural that the accused and guilty ecclesiastics were the first to take a stand against their accusers and exact vengeance on them. Presbyter Kozma, who seems to have been an honorable man in the state church, endeavored to shelter his colleagues and superiors, but finally admitted their guilt and pled with them to reform.<sup>1</sup>

The teaching of the Paulician colonists found most favorable soil in the heart of the dissatisfied priest, Bogomil, and thousands of others like him who longed for liberty, personal communion with God, and freedom from the unhealthy circumstances around them. The Paulician worship, the comparative purity of their lives and their putting vital Christian principles into practice, evidently gripped the heart and mind of Bogomil and helped him greatly in creating his system which was destined to shake to its very foundation the ecclesiastical world and thus prepare the way for the great Western reformers.

## 2. Conditions under the Byzantine Yoke (1018-1186 A.D.)

Although the Bogomils helped to their utmost king Samuel and other rulers who were opposed to Constantinople and its religious and political domination,

. . . . .

1. Cf. Blagoeff, op. cit., pp. 61-62; Kisselkoff, op. cit., pp. 49-50; Sharenkoff, op. cit., pp. 68-69; Appendix B



finally the Byzantine emperors, assisted from within Bulgaria by their spies and pro-Byzantine bolyars, succeeded in subjugating the whole country.

It is needless to say that the plight of the Slavonic population in general, which had already been reduced to a state of serfdom, became worse<sup>1</sup> and with that the hatred of the poor toward the rich and Byzantium grew stronger and stronger manifesting itself in occasional uprisings.

Tormented, impoverished, disheartened, the poor Slavs sought solace in the religion of the "heretical" Bogomils, who were different from the oppressing clergy. The Bogomil leaders did not hesitate to champion bravely the cause of the needy and troubled population.<sup>2</sup>

A number of efforts were made in various sections of Bulgaria to effect a general revolt; but finally, under the brutal force of the conquerors and their accomplices among the pro-Byzantine Bulgarians, all such efforts were crushed, and during the reign of the Comnen dynasty, which was supported by the military caste, no uprisings of note are recorded.

"But although the Bulgarians did not revolt, they cherished within themselves enmity toward the foreign rule and this enmity they expressed by joining the Bogomils en masse. In the beginning of the

. . . . .

1. Cf. Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, op. cit., p. 88
2. Cf. *ibid.*

twelfth century the Bogomilian movement assumed such large proportions that it became dangerous for the government, because the Bogomils always pointed to the devil as the source of all evil and stated that he dwelt in Constantinople."<sup>1</sup>

Emperor Alexis Comnenus did his best to "convert" the "heretics," his political opponents, to Orthodoxy and Byzantium. For the purpose he spent a long time in and around Philippopolis, the headquarters of the sect, but most of his efforts were in vain. At last he began a severe persecution of these people, not so much because of their views against the state church but because they did not like Byzantine rule and thus were his enemies. He found it very convenient, under the pretense of persecuting heresy, to deliver himself of those who challenged his rule.<sup>2</sup>

It was during this time that the noted Bogomil Basilius, who was very actively engaged in spreading his teaching, was apprehended by the emperor through trickery. Supposedly "interviewed" by the emperor in regard to the Bogomilian teaching, he was accused of heresy, sentenced, and eventually burned at the stake in Constantinople,<sup>3</sup> thus becoming the first martyr of the sect. Others followed him in the path of suffering, while some managed to

. . . . .

1. Pastouhoff and Stoyanoff, op. cit., p. 90
2. Cf. *ibid.*
3. Cf. Klincharoff, op. cit., p. 133; Neander, *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, Vol. IV, p. 560

escape the scourge of persecution and carried their doctrine to the West.

While Alexis Comnenus and his successors did the actual persecuting of the Bogomils, we must not forget that their inspiration in what they did came from the higher Orthodox clergy who could not stand the Puritanistic protest of the "heretics." The fact of the matter is that the very lives of the "heretical" leaders who commanded the respect of the population with their Puritan practices, were as an irritating light in the eyes of the Orthodox clergy, who preferred darkness as was shown by their lives.

### 3. Conditions under the Second Bulgarian Kingdom (1186-1393 A.D.)

Toward the end of the twelfth century Byzantium weakened. The Latins through their crusades finally subjugated Constantinople and in 1204 A.D. the Byzantine empire came to an end.

Naturally, Bulgarians, Serbs, and others who had been subjugated by Constantinople, now found the moment opportune for revolt. Thus in 1186 the Bulgarian kingdom came to life once again in the form of what is known in history as the Second kingdom. The nobles who aspired to a kingly crown made overtures to the pope at Rome and succeeded in obtaining his recognition on several occasions.

The limits of this study make it unnecessary to go into detail historically. Therefore, we shall mention only several of the more important facts relevant to this study.

Back of the revolt which gave birth to the Second Bulgarian kingdom we find the influence of the Bogomils who as good nationalists did everything possible to see Bulgaria once more an independent state. Their good services were not forgotten by those who by their assistance came to the throne. For example, king Ivan Assen II (1218-1241), who is considered one of the wisest and best Bulgarian monarchs, did not persecute the Bogomils in the least. Such humane treatment was appreciated by these people and they lent their full support to the king. It is natural that such peaceful periods were favorable for the spread of Bogomilism.

However, there were some rulers whom the Bogomils opposed even during the Second kingdom. One of them was Boril<sup>1</sup> who usurped the throne and so met with the extreme displeasure of the "heretics" who could not tolerate injustice. In turn Boril severely persecuted them and even called a church council in 1211 A.D. to take measures against the "heretics," most of whom were nothing

. . . . .

1. Cf. ante, p. 83 (fn. 5); Klincharoff, op. cit., p. 137; Sharenkoff, op. cit., p. 38

more nor less than his political opponents. Naturally it was convenient for him to accuse them of heresy and thus create prejudice against them among the people, or at least discredit them.<sup>1</sup> Just as Kozma selects the worst epithets to describe the Bogomils whom he hated,<sup>2</sup> so did the writer of the Synodik Tsaria Borisa<sup>3</sup> which abounds in curses against the heretics.

#### E. Summary and Conclusion

We have seen that ever since the beginning of the Christian church there has been a constant stream of primitive or apostolic Christianity, but when its flow has been checked or impeded, the very obstacles have given impetus to the rise of Puritanism.

Further, we noted that with the introduction of Greek Orthodox Christianity into Bulgaria, certain unfavorable conditions were created in the church which dammed the stream of pure Christianity and the result was the birth of the Puritan Bogomil movement.

In our further discussion we took into account the fact that several sectarian teachings had been introduced into Bulgaria prior to the rise of Bogomilism,

. . . . .

1. Cf. Blagoeff, op. cit., p. 56
2. Cf. Klincharoff, op. cit., p. 129
3. Cf. Sharenkoff, op. cit., pp. 81-83; Appendix D

through colonists brought to the Balkans by several emperors. We noted that, although Bogomilism strictly speaking was a Bulgarian movement, it cannot claim full originality because it owes much of its religious doctrine to the Paulicians, and perhaps the Manicheans and Euchites.

But in relating Bogomilism to its spiritual ancestors we felt that we could not accept any of the views most commonly advocated, in view of evidence made available in more recent years. We therefore took the position that the movement was closely related to Paulicianism, having borrowed from this movement most of its religious elements, but differing from Paulicianism in that it was not a purely religious protest but was also a social and political movement.

We saw that the reasons for the rise and development of this great movement were many and that all of them constituted the fertile ground from which it finally sprang. As a finished product Bogomilism was a well-defined system which expressed itself in a tremendous protest against the impurity, decay, and superstitions of the organized state church and against oppressors who held many thousands of democratically-minded, freedom-loving people in a state of slavery.

Indeed, it may be said that the unfavorable conditions, instead of crushing this movement, helped it

to get established until finally it became a most powerful force within the borders of the Byzantine empire.

Regardless of the fact that Bogomilism was constantly stigmatized by the church, for several centuries it stood as a living protest against this institution and against the civil authority back of its policy. It proclaimed liberty for each individual, purity of life, equality among men, and personal communion with God. In other words, Bogomilism was an outburst of the principle of Puritanism, the ever-recurring phenomenon which is conditioned on circumstances favorable to its appearance.

PART TWO

DEVELOPMENT AND SPREAD

OF

THE BOGOMIL MOVEMENT



CHAPTER IV

BOGOMILISM

AS

A NATIONAL MOVEMENT

## CHAPTER IV

### BOGOMILISM

AS

### A NATIONAL MOVEMENT

#### A. Introduction

Strictly speaking, Bogomilism was a Bulgarian, or rather a Slavic product based on solid Slavic traditions and principles. It is true that it borrowed many things from other religious movements, as described in the last chapter, but all these other movements lay chiefly in the sphere of religion. As far as the social and political aspects of this movement are concerned, we may state with certainty that they were original to it because they grew out of the native Slavic soil.

The Bogomilian protest was similar in nature to that of the Paulicians and other Puritan groups, insofar as it was a rebellion and protest against the backslidden state church; but it was different from them in its rebellion against the oppression of political and ecclesiastical authorities.<sup>1</sup> As already stated, it was not an altogether otherworldly movement, severed from

. . . . .

1. Cf. Ivanoff, *Bogomilski Knigi i Legendi*, p. 30

the affairs of this life. It cannot be denied that the Bogomils were real Puritans and some of them went to extreme asceticism, but as a whole they were vitally interested in the independence and welfare of the Bulgarian state and its form of government. Regardless of what their enemies have written about them, we know now with certainty that the perfects, who were the mouthpieces of the Bogomil movement, were highly intelligent men who dared to place their practical Puritanism over against the decaying system of medieval Orthodoxy and Romanism.

Regarding the social aspect of the movement, Klincharoff says:

" . . . in its social relations Bogomilism is saturated with well-defined principles of brotherhood and equality . . . the denial of the existing church with its clergy and of the state with its class distinctions."<sup>1</sup>

The Bogomilian teachers proclaimed far and wide during their preaching tours

" . . . disobedience to the authorities which oppressed the poor and the economically weak; they disliked the bolyars, incited the slaves and serfs not to work for their masters and preached that those who serve the king (a tool of Byzantium) are not acceptable to God."<sup>2</sup>

This behavior of the Bogomils came from their "desire for humanitarianism and equality in society"<sup>3</sup> and

. . . . .

1. Klincharoff, *Pop Bogomil i Negovoto Vreme*, p. 65; cf. Ivanoff, *loc. cit.*
2. Klincharoff, *op. cit.*, p. 67; cf. Ivanoff, *loc. cit.*
3. Ivanoff, *loc. cit.*

therefore they should not be accused of anarchy. They wanted to change the undesirable Byzantine form of government but their Puritan principles restrained them from using violence. We quote Ivanoff:

"At last, priest Bogomil added to his system a humanitarian view regarding the social condition of man, a thing which was rare in his day. Furthermore, this point of view which he had was manifested not simply as a 'good wish,' but in a form of protest against the social injustice inflicted upon the helpless, against the institutions of slavery, nobility (bolyars), and the monarchy. Priest Bogomil dared to write on his banner that desire which was always hidden in the souls of the oppressed, but which no one else dared to declare aloud. In this respect, the Bulgarian priest antedates<sup>by</sup> centuries the noble preachers of social justice in the new era."<sup>1</sup>

We add a thought from Klincharoff:

"As he taught against the rich and riches, priest Bogomil turned toward the poor, and in doing this he brought about his social reform in relative harmony with primitive Christianity."<sup>2</sup>

## B. Its Name

### 1. The Two Theories

There are two theories regarding the origin of the name "Bogomilism" (Богомилство, Bogomilstvo). Some, basing their argument on certain Byzantine writings, claim that the name was derived from the old Bulgarian words Bog (God) and milui (have mercy). Others contend

. . . . .

1. Ivanoff, op. cit., p. 24
2. Klincharoff, op. cit., p. 69

that the name was derived from Bogomil, the personal name of the man who founded the sect, which corresponds to the Greek Theophilus. This is a compound word, composed of Bog (God) and mil (dear) and can be interpreted "dear to God" or "beloved of God."<sup>1</sup>

## 2. The Proper Solution

We accept the second view as probably more correct. Presbyter Kozma, who no doubt was a contemporary of priest Bogomil,<sup>2</sup> certainly knew better than the Greeks in Constantinople who were not acquainted with the Slavic; to Kozma, Bogomil is the personal name of the founder of Bogomilism.<sup>3</sup>

There are some Slavic authorities who confuse Bogomil with one of his followers, or perhaps co-worker<sup>5</sup>, named Jeremiah, but they are not categorical in their position. Among these are Racki, Jirecek, Iagich, Osokin, and A. Vaselovsky.<sup>4</sup> Klincharoff's opinion is valuable:

"According to us, as the most authoritative source in establishing the historical name of the founder

. . . . .

1. Cf. Fred J. Powicke; "Bogomils," Hastings Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, Vol. II, p. 784; Blagoeff, Bessedata na Presviter Kozma protiv Bogomilite, p. 30; Neander, General History of the Christian Religion and Church, Vol. IV, p. 552; Adeney, The Greek and Eastern Churches, p. 225
2. Cf. Ivanoff, op. cit., p. 22
3. Cf. Kisselkoff, Beseda protive Bogomilite ot Prezviter Kozma, p. 6; Sharenkoff, A Study of Manichaeism in Bulgaria, pp. 37, 66; Ivanoff, loc. cit.; Klincharoff, op. cit., pp. 23-26; Appendix B
4. Cf. Klincharoff, op. cit., pp. 23, 26; Jirecek, Istoria

of the Bogomilian heresy, we should accept the Sermon of Presbyter Kozma. Presbyter Kozma either began his career in the latter days of king Peter (927-967), when Bogomilism was being organized under the agitation of priest Bogomil, or soon after the death of the king. This is evident from the very text of the sermon. . . . The author narrates as an eyewitness . . . we are convinced that the author has mentioned the exact name of the person (Bogomil), who was the object of his assailing sermon."<sup>1</sup>

### C. Its Founder

#### 1. The Various Theories

As already mentioned<sup>2</sup> there are several theories regarding the founder of Bogomilism. Kozma distinctly names a priest Bogomil who gave his name to the movement he founded. Others consider a man by the name of Jeremiah to have been the founder, who for certain reasons, assumed the name Bogomil. There are even some who doubt that the Bogomil movement had a founder.

#### 2. The Logical Conclusion

As we have seen above<sup>3</sup> the strongest evidence is in favor of the view that priest Bogomil actually lived during the reign of king Peter (927-969 A.D.) and that he is to be considered the founder and leader of the sect as is stated by his enemy and contemporary, presbyter

. . . . .

na Bulgarite, pp. 128

1. Klincharoff, op. cit., pp. 25-26

2. Cf. ante, pp. 99-100

3. Cf. ante, pp. 100-101; Pawicke, loc. cit.

Kozma.<sup>1</sup> In the Sinodik Tzaria Borisa (1211) Bogomil is named the founder of Bogomilism.<sup>2</sup>

We have at our disposal rather meager information concerning this priest, but from what we have on hand we can restore the picture of the Bulgarian reformer.

Ivanoff says:

"From what we know regarding the religious systems and the socio-political life during the tenth century, and from what we find in the Bogomil teaching, we must acknowledge that priest Bogomil was not an ordinary man but that he had a very awake and daring mind, which rises above its environment, captivates it with his spirit and leads into new paths. He must have been, to begin with, a Greek Orthodox priest who lived closer to the people with their burdens, than the representatives of the 'black clergy,' the monks. Priest Bogomil was dissatisfied with the official Christianity which was separated from its original simplicity and was loaded with magnificent ceremonies, behind which the people in general could scarcely recognize and understand the work of Christ. He could not sanction the religious and state structure, where a larger portion of the people, scattered through bolyar and monastic estates and households, were suffering deprivation in slavery and serfdom, and decided to become a preacher of true Christianity, which can be close to the understanding of the people, and to give them human rights and salvation for the soul. He obtained the purely religious elements in his system from his conception of early Christianity, as well as from the teaching of Manichaeans, Paulicians, and Messalians. And, if he did adopt more or less the view of the dualists he did it because he could not ascribe the existence of evil in the world and in man to an all-loving and omnipotent God."<sup>3</sup>

. . . . .

1. Cf. Kisselkoff, loc. cit.; Blagoeff, op. cit., pp. 4, 38-39; Appendix B
2. Cf. Sharenkoff, op. cit., p. 81; Ivanoff, op. cit., pp. 21-22; Appendix D
3. Ivanoff, op. cit., p. 23

## D. Its Development

### 1. The Early Stages

It is quite evident that Bogomilism passed through various stages of development as was the case with other similar movements. In the opinion of Blagoeff, originally there were no heretical elements in the movement. It was presbyter Kozma and others who hated the Bogomils for their Puritan protest and unfriendly attitude toward the state and church, who were responsible for stigmatizing them as heretics. After a careful examination of Kozma's sermon and other writings by enemies of the Bogomils, Blagoeff comes to the conclusion that perhaps the Bogomils were never heretics in the strict sense of the word,<sup>1</sup> that during the time of king Peter they were Orthodox in their beliefs,<sup>2</sup> and that they were branded as heretics because they insisted on having purely national churches, separated from Constantinople.<sup>3</sup> The Bogomils were considered heretics on the same basis as the Greek Orthodox people of the Balkans considered the Catholics heretics, and vice versa.<sup>4</sup>

Blagoeff insists that the main reason the Bogomils were branded as heretics was the fact of their very

. . . . .

1. Cf. Blagoeff, op. cit., pp. 32, 36, 79
2. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 33
3. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 80
4. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 35-36



unfriendly attitude toward the Byzantium-controlled Crown and toward the higher Bulgarian clergy. He says:

"A large part of the bolyars and the clergy supported king Peter, but a certain group of bolyars, and especially fellow-fighters of king Simeon and the unbending clergy, were against him. Among the first doubtless was presbyter Kozma and among the latter priest Bogomil. These two leading Bulgarian priests must have been not only political opponents, but also personal enemies. Presbyter Kozma, in order to weaken and bring to naught the opponents of king Peter before the Bulgarian people, in the spirit of his time and as a member of the clergy accuses them of heresy and ascribes to them the teaching of the Paulicians. King Peter adopts the same manner of defense and attack in his letter to patriarch Theophilact when he brands his political opponents as heretics and wants them to be punished according to the civil laws. . . . In the tenth century the Bulgarians utilized religion in their political conflicts. In this we see nothing original or unusual, because during the middle ages the political and cultural conflicts were fought on religious soil. The great ecclesiastical question which arose between Rome and Constantinople during the ninth century in reality was a political and cultural one, but formally (the dispute) was carried on upon religious ground and the struggling parties accused each other of heresy and anathematized each other. The Catholic clergy accused the Bulgarian saints Cyril and Methodius and also their disciples of heresy because they conducted their church worship in the Slovenian tongue. The Byzantine emperor, Alexis Comnenus (1081-1118), also utilized religion for his purposes. He was a true Byzantine and developed Byzantianism to perfection. Thanks to this and to his undisputed abilities, he succeeded in ascending the imperial throne at the early age of twenty-four. In order to popularize himself among the population he utilized religion. He created in Byzantium and used for his personal purposes the Bogomil heresy, concerning which he heard for the first time among the Bulgarian population in Plovdiv (Philippopolis)."<sup>1</sup>

. . . . .

1. Cf. Blagoeff, op. cit., pp. 38-39

Although Blagoeff is very forceful in his arguments we cannot fully agree with him that the Bogomils always remained purely Greek Orthodox. It is obvious that the tens of thousands of Paulicians and other "heretical" colonists must have exercised a tremendous influence in the formation of the Bogomilian doctrines and in their everyday philosophy of life. How otherwise can we explain the Puritan ideals and life of the Bogomils, as well as their strong Puritan protest? We may be faced with the suggestion that the traditions and principles of the heathen Slavs must have played an important part in the process, a thing which we admit, but nevertheless we can explain Bogomilism more logically as an expression of the principle of Puritanism on the basis of its relation to Puritan Paulicianism.<sup>1</sup>

## 2. The Conflicting Teachings

Most authorities agree that Bogomilism, as it originally appeared in Bulgaria, and as it developed in that land, held a moderate dualistic teaching, and it is possible that the dualism of the Bogomils did not go "beyond the well-marked dualism of the New Testament," as was the case with the Paulicians.<sup>2</sup> We may add that per-

.....

1. Cf. Conybeare, *The Key of Truth*, pp. cxxxvii, cl
2. Cf. *ibid.*, p. xliv; John 12:31 and 14:30, also II Corinthians 4:4

haps Adoption rather than Marcionism was the basis of Bogomilism.<sup>1</sup>

In the course of time another movement was inaugurated in Byzantium, which the clergy at Constantinople as well as the emperor called Bogomilism. It was either an altogether new sect or it was Bogomilism adulterated because, when we compare what Euthymius Zygabenus says about this movement with what presbyter Kozma had to say previously about the original Bogomils in Bulgaria, there appear considerable differences,<sup>2</sup> especially in the matter of dualism. While the Bulgarian Bogomils appear to have been moderate in their dualism the Byzantines seem to have been extreme, if we are to judge by what Zygabenus says regarding their cosmogony.<sup>3</sup>

### 3. The Establishment of Two Bogomil Churches

As a result of the differences in teaching and the constant friction which they produced, finally we find the establishment of two rival Bogomil churches; that of Druguria or Dragometia, probably with headquarters in Macedonia or Philippopolis, which sanctioned the views held by the Byzantine sect; and the Bulgarian, with headquarters probably in Sofia or Preslav, which held the

. . . . .

1. Cf. Conybeare, op. cit., p. ix
2. Cf. Blagoeff, op. cit., p. 29
3. Cf. Sharenkoff, op. cit., pp. 39-41

original Bogomil teaching.<sup>1</sup> In church history these two churches are better known under the names of Ordo Druguriae and Ordo Bulgariae or Ecclesia Druguriae and Ecclesia Bulgariae.<sup>2</sup>

These two Bogomil churches "became the mother churches of all heretical sects in western Europe,"<sup>3</sup> and their hostile attitude one toward another was reflected in the conflicts between the two branches of the Cathari in that part of the world for some time.<sup>4</sup>

During the thirteenth century there appeared another Bogomil church whose doctrinal independence is doubtful. It was called Ordo Slavoniae "which dominated Bosnia, Dalmatia and Slavonia."<sup>5</sup>

### E. Its Organization

#### 1. The Pattern

It is not certain from what source the Bogomils borrowed their form of government, but it is most probable that the Paulician organization served them as a pattern. The slight modifications are perhaps due to the

. . . . .

1. Cf. Sharenkoff, op. cit., p. 40; Klincharoff, op. cit., p. 59
2. Cf. Sharenkoff, loc. cit.; Ivanoff, op. cit., p. 42; Mishew, *The Bulgarians in the Past*, pp. 76-79 (Mishew is of the opinion that the Bulgarian church had its headquarters in Philippopolis, while the Drugurian had its seat in Melnik, Macedonia.)
3. Sharenkoff, loc. cit.; cf. Ivanoff, op. cit., pp. 40-42
4. Cf. Sharenkoff, loc. cit.
5. Sharenkoff, loc. cit.

old Slavic democratic influence. However, there is a possibility of the Bogomils having borrowed some elements from the Manicheans if we accept what Kozma says about the Bogomil perfects and ecclesiastical heads. He claims that they never worked for their living, as was the case with the Manichean leaders while the Paulician leaders worked.<sup>1</sup>

## 2. The Two Classes of Members

There is very little told us about the matter of their hierarchy and orders by Kozma and Euthymius Zygabenus. Our knowledge of the details regarding the Bogomil organization is "largely drawn from allusions to Bogomilism in documents which deal with the Cathars and Patarenes as later offshoots of the Bogomils."<sup>2</sup>

It is well known that the Bogomils were against the organization and hierarchy of the official church, but on the other hand, they seemed to have had "a sort of hierarchy of their own."<sup>3</sup> We find in the Synodik,<sup>4</sup> points 14, 15, 17, and 20, the names of Bogomil and some of his disciples, while Anna Commena mentions Basil and his twelve apostles<sup>5</sup>; but it is not clear from these

. . . . .

1. Cf. Sharenkoff, op. cit., p. 52; Conybeare, op. cit., p. cxxxi
2. Sharenkoff, op. cit., p. 51; cf. Ch. Schmidt: *Histoire et doctrine de la secte des Cathares ou Albigeois*, Vol. II, pp. 104 ff.
3. Sharenkoff, op. cit., p. 50

references exactly what the offices of these men were.

If we are to base our assumptions on what we glean from Catharist sources, the Bogomils were divided into two groups; namely, the perfects or "selected," corresponding to the elect among the Paulicians and Manicheans,<sup>1</sup> and credents or "believers," corresponding to Paulician and Manichean auditors.<sup>2</sup>

According to the information we have at our disposal, the Bogomilian perfects were men and women

"who were able to maintain an entirely ascetic life. . . . They never served the state, never went to war, never attended the meetings and festivals of non-Bogomils. They had to undergo special fasts and their duty was to teach and to preach constantly."<sup>3</sup>

The believers were the rank and file of the Bogomils who accepted the Bogomil doctrines. They aspired to a higher life but lived more or less as ordinary people.

"They were free to marry, to serve the tsar and the fatherland and to go to war. They had to support the Perfects and to show them honor. Their ultimate duty was to struggle unceasingly against evil and thus, at the end of life, through repentance to receive complete sanctification."<sup>4</sup>

. . . . .

4. Cf. Sharenkoff, p. 83; Appendix D
5. Cf. Sharenkoff, op. cit., p. 50

1. Cf. ante, pp. 57, 73; Sharenkoff, op. cit., p. 51
2. Cf. Sharenkoff, op. cit., p. 51
3. Sharenkoff, loc. cit.
4. Ibid.

### 3. The Leadership

The democratic principle is evidenced in the election of leaders for the Bogomil movement. Women as well as men were eligible, but we have no record of women who occupied a high office.

"From the Perfects were selected leaders who occupied the first place in the Bogomilian hierarchy. These persons were called dedtsi, dedi, 'grand-fathers,' which corresponded to that of bishop. The dedets governed a diocese and had two elected members as assistants."<sup>1</sup>

In regard to the character of the Bogomil leaders we quote Mishew:

"The Bogomil apostles as a rule were conspicuous not only for their education, but also for zeal, strong convictions and self-sacrificing spirit. Truth and virtue were dearer to them than their own life. Neither persecution, nor torture, nor even death, could deter them from their beliefs."<sup>2</sup>

### F. Summary and Conclusion

From what has been stated above it is evident that Bogomilism began as a national movement in which the social element was predominant. It was a strong protest against the social injustice inflicted upon the helpless and the poor by the rulers and the higher clergy. It advocated a social reform which would guarantee liberty and independence to the individual, as well as

. . . . .

1. Sharenkoff, loc. cit.; cf. *ibid.*, p. 83; Appendix D  
2. Mishew, op. cit., p. 79

effect social equality and democratic government.

In its religious aspect, Bogomilism was a manifestation of the principle of Puritanism. It raised a vigorous protest against the corrupted official church, not only by preaching but also by demonstration of everyday life. This was in sharp contrast to the lax and immoral life of the clergy who kept the multitudes in spiritual bondage.

We found that a priest, by the name of Bogomil, who lived during the reign of king Peter in the tenth century, should rightfully be credited with giving birth to the Bogomilian movement, which as a consequence was named after him.

Considering the development of the movement we emphasized the fact that originally the Bogomils, being within the Orthodox Church, protested against its practices, and especially against the high clergy who were extortionists and oppressors of the population in league with the secular rulers. We acknowledged also the influence of the Paulicians in the establishment of the Bogomil doctrines. We saw further that the Bogomil protest prejudiced the secular and ecclesiastical authorities who branded the Bogomils as heretics, not so much because of their teaching but because they considered the Bogomils to be dangerous political enemies.

In our further study we saw that because of



difference of doctrines two separate Bogomil churches were established, which in the course of time gave rise to the various western Catharist movements.

In regard to the organization of the Bogomils, we have stated that it differed very little from that of the Paulicians and Manicheans and emphasized the fact that the Bogomil leaders at least lived exemplary lives as strict Puritans.

We shall conclude by saying that due credit should be given to the priest Bogomil for his courage in producing a system which effected a religious and social revolt so significant not only in Bulgarian history but also in the history of all Europe.

CHAPTER V  
BOGOMILISM  
AS  
AN INTERNATIONAL MOVEMENT

## CHAPTER V

### BOGOMILISM

#### AS

#### AN INTERNATIONAL MOVEMENT

##### A. Introduction

During the process of our research we were repeatedly impressed that most western European writers, with the exception of a few outstanding authorities in the field like Ch. Schmidt, give only slight consideration to Bogomilism, as though it were an isolated Bulgarian movement which made no impression of note in medieval times. On the contrary, all Slavonic authorities, practically without exception and regardless of the fact that some of them are hostile to Bogomilism, give it due credit as an international movement of paramount importance and far-reaching effects.

In the following pages we shall endeavor to consider as briefly as possible the international aspect of Bogomilism, expressing at the same time the hope that the day may soon come when someone will undertake the task of making an exhaustive study of this particular matter and provide us with a work which will portray the clear relation between Bogomilism and the western Puritan

movements.

## B. Bulgaria, Crossroad of Nations

### 1. A Geographical Bridge

For many centuries the Balkans have played a very important part in European history because of their peculiar position. This was especially true during the early Christian Era and up to the time when the Turks conquered that area.

Bulgaria, which lies in the heart of the Balkan peninsula, has been an actual bridge between Europe and Asia. Armies of various conquerors have pitched their tents in its valleys, the voices of cosmopolitan crusading parties have echoed in its mountain passes, and the fiery sermons of Asiatic colonists were often heard in its village market places. All these have left indelible impressions on the native population in one way or another. But what is more important, Bulgaria, with its strategic position, has often rendered valuable service to the West; for here invading armies were stalled and exhausted, making it difficult for them to proceed further west, and here Eastern ideas were halted, to be examined as it were at a border customs office, before they were allowed to proceed toward the setting of the sun.

## 2. A Theological Melting Pot

The Bible student recalls the European ministry of the great apostle Paul who first set his foot in Macedonia on what, centuries later, became known as Bulgarian soil. Here he preached the Gospel story and his faithful witnesses and disciples carried it further on. A few centuries later two other men, Cyril and Methodius, closely associated with the Balkans, began their journey northward and westward spreading the Gospel light.

The above shows that the Balkans, often spoken of as the volcano of Europe, have not always caused anxiety to the nations in the West; more often they have been a blessing to them than a curse.

When medieval Europe sank into spiritual darkness and many unworthy things were done in the name of Christ, something began to happen in the Balkans which eventually brought blessing and light to the entire continent. Thousands of Asiatic Christian colonists were transplanted into the valleys north and south of the Balkan Mountains. In addition, eager preachers from Asia Minor made their way to the newly-established Bulgarian kingdom, burning with zeal to bring their message to the heathen population in that region. Many of those humble preachers, who professed to hold apostolic Christianity, did not realize the greatness of their mission. They did a great work but their names will never appear among the

names of the great on the pages of ecclesiastical history.

Here, in the homeland of democratic, freedom-loving Slavs, were brought ideas of Christian purity and simplicity. Here they met the reaction of the ruling, but at the same time decaying system of Orthodoxy, which was oppressing those very people to whom it should have given life and light. The result was a refining process of suffering, sorrow, and pain. But from this melting pot, which was called Bulgaria, came forth a new system under a new name, Bogomilism,<sup>1</sup> and on its spiritual banner were inscribed the words: Personal communion with God, freedom of conscience and conviction, freedom from evil, purity of life, deliverance from the oppressor on earth, and a glorious life with God beyond the grave.

The banner of Bogomilism became that of the oppressed thousands in Bulgaria and under it they wanted to live and die. But this banner was destined to cross the borders of the kingdom and journey eastward and westward, northward and southward, even to the regions where Philippi once received the message of Life and Light.

. . . . .

1. Cf. Jones, *The Church's Debt to Heretics*, p. 177

## C. Reasons for the Spread of Bogomilism

### 1. Persecutions in Bulgaria

Darkness does not welcome light. When the Light of the World appeared, the people who professed to represent the kingdom of light preferred darkness to light and the result was Calvary.

When the message of Bogomilism began to enlighten the hearts of men, those who pretended to represent the Sun of Righteousness, but in theory only, proved by their deeds that they hated bitterly light in any shape and form, for their deeds were evil. The result was torture and death for the Bogomils.

The very persecution of the bearers of light and hope in Bulgaria proved to be a blessing in disguise; thousands of those of whom Byzantium was not worthy carried the banner of Bogomilism to the neighboring countries and further west, where millions sitting in medieval darkness were longing for the appearance of light.

### 2. Favorable Conditions in Other Lands

The Bulgarian Slavs were not the only people suffering the agony of ecclesiastical and secular oppression. The Slavs in neighboring Serbia, Bosnia, and Dalmatia, and even the multitudes in Lombardy and southern France were in a similar hapless state. They also suffered under the hand of feudal, ecclesiastical, and

secular lords. They also were perplexed by the godless life of those who pretended to represent the Son of God on earth. When the sparks of hope which Bogomilism scattered on its march reached the regions where many thousands of hearts were waiting ready for its message, it took them but a short time to kindle a fire of Puritan protest which swept everything in its way.

Liberty-loving Lombardy, as well as democratic-minded southern France, became lands of flaming torches, which could not be extinguished for a long time, neither by threats, nor by stigmatizing, nor by persecution, nor even by death. When the flood of the Inquisition covered those lands, the torch bearers disappeared, but before the light could die down completely stronger hands, those of the reformers, picked the torches up and did not permit the night of medievalism to return again.

### 3. Commercial Intercourse between Nations

Wherever the Bogomilian influence could not be carried by the usual channels, the preaching of the perfects, the Bogomilian merchant took it. Nations were constantly in commercial intercourse one with another at the time Bogomilism appeared. But the caravans and merchant vessels did not only carry loads of goods from one port to another or from a town to another; they carried also merchants, many of them full of new ideas, borrowed



from here and there. Among these men there were not a few who carried a purse in one hand and the Bogomilian banner in the other.<sup>1</sup> They went as far as the leading Italian commercial centers,<sup>2</sup> and even visited the French Riviera. Of course, their visits were not in vain.

#### 4. The Crusades and their Contribution

While the chief purpose of most of the crusades was to recapture or to hold the Holy Land, unintentionally they served as vehicles for the exchange of ideas. Some of the crusading throngs happened to pass the very headquarters of Bogomilism, and we may rest assured that on their return home they did not carry only relics from the East, but also worthwhile ideas passed on to them by the eager preachers of the "Bulgarian heresy." We are told of a number of cases when the crusaders came face to face with the Bogomils and no doubt had an opportunity to get acquainted with their teaching.<sup>3</sup>

#### D. Spheres of Diffusion

##### 1. Constantinople and Asia Minor

During the reign of the Bulgarian king Peter, Bogomil preachers occasionally had an opportunity to visit

. . . . .

1. Cf. Ellen Scott Davison: Forerunners of Saint Francis, p. 202
2. Cf. Sharenkoff, A Study of Manichaeism in Bulgaria, p.

the Byzantine capital. After Bulgaria became once more a part of the Byzantine empire, during what is termed the "Byzantine bondage" and there were no more guarded boundaries between the Bulgarians and the Greeks, things changed. In a short time Constantinople became the center of a branch of the original Bulgarian movement,<sup>1</sup> which produced the first martyr of renown, Basilus the physician, who was the leader of the sect in that great metropolis.<sup>2</sup> Through guile he was induced to visit the royal palace, and there, supposedly of his own free will, he disclosed to the inquiring emperor the details of his "heretical" teaching.<sup>3</sup> This story is told us by those who are bitter enemies of the sect; therefore, it must be regarded with considerable reserve.

The execution of Basilus did not stop the growth of the sect.<sup>4</sup> Although some recanted, there were many more who joined the<sup>de</sup>serted ranks.

We are told that the movement spread from Constantinople to Asia Minor, to a certain section of which

. . . . .

41; Klincharoff, *Pop Bogomil i Negovoto Vreme*, pp. 148-150

3. Cf. Klincharoff, *op. cit.*, p. 151

1. Cf. Ivanoff, *Bogomilski Knigi i Legendi*, p. 37

2. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 38

3. Cf. Neander, *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, Vol. IV, p. 559

4. Cf. Ivanoff, *loc. cit.*; Weber, "Bogomili," *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. II, p. 612

many Bulgarians were transplanted, and that at one time two Cappadocian bishops were deposed for their alleged Bogomilism.<sup>1</sup>

## 2. Macedonia

Due to its close proximity to Bulgaria proper and because of its Slavonic population, Macedonia presented a fine field for the Bogomil missionaries. In this section of the peninsula was eventually established a branch of the Bogomils named the Ordo Druguriae, which played a very important part in the spread of Bogomilism. We have mentioned already<sup>2</sup> that the headquarters of this Bogomil church was located in the town of Melnik. However, there are some who believe that these headquarters were in Thessalonica.

The Macedonian Bogomils together with those in the district of present-day Sofia, assisted the anti-Byzantine Bulgarian rulers of the western Bulgarian kingdom very much.<sup>3</sup>

## 3. Serbia and Bosnia

The two countries of Serbia and Bosnia were ripe for the seed of Bogomilism because of conditions in them

. . . . .

1. Cf. Ivanoff, op. cit., pp. 37-38; Powicke, "Bogomils," Hastings Encyclopaedia etc., Vol. II, p. 785
2. Cf. ante, pp. 106-7
3. Cf. Ivanoff, op. cit., pp. 34-35; Klincharoff, op. cit., pp. 124-5

which were very similar to those in Bulgaria. Here Bogomil's followers were known under the names: Bogomili, Babouni, and Koudougeri. Stefan Nemanya, king of Serbia (twelfth century), and Stefan Dachanski (fourteenth century) fought bitterly against them, destroying large numbers. Nevertheless they continued to exist in certain sections of the country until the fifteenth century when that whole area was subjugated by the Turks.<sup>1</sup>

In Bosnia the Bogomilian system at one time became the state religion. Here they called themselves "Christians," but their enemies called them "Patarenes."<sup>2</sup>

#### 4. Dalmatia and Italy

When in 1040 A.D. the revolt of Peter Delian in Macedonia was suppressed, part of the population there emigrated to Italy.<sup>3</sup> Formerly some Bogomil preachers had visited Dalmatia<sup>4</sup> and Italy; so the ground was prepared for the new immigrants, who settled in Verona, Turin, and other cities.<sup>5</sup>

#### 5. Southern France

Some of the Bogomil leaders managed to cross into southern France, and the chroniclers of the eleventh

. . . . .

1. Cf. Ivanoff, op. cit., p. 40; "Bogomils," Encyclopaedia Britannica, Vol. III, p. 780
2. Cf. Ivanoff, loc. cit.; Sharenkoff, loc. cit.
3. Cf. Ivanoff, op. cit., p. 41
4. Cf. Klincharoff, op. cit., p. 148
5. Cf. ibid.; Ivanoff, loc. cit.

century point to the fact that at that time "dangerous heretics" were to be found in Toulouse, Orleans, and elsewhere.

The heretics were called variously Cathars, Manicheans, Albigenses, but the most hateful appellations were Bulgarians (Bogri, Bugres, Bolgari, Bulgari) and Paulicians (Popellicani, Publicani, Populicani, Piphli).<sup>1</sup>

The extreme dualistic teaching of the Ecclesia Drugometiae found fertile soil, especially in Provence (southern France), while the Ecclesia Bulgariae, the moderate dualistic church of the Bogomils, flourished in northern Italian localities.<sup>2</sup>

#### 6. Germany and Moravia

Some claim that the Bogomil teaching, by means of the channel of western Catharism, penetrated into Germany<sup>3</sup> as far as Köln, but the information we possess is not sufficiently clear, so we cannot come to a positive conclusion on this point. It is possible that the German heretics have no organic connection with the Bogomils.

Moravia, another Slavic country, and nearby

. . . . .

1. Cf. Ivanoff, loc. cit. (Note especially the footnote regarding the name "Bulgarian" used in western Europe); Klincharoff, op. cit., p. 150
2. Cf. Ivanoff, op. cit., p. 42; Klincharoff, op. cit., p. 149; Racki, Bogomili i Patareni, p. 373
3. Cf. Sharenkoff, loc. cit.; Klincharoff, op. cit., pp. 148-152

Bohemia were also reached by some Bogomil merchants. We quote a passage from Mishew in which he gives Sismonde's opinion on this point:

"The Bulgarian merchants, together with their goods carried up the Danube River, had brought into Bohemia the first seed of the Reformation. The Bogomil teaching found a fertile soil here and the way for the work of John Huss and Jerome of Prague was paved."<sup>1</sup>

#### 7. Russia

Russia was in constant religious and literary contact with Bulgaria and it is natural to expect that at an early date Bogomilian ideas would penetrate this great country. The Russian Goloubinski considers the "protesting" but godly monk Andrian (1004) a follower of Bogomil. There are other names in Russia associated with Bogomilism.<sup>2</sup>

The Bogomilian literature was very much read and copied by the Russians.<sup>3</sup>

#### E. Successors of the Bogomils

No serious writer has attempted to portray the western Cathari and Albigenses as movements entirely independent from Bogomilism. Some have considered the

. . . . .

1. Mishew, *The Bulgarians in the Past*, pp. 84-85
2. Cf. Ivanoff, *op. cit.*, pp. 39-40; "Bogomils," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, *loc. cit.*
3. Cf. Ivanoff, *op. cit.*, p. 40

Paulicians to have been the spiritual ancestors of the Cathari, but it must be remembered that only isolated cases of purely Paulician missionaries are reported in the West, while their general influence upon western Europe was not direct but exercised by way of the Bogomil movement which adopted, as already mentioned several times, many if not all of the Paulician doctrines. So when we speak of Paulicians and their contribution to the West, we must really speak of the Slavonic Bogomils, who carried the Paulician doctrines to the West after first having mixed them with other elements.

#### 1. The Cathari

The name Cathari, which means pure, embraces all of the heretical Puritan movements in the West and suggests their Eastern origin. Some authorities are of the opinion that these sects arose upon the ruins of Manicheism, traces of which were found in southern France during the Middle Ages. While it may be true that Manichean elements could have survived in the West that long, it is very doubtful that they could come to life in such a way as to inspire new movements. This inspiration was received from another source, the Bogomilian protest.

Today, more and more the authorities are coming to see the truth that the logical ancestors of all the Cathari are the Bogomils;<sup>1</sup> the western Cathari themselves

acknowledge their origin from the Bulgarian Bogomils.<sup>2</sup>

## 2. The Albigenses

The Albigenses should not be considered separately from the Cathari family, but since most historians treat them as a separate sect, we shall do the same for convenience.

The ancestors of this sect were perhaps Bogomils of the Drugurian order, who held the extreme dualistic view.<sup>3</sup> Some authorities are not ready to acknowledge this, but admit that the Bogomils have had great influence in the development of the Albigensian doctrines.

Some of the Albigenses readily accepted the Bogomilian social views alongside their religious doctrines. As a result of this they ceased to pay taxes to the large land owners.<sup>4</sup>

## 3. Bulgaria the Seat of Authority

Another thing which establishes the thesis that

. . . . .

1. Cf. Sharenkoff, op. cit., pp. 40-41; Neander, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 566; Davison, loc. cit.; Ch. Schmidt, Histoire et doctrine de la secte des Cathares ou Albigois, Vol. I, pp. 1-15; Conybeare, The Key of Truth, p. cxlviii
2. Cf. Ivanoff, op. cit., p. 42
3. Cf. ibid.; Conybeare, op. cit., pp. cxlvii-cxlviii; F. J. Foakes-Jackson: An Introduction to the History of Christianity, p. 186; Adeney, The Greek and Eastern Churches, p. 228; Jones, op. cit., pp. 182-3; "Albigenses," Encyclopaedia Britannica, Vol. I, p. 528
4. Cf. Ivanoff, loc. cit.



the Bogomils were the spiritual ancestors of the western Cathari is the fact that the latter considered the former the authorities in their religion. The "heretical pope," so called by the Catholics, who was the supreme advisor of all dualistic sects, lived in Bulgaria and his substitute or helper dwelt in southern France. All controversial questions were brought for solution to the "pope" in Bulgaria.<sup>1</sup> In order to see more clearly the place of authority which the Bogomils occupied in the West, we quote the following:

"In the second half of the twelfth century there came from Constantinople to Lombardy a certain bishop, 'Pope' Nicetas, who had been ordained by the Drugurian bishop. When he found that the heretics of Lombardy recognized the Ecclesia Bulgariae, Nicetas succeeded in converting them to the Ecclesia Druguriae. In 1167 he gathered a convention of the heretics of southern France and northern Italy, all of whom were under the Bulgarian order, and he also converted them to the Drugurian order. But the Ecclesia Bulgariae did not remain indifferent to the acts of Nicetas. They sent to Italy a certain Petracus who put a check to the Drugurian advance. The majority of the heretics of Lombardy were won back to the Bulgarian order."<sup>2</sup>

. . . . .

1. Cf. Ivanoff, loc. cit.; Neander, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 590; J. B. Mullinger: "Albigenses," Hastings Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, Vol. I, p. 286
2. Sharenkoff, op. cit., p. 40; cf. Henry Charles Lea: A History of the Inquisition, Vol. I, p. 107; Racki, op. cit., pp. 374-5; Mullinger, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 281

### F. Summary and Conclusion

In our brief discussion of Bogomilism as an international movement, we have emphasized the fact that by virtue of its geographical position Bulgaria represents a bridge over which, not only armies and migrating multitudes passed, but also ideas were exchanged. Because of this strategic position, in the realm of religion Bulgaria has acted as a sort of melting pot or rather as a filter. In other words, religious ideas emanating from the East before they could reach the West were here refined or filtered. In this way Bulgaria, a crossroad of nations, has contributed very much to western Europe. Perhaps the most valuable contribution made by Bulgaria is the system of the priest Bogomil and the Puritan protest it produced, which was nothing else than a manifestation of the principle of Puritanism in action.

As reasons for the diffusion of Bogomilism we have mentioned the persecution of the Bulgarian and Macedonian Bogomils, conditions in other lands which produced favorable soil for the spread of Bogomilism, commercial intercourse between Bulgaria and the West, and the crusades which brought Westerners into contact with the Bogomils.

We have seen that because of favorable conditions Bogomilism spread into Byzantium, Macedonia, Serbia,

and Bosnia, and in the course of time to Dalmatia, Italy, France and even Germany, Moravia, and Russia.

We placed special emphasis on the fact that the western Cathari, including the Albigenses, were offshoots of the Bogomils; a fact which is established by the place of authority Bogomilism enjoyed in the West, and by the existence of a supreme leader of these movements, not in any Western city, but somewhere in Bulgaria.

We conclude by saying that Bogomilism of the East and Catharism of the West stand and fall together. They cannot be separated by virtue of the organic relation between them, manifested in their fellowship, doctrines, and Puritan protest.

PART THREE

THE LIFE AND TEACHINGS

OF

THE BOGOMILS

CHAPTER VI  
THE LIFE AND TEACHINGS  
OF  
THE BOGOMILS  
AS RELATED  
TO THE PRINCIPLE OF PURITANISM

CHAPTER VI  
THE LIFE AND TEACHINGS  
OF  
THE BOGOMILS  
AS RELATED TO  
THE PRINCIPLE OF PURITANISM

A. Introduction

Even most of the enemies of the Bogomils, such as presbyter Kozma, are ready to admit that the life at least of the perfect Bogomils who in reality were the true members of their church, was beyond reproach.<sup>1</sup> The stories regarding wild orgies and other alleged crimes must be either entirely rejected or regarded with extreme reserve, as they are products of minds highly prejudiced against the Bogomils.<sup>2</sup> There are always exceptions to a general rule and therefore it is quite possible that occasionally there were unsavory examples among the Bogomils, but it is dangerous to generalize upon the basis of exceptions to a rule.

. . . . .

1. Cf. Sharenkoff, A Study of Manichaeism in Bulgaria, p. 49
2. Note: The writer personally observed a similar situation in a Greek Orthodox country several years ago. A Protestant church of the extreme evangelical Puritan type, whose members lived exemplary lives known to all

It must be kept in mind that in medieval times it was an ordinary thing for the clergy when rightfully accused of iniquity to turn around and stigmatize their accusers as heretics and even accuse them of all kinds of crimes.

In regard to the teaching of the Bogomils, there is much speculation. On the one hand we have men like Blagoeff<sup>1</sup> who do not believe that the Bogomils were actually heretical, but that their enemies for political and other reasons branded them as heretics. On the other hand, Sharenkoff<sup>2</sup> and others go<sup>to</sup> the opposite extreme and imply that the Bogomils were offshoots of the Manicheans. As already stated, it seems to be nearer the truth to stay in the middle of the road and accept Conybeare's view of the Paulician origin of the Bogomils.<sup>3</sup>

It must not be forgotten that "a heresy of one generation sometimes because the Orthodoxy of the next,"<sup>4</sup> for indeed "heresy" is a relative term. Nagler says, "When doctrine is in the process of becoming orthodox,

. . . . .

citizens of the community, were accused of holding wild orgies and indulging in the worst kind of vices. The accusations came from the Greek Orthodox priests who hated the Protestants and envied them because of their success.

1. Cf. Blagoeff, Bessedata na presviter Kozma protiv Bogomilite, p. 79
2. Cf. Sharenkoff, op. cit., p. 60
3. Cf. Conybeare, The Key of Truth, p. cxxxvii
4. Arthur Wilfred Nagler: The Church in History, p. 367

contrary views, which are held at the time, later come under the category of heresy."<sup>1</sup>

When we consider the various doctrines of the Bogomils, great caution must be exercised because the information regarding this matter is supplied chiefly by the enemies of Bogomilism. After a careful study of the subject the writer is ready to accept with some reservation the teachings of the Paulicians, as a basis for the teachings of the Bogomils. These doctrines are summarized by Conybeare in the Key<sup>2</sup> and for the convenience of our readers extracts of the same were reproduced in Chapter Three of this study.<sup>3</sup>

Sharenkoff gives the teaching of the Bogomils on the basis of his Manichean hypothesis and closely following presbyter Kozma's writing. We shall make extracts from Sharenkoff's presentation, only for the sake of convenience, and because of our desire to present before our readers in a brief form the popular view regarding the Bogomil doctrines.<sup>4</sup> However, let us keep in mind that what Kozma and other Greek writers tell us is not to be fully trusted; we must regard their information with

. . . . .

1. Nagler, op. cit., p. 368
2. Cf. Conybeare, op. cit., pp. xxxii-xl
3. Cf. ante, pp. 68-73
4. Cf. Powicke, "Bogomils," Hastings' Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, Vol. II, p. 785 (In this article the Bogomil doctrines are outlined on the basis of what Euthymius Zygabenus reports in Patrologia Graeca, Vol. CXXX.)



great reserve.

Blagoeff, who has carefully analyzed two of the source materials on which most modern authors base their works; namely, Kozma's Sermon<sup>1</sup> and the Biography of St. Hilarion<sup>2</sup> written by the last Bulgarian patriarch, Euthymius (1375-1393), comes to the conclusion that they are not original, at least in parts.<sup>3</sup>

For example, Kozma uses as the foundation for the first part of his Sermon much of the material of what Petrus Seculus wrote to the Bulgarian archbishop in 868 A.D., after his visit to Armenia where he got in touch with the Paulicians and learned from them that they intended to send missionaries to the "newly-converted" Bulgarian kingdom.<sup>4</sup>

The second part of his epistle in which Kozma describes conditions in Bulgaria is trustworthy because it is original.

What we said about Kozma may be said also about the Bulgarian patriarch Euthymius who wrote the Biography. He draws very much upon the work of Euthymius Zygabenus, the Panoplia dogmatica. This is clearly seen in Blagoeff's parallel column analysis.<sup>5</sup>

. . . . .

1. Cf. Sharenkoff, op. cit., pp. 66-78; Appendix B
2. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 79-80; Appendix C
3. Cf. Blagoeff, op. cit., pp. 14-25; Conybeare, op. cit., p. cxxxviii
4. Cf. Blagoeff, op. cit., pp. 14-15
5. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 23-25

There is another problem in connection with the study of the Bogomilian doctrines. There were men, like the venerated monk, Constantine Chrysomalos, who during the reign of Manuel Comnenus spread Puritan ideas orally and through writings. In 1140 the emperor pronounced a sentence of condemnation upon him and his followers upon the basis that they were considered Bogomils. His books were also destroyed. A careful examination of what this man thought proves beyond any doubt that he was thoroughly evangelical and Puritan. He attacked the prevailing worldliness of the dominant church. In his teaching he closely followed Paul, the apostle. He opposed infant baptism and taught that to become a Christian one must undergo an inward change.<sup>1</sup>

A little later we read of another pious and truly holy monk by the name of Niphon. He also stood at the head of a movement motivated by the principle of Puritanism—another reaction against the proceedings of the corrupt church. He and his followers were seeking to restore primitive Christianity and endeavored to oppose superstition. The result was that they were branded as Bogomils.

There are other men of this type, including the

. . . . .

1. Cf. Neander, General History of the Christian Religion and Church, Vol. IV, pp. 560-1; Powicke, loc. cit.

godly patriarch Cosmas of Constantinople who was a friend and protector of Niphon, and who on account of this was deposed as a Bogomil. The two Cappadocian bishops of whom we made mention earlier were friends of Niphon and were deposed for the same reason.<sup>1</sup>

Were these men stigmatized as Bogomils for political reasons or were they real Bogomils? If the latter is true, then the teaching of these men were more orthodox than that of the Greek Orthodox church.

#### B. Their Manner of Life and Worship

##### 1. Their Puritanism.

The Bogomil perfects shunned worldly amusements. They practised strict morality and even asceticism. No one, even their enemies, could point a finger at them.<sup>2</sup>

The believers were as a rule followers of the perfects in their way of living and were engaged in a constant battle with evil. Bad habits, such as drunkenness, were foreign to them.

##### 2. Their Rules of Life

The perfects did not do manual work as they were engaged in preaching and teaching. They were sup-

. . . . .

1. Cf. Neander, op. cit., Vol. IV, pp. 563-4; Weber: "Bogomili," Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. II, p. 612
2. Cf. Sharenkoff, op. cit., p. 49; Powicke, loc. cit.; Mishew, The Bulgarians in the Past, p. 88

ported by the believers who did engage in ordinary secular work.

The menu of the perfects was very meager and they seem to have avoided animal food, thus being for the most part vegetarians.

The clothing of the perfects was dark in color, and their faces were pale because of much fasting. Their very appearance commanded the respect of the people.<sup>1</sup>

### 3. Their Standards

The Bogomils held truth very high in their everyday life. They preached equality among men. They placed a high value on human personality and life. This latter is evidenced by their bitter opposition to slavery. Women were considered to be on the same level as men.

### 4. Their Zeal and Endurance

The Bogomils were almost fanatical in the propagation of their teaching. Jackson says, "This Slavic sect had many of the characteristics which make people of that race such formidable fanatics."<sup>2</sup>

### 5. Their Form of Worship

The worship of the Bogomils appears to have been very simple. They gathered in simple, undecorated dwell-

. . . . .

1. Mishew, loc. cit.

2. Foakes-Jackson, AN Introduction to the History of Christianity, p. 186

ings. They listened to the reading and expounding of the Word by their leaders. They had practically no ceremonies or rites except the process of receiving the baptism with the Holy Spirit.<sup>1</sup> This one must experience before he can join the ranks of the perfect. Generally speaking, their gatherings must have resembled very much the services of some present-day extreme evangelical or Puritan churches.

#### 6. Their Private Devotional Life

The Bogomils prayed four times a day and four times at night.<sup>2</sup> They indulged in private reading of the Gospel of John and in commenting upon what they read. This is one of the reasons why so many of their ordinary believers were so well versed in the Scriptures.

### C. Their Teachings

We give in substance below the Bogomilian doctrines as outlined by Sharenkoff on the basis of Kozma's Sermon and other Greek sources.

#### 1. About God

The Bulgarian Bogomils of the moderate dualistic type believed in God as the Supreme Being and Creator. According to enemy sources, some of the Bogomils (the

. . . . .

1. Cf. Racki, *Bogomili i Patareni*, pp. 537-8

2. Cf. Sharenkoff, *A Study of Manichaeism in Bulgaria*, p. 48; Racki, *op. cit.*, p. 551

extreme dualists) held a view similar to that of the Manicheans; namely, they believed in the existence of a good and an evil god.

## 2. About Christ

Christ is the younger son of God who is sent to earth to destroy the works of Satan, his elder brother.

According to some sources, Christ only seemingly appeared in the body; in other words, a Docetic view is attributed to the sect. Conybeare is of the opinion that the Bogomils held Adoptionist views regarding Christ.<sup>1</sup>

## 3. About the Holy Spirit.

The Holy Spirit is considered to be a member of the Holy Trinity. He played an important part in the lives of the Bogomils, especially in the experience which they considered the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

## 4. About the Trinity

According to Kozma, the Bogomils must have held the view that there are two trinities: one, composed of God and his two sons, Christ and Satan; and the other composed of God, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. "God was triune only thirty-three years, from 5500 to 5533, because prior to the 5500 neither the Son nor the Holy Ghost had

. . . . .

1. Cf. Conybeare, op. cit., p. ix; Racki, op. cit., p. 507

existed on the earth."<sup>1</sup>

#### 5. About the Church

The Bogomils considered the official church to be false and their own system the true church of Christ. They were opposed to church temples also.

#### 6. About the Scriptures

The Bogomils held the Gospel of John in high esteem and read it in their meeting places and in their homes. They also cherished Paul's writings of which they had their own interpretation. The Old Testament with the exception of some books was rejected by them, and even some New Testament books were rejected according to the opinion of their enemies.<sup>2</sup>

#### 7. About Creation

We find Sharenkoff's summary on the theogony and cosmogony of the Bogomils, based on the Greek sources and Kozma's sermon, a fitting one. We reproduce it below for the benefit of our readers. This does not indicate that we agree with Sharenkoff's presentation.

"God the Father created the invisible world and the angels. The chief of these, Satanael, had the position of honor as the elder son. Satanael became jealous and, taking some angels with him, he revolted against his father, whereupon God drove him out of

. . . . .

1. Sharenkoff, op. cit., p. 46
2. Cf. ibid.; Racki, op. cit., p. 505

heaven. Since he was not deprived of his creative power, Satanael brought into existence all things that are visible and created the first man Adam. He formed Adam out of mud but could not breathe a soul into the body. When he had created the body and caused it to stand upright, a little stream of water flowed out from the big toe of the right foot of Adam and a snake appeared. When he tried to breathe a soul into Adam, the breath went out through the same toe, and entered the snake. Satanael then prayed to God who helped him on condition that they both should rule over man. God breathed a soul into Adam and endowed him with the qualities of Light. Eve was created in the same way. When Adam and Even began to live their lives, they declared that they were not dependent upon Satanael. The Devil thereupon regretted that he had made the agreement with God that they should rule together over human beings, and being afraid that he might lose his prerogatives, he seduced Even, who bore him two children, a son, Cain, and a daughter, Colomena. Under the influence of Satanael Adam committed the same sin with Eve and she gave birth to Abel who was purer and better than Cain. God punished Satanael by depriving him of his creative power and celestial qualities, but he allowed him to rule over the material world because he hoped that the souls which had been led astray would themselves revolt against evil. For this reason Satanael became gloomy and began to plot against God. He caused Abel to be murdered by the wicked Cain, and thus crime began on earth. The fallen angels, likewise, married the daughters of men and gave birth to giants, who rose against Satanael. In his anger Satanael created the flood in order to destroy the giants; he confounded the languages and caused the dispersion of men over the earth; he likewise destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, and appeared to Moses at Sinai, thus giving through him to men a bad law. He also sent the prophets to lead mankind astray. God the Father, on seeing all this, resolved to redeem the world from his own evil son. For this reason fifty-five hundred years after the creation of the world, he plucked from his heart the Word-Jesus his own son called the Christ, and sent him to redeem mankind. The Word-Jesus entered the right ear of the Holy Virgin and going out through the left ear, assumed a visible human form. Jesus was seemingly persecuted, tortured, tried, condemned, and crucified by the Jews; and seemingly, likewise, he died and rose from the dead. Through his resurrection he crushed the



power of Satanael, chained him, and caused the last syllable el of his name to be dropped, so that Satanael became thus merely Satana. Satana, after having been shackled and degraded, was shut up in Hades. When he had accomplished all this, Jesus returned to heaven, and casting off his human form in the air he was united again with God. Jesus indeed had overcome Satana, but because of the compassion of God the Father, the demons were not exterminated from the earth and that is why they are a special object of dread to the Bogomils."<sup>1</sup>

8. About the Virgin Mary

"The Holy Virgin was not an earthly woman. Some of the Bogomils called her the Heavenly Jerusalem and did not recognize her as the mother of Jesus."<sup>2</sup>

9. About Prophets and Saints

"They argued that no one should recognize Moses . . . entirely rejected the prophets, who had led mankind astray, and they rejected likewise the saints, because they paid reverence to the cross and the icons and believed in the Old Testament and the miracles of Christ."<sup>3</sup>

10. About the Orthodox Ceremonies

The Bogomils were opposed to all outward ceremonies of the church. They had a figurative interpretation of the Lord's supper and rejected the Greek Orthodox water baptism. It is not clear whether they rejected water baptism in general or only the baptism of infants.<sup>4</sup>

11. About Relics and Icons

The Bogomils did not reverence the cross be-

. . . . .

1. Sharenkoff, op. cit., pp. 44-45
2. Sharenkoff, op. cit., p. 46
3. Ibid.
4. Cf. ibid., p. 47

cause it was made by Satan for the crucifixion of Christ.<sup>1</sup>  
Icons and images,<sup>2</sup> well as relics, were considered idols.<sup>2</sup>

## 12. About the Priesthood

According to Racki the Bogomils held that every human being can be admitted to the priesthood, without any special ceremonies, provided he is morally qualified for such a post.<sup>3</sup>

## D. Summary and Conclusion

Regardless of the fact that the Bogomils have been occasionally blackened and stigmatized by their enemies, one fact remains, that with rare exceptions the so-called heretics maintained a very high standard of morality, especially the perfects. This phenomenon cannot be explained apart from the principle of Puritanism which must have motivated the actions of these people and thus caused them to be "a living protest" against the decaying church.

As far as the Bogomil doctrines are concerned, we saw that there is great uncertainty, and until more definite data are obtained regarding this matter we must accept with great reservations what the enemies of Bogo-

. . . . .

1. Cf. Sharenkoff, loc. cit.; Racki, op. cit., p. 526
2. Cf. Sharenkoff, loc. cit.
3. Cf. Racki, op. cit., p. 598; Mishew, op. cit., p. 86

milism say about their beliefs. We must always keep in mind that the most important sources of Greek or Bulgarian origin are not fully authentic because they are not original, but represent free borrowings from older sources.

Perhaps the safest course to pursue as to the doctrines of the Bogomils is to study them in the light of what Conybeare writes in The Key of Truth about the doctrines of the Paulicians.

**CHAPTER VII**

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

## CHAPTER VII

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

#### A. Summary of the Bogomilian Protest

As we look back on our research, several outstanding facts appear in connection with the rise, development, and spread of Bogomilism.

First, there would have been no Bogomil movement had there been no conditions favorable to its appearance. We saw that the Byzantine government and the Greek Orthodox church had produced circumstances which enslaved the democratic, freedom-loving Slavs both spiritually and physically.

Second, we noticed that the colonization by Puritan Paulicians and other so-called heretics on the fertile soil of the tormented and dissatisfied population of the Balkans brought a strong reaction in a comparatively short time.

Third, the reaction produced a mighty leader, named Bogomil, who voiced the protest of the whole suffering nation and thus became its mouthpiece. Bogomil's protest against the evils existing in the oppressing church and government, coupled with his deep longing for political and religious freedom, his great passion for

experiencing spiritual reality as well as his desire for purity of life, was nothing less than another manifestation of the principle of Puritanism in one of its periodic recurrences.<sup>1</sup> This manifestation affected the whole Bulgarian nation because in Bogomilism

" . . . was expressed the national protest, not only against the Church and State, which in their structure were foreign to the national conceptions, but also in general against the moral decline and the indiscriminate imitation of everything which was not Bulgarian, and which brought the foreign and injurious for the State Byzantine influence."<sup>2</sup>

Fourth, the Bogomilian protest had two aspects: a socio-political and a religious one. On the one hand the reformer expressed the longing of the masses for freedom and democracy, and on the other he violently protested against the church because of its decay and unwillingness to lead the souls of men into a life of purity and personal communion with God.<sup>3</sup>

Speaking of the cultural and religious value of Bogomilism, Lavrin says:

"There are two factors, at any rate, to its credit. One of them is the Bogomil hatred of all injustice; and the other an equally strong emphasis on spirituality, on the true inward religious endeavor and experience. In their violent protest against the official church, the Bogomils, as it were, anticipated the subsequent Reformation."<sup>4</sup>

. . . . .

1. Cf. Warren, *The Principle of Puritanism and the Significance of Its Recurring Manifestation*, pp. 3, 110-1
2. Zlatarski, *Istoria na Bulgarskata Durzhava prez Srednite Vekove*, Vol. I, Part II, p. 566
3. Cf. Warren, *op. cit.*, p. 65
4. Lavrin, *The Bogomils and Bogomilism*, p. 282

Fifth, while originally Bogomilism was a national protest, eventually it developed into an international one. Prevailing conditions in state and church everywhere were demanding a universal reaction. This came with the appearance of the various Catharist movements in the West.

Warren's use of the definition of Protestantism by Dean Inge is very fitting to Puritanism in general, and to Bogomilism in particular, since it was a manifestation of the principle of Puritanism. We take the liberty of quoting this definition as changed by Warren; it will be an appropriate closing paragraph of this summary:

"Puritanism 'is the revolt of genuine religion against secularization. Almost always we find it advocating ethical purity against ceremonial rules, and individual freedom against ecclesiastical discipline. We find it claiming the right of immediate access to God without the intervention of a professional priesthood. We find it insisting on inward conviction in the place of unquestioning conviction, docile acceptance and surrender of private judgment."<sup>1</sup>

#### B. The Contribution of Bogomilism

A movement of such a large scope and far-reaching effects as was Bogomilism, certainly made a number of valuable contributions to humanity.

. . . . .

1. Warren, op. cit., p. 113

### 1. In the Field of Literature

In their day the Bogomils enriched immensely the meager store of medieval literature, especially in the Balkans. Many apocryphal and other writings were composed by them, and although most of these writings were destroyed many of the Bogomil legends continue to travel from mouth to mouth even today. Mishew says:

"During the Bogomilian epoch the growth of the romantic or apocryphal kind of literature received a great stimulus . . . The Orthodox read the Bogomil books with no less interest, which exerted such an influence upon them that there were periods when it was impossible to distinguish an Orthodox from a Bogomil."<sup>1</sup>

The Gospel literature was enriched by many copies of Gospel portions, which the Bogomils used and circulated.<sup>2</sup>

### 2. In the Field of Sociology

As early as the tenth century, four hundred years before any of the great Western social reformers had appeared, priest Bogomil advocated a true democracy, emancipation of the slaves and serfs, emancipation of women, and international brotherhood.

### 3. In the Field of Religion

Besides the moral reform which was at the heart

. . . . .

1. Mishew, *The Bulgarians in the Past*, pp. 91, 97
2. Cf. Racki, *Bogomili i Patareni*, p. 576; Lavrin, "The Bogomils and Bogomilism," *Slavonic Review*, Vol. III, p. 282



of Bogomil's protest and that urge for purity in the heart of man which his preaching produced, the priest Bogomil contributed two very precious things to the world: the idea of the priesthood of every believer, including women, which anticipated the fundamental principle of the great Reformation; and the circulation of the Scriptures in the vernacular, as well as their private study and free interpretation by each believer. This latter emphasis antedates our modern Bibliocentric program of religious education by many centuries.<sup>1</sup> Mishew remarks:

"A distinguished feature of the Bogomil and Catharist Christians was that even those among them who were illiterate or lacked a school education, were more familiar with the Gospels than their Orthodox and Catholic brothers."<sup>2</sup>

During recent months the oldest Bulgarian newspaper Zornitza (Morning Star) which is the organ of the Protestants in that country, published an article by a noted Orthodox writer and poet, Vl. Roussalief, in which the priest Bogomil was listed as one of the ten greatest Bulgarians. A colonel of the reserves, Malcheff, dissatisfied greatly because of the honor bestowed upon Bogomil, wrote a bitter article in the organ of the Greek Orthodox priests, Pastirsko Delo, assailing Roussalief and others associated with the Protestant paper. Although

. . . . .

1. Cf. Racki, op. cit., p. 598; Mishew, op. cit., p. 86; Lavrin, loc. cit.
2. Mishew, p. 90

over a thousand years have passed there are still people who allow themselves to be blinded by prejudice. In 1909, the Synod of the Orthodox church chided Professor Mladenoff, who at that time was lecturing in the Orthodox seminary, for teaching concerning Bogomilism what was written in the official textbooks on Bulgarian literature. The professor declared that he did not want to be an insincere teacher and to twist the truth. As an act of protest he left the seminary and became a professor in the state university.<sup>1</sup>

Mladenoff is one of many cultured Bulgarians who refused to be biased. As we have already mentioned,<sup>2</sup> due credit is given to priest Bogomil and his work by leading Bulgarians. The following extract from Zornitza<sup>3</sup> with which we conclude our study, shows clearly the attitude of these people in paying tribute to whom honor is due:

"We consider that in the tenth century there were three religious revolutionists: Kozma, Ivan Rilski, and Bogomil. Kozma saw the faults and said that the bolyars exploited the poor, oppressed and judged them unrighteously; that the bishops loved the houses of the rich more than the House of God; that the priests were illiterate, that they drank, that the poor could hardly breathe. Kozma saw all this, criticized it, but considered that slavery comes from God, and that inequality is pleasing to Christ.

. . . . .

1. Cf. Zornitza, March 13, 1940, p. 3
2. Cf. ante, pp. 8-9, etc.
3. Zornitza, loc. cit.

"Ivan Rilski saw the faults but ran away to save himself, without having been able to influence somewhat the betterment of life.

"However, Bogomil not only saw the faults of his time, but pointed out the measures and the medicine for their cure. First of all, Bogomil purified the Christian cult from heathen sediments from various magics and superstitions and in their stead he placed the rational, ethical, and spiritual faith in Christ. Bogomil removed the heavy impressions lying upon the thought, conscience, and word, during a time when throughout Europe spiritual darkness reigned. Bogomil removed the chains of slavery a thousand years ago; he annihilated the institution of slavery, which Europe did only in the nineteenth century.

"Bogomil placed woman on the same level with the man and gave her the right to become a priest, mayor, judge, etc., a reform which many nations have not been able to realize during their existence. He removed all those civil and church laws and regulations which degraded the person of woman. A thousand years ago Bogomil raised his voice in behalf of peace and brotherhood among the nations. He was the first temperance leader among the reformers.

"In view of the above, we shall make no mistake if we say that Bogomil proved to be the brightest and the most ideal which Bulgarian genius has been able to produce. Through Bogomilism we became the forerunners of humanism and the Reformation and can justly call ourselves teachers of the Europeans."

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

THE LETTER OF PATRIARCH THEOPHYLACT  
TO  
TSAR PETER OF BULGARIA

(Translated from the Greek)

The manuscript containing this letter is in the Ambrosian Library (Bibliotheca Ambrosiana) in the city of Milan, and has been edited by N. Petrovski in the Bulletin of the St. Petersburg Imperial Academy, Class Russian Language, Vol. XVIII (1913), Part III, pp. 356-372. Theophylact was the patriarch of Constantinople from 933 to 956 A.D. His letter to the Bulgarian tsar, Peter, is the oldest document which gives some details regarding the Bulgarian heresy. The more important passages in this letter, especially those recording the anathemas against heretics, are here translated from the Byzantine Greek.

After having asked Peter about the new heretical teaching which had made its appearance and having received from him information concerning it, the patriarch Theophylact then gave advice to tsar Peter as to what was to be done. He says:

"It has been written to you regarding the question of the newly appeared heresy and since we know in detail about this accursed teaching, we write to

you again more clearly and more plainly, stating the bare facts with simple letters (as to the method of procedure), as you have requested."1

The patriarch then goes on to state that the heretics must abjure their faith and receive holy baptism. Those who are unwilling to do so must be persecuted and cut off from the church. They were to be cursed with the following anathemas<sup>2</sup>:

"In the name of the Holy Consubstantial and Worshipped Trinity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, cursed be everyone who does not think and believe as does the Holy Divine Catholic Church, the churches of Rome, of Constantinople, of Alexandria, of Antioch, and of the Holy City—in a word, those from one end of the world to the other who do not accept the rules, decrees, and dogmas of the seven holy ecumenical councils.

(1) Cursed be everyone who believes and admits that there exist two principles (δύο ἀρχάς), both good and evil (ἀγαθὴν τε καὶ κακὴν), on the creator of light, the other of darkness; one the creator of man and the other of the angels and of the other creatures.

(2) Cursed be those who talk idly that the guileful devil (τὸν πονηρὸν διάβολον) is the creator and ruler of matter (ὑλης), of this whole visible world, and of our bodies.

(3) Cursed be those who slander the law of Moses and say that the prophets are not good.

(4) Cursed be those who reject lawful marriage, slander it, and say that the increase and continuation of our generation is the institution of the devil.

(5) Cursed be those who blaspheme and say that the member of the Holy Trinity, the Son and Word of the same substance with God the Father, was man without sin in imagination and appearance but not in fact.

(6) Cursed be those who fancy that the crucifixion, death, and resurrection of Christ were only apparent.

(7) Cursed be those who do not believe in the reality of the body and the blood of Christ, as it was said to the apostles and handed down to them by Him in the 'Take, eat,' but who tell fables about the Gospel and the Epistles.

(8) Cursed be those who say idly that the Mother

of God was not the Virgin Mary, the daughter of Joakim and Anna, but was the high Jerusalem<sup>3</sup> into which, they say, Christ entered and from which he had emerged.

(9) Cursed be those who invent the story that the eternal Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, after the indescribable birth of the Son and the Word of God had given birth to other children by sexual intercourse with a man.

(10) Cursed be the authors and teachers (ἀρχηγαὶ καὶ διδασκαλοὶ) of this ancient and newly appeared heresy."

Then, in paragraphs 11-14, there follow the names of various heretics well known through Manicheism, including Mani himself. Among them are the familiar Scythianus of Egypt, the father of the heresy who dared to call himself God the Father; also Terebinthius, called Buddha (Βούδης), Gurbicus (Κοῦρβίκος), who is Mānī (Μάνης) and who called himself the Paraclete.<sup>4</sup> Then follow the names of Paul and John, as sons of Calinica, and Constantine the Armenian. Especially to be noted among the list of false teachers is one denounced as "filthy Baanes" (ὁ φυκαρὸς Βαίνης), whose name, as Professor Jackson has recently pointed out in an article in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, October, 1924, preserves the titles of the great Ban, or divine architect, who forms the middle member of the godlike triad in the "Second Evocation" according to Mani's religion.

. . . . .

1. Petrovski, "Pismo," p. 362
2. Ibid., p. 364
3. Cf. Zhitie Illariona, and Appendix III
4. For these Manichean personages, see Acta Archelai, ch. 62-64 (ed. Beeson, pp. 90-93).

## APPENDIX B

### PRESEBYTER KOZMA: A SERMON AGAINST THE BOGOMILIAN HERESY<sup>1</sup>

(Translated from the Old Bulgarian.)

(p. 2)\* "It came to pass that in the reign of the orthodox tsar Peter of Bulgaria, there appeared a priest by the name of Bogomil, 'Beloved of God,' but in reality Bogunemil, 'Not beloved of God.' He was the first who began to preach in Bulgaria a heresy, of which I shall relate below.

As I commence to condemn the teachings and the deeds of the Bogomils, it seems to me that the air is polluted by their deeds and preachings. But for the sake of the pious I shall expose the deceitful teachings of these in order that no one after knowing them, shall fall into their snares, but keep afar from them, because, as God says, 'Each tree is known by its own fruit.'

(p. 3) The heretics in appearance are lamb-like, gentle, modest, and quiet, and their pallor is to show their hypocritical fastings. They do not talk idly, nor laugh loudly, nor do they manifest any curiosity. They keep themselves away from immodest sights, and outwardly they do everything so as not to be distinguished from the Orthodox Christians, but inwardly they are ravaging wolves. The people, on seeing their great humility, think that they are Orthodox, and

. . . . .

1. This sermon was composed by Kozma in the latter part of the tenth century. According to Popruzhenko, Kozma lived 977-1014 A.D. The manuscript is preserved in the Library of the Theological Academy of Moscow. Several editions of it have been published. The best is "Svetago Kozmi Presvitera Slovo na eretiki i pouchenie of bozhestvennikh knig" edited by M. G. Popruzhenko, in Pamiatniki drevnei pismennosti i iskustva 167, St. Petersburg, 1907, from which the present extract is translated. (\* The pages here refer to the edition of Popruzhenko.)



able to show them the path of salvation; they approach and ask them how to save their souls. Like a wolf that wants to seize a lamb, they pretend at first to sigh; they speak with humility, preach, and act as if they were themselves in heaven. Whenever they meet any ignorant and uneducated man, they preach to him the tares of their teachings, blaspheming the traditions and orders of the Holy Church.

- (p. 4) But what do the heretics say? "We pray to God more than you do; we watch and pray and do not live a lazy life as you do." Alas! This is similar to the words of that proud Pharisee who, when he prayed, said, "God, I thank thee that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican" (Luke 18:11).
- (p. 6) The demons are afraid of the cross of Christ, but the heretics cut it and make of it their tools. The demons are afraid of the image of the Lord God, painted on a board; the heretics do not reverence icons, but call them idols. The demons fear the relics of the saints and are not to approach the reliquary caskets in which lie the precious treasures that are given to the Christians to free them from misfortune; the heretics on seeing us revering these objects, mock them and laugh at us.
- (p. 8) About the cross of God, they say, "How can we bow to the cross? Is it not the tree on which the Jews crucified the Son of God? The cross is detestable to God." That is why they instruct their followers to hate the cross and not to reverence it, saying, "If some one murders the son of the king with a piece of wood, is it possible that this piece of wood should be dear to the king? This is the case with the cross."
- (p.13) Why do you heretics inveigh against the sacred orders that are given us by the holy apostles and holy fathers, the liturgy, and the rest of the services which are carried on by good Christians? You say that the apostles established neither the liturgy, nor the holy sacrament, but it was John Chrysostom who instituted them. Do you know that from the incarnation of Christ to John Chrysostom it was more than three hundred years? Were the churches of God without any liturgy or holy sacraments during that time? Did not the apostle Peter establish the liturgy which the Romans preserve till the present day? James, the brother of the Lord God, who was appointed bishop of Jerusalem by Jesus himself, composed a

liturgy which we hear sung at the sepulchre up to the present day. Later on, Basil the Great from Cappadocia, having been inspired by God, gave us the liturgy and arranged the holy sacrament, dividing it into three parts according to the commandment of the Holy Ghost. Why, then, do you say that the holy sacrament and the ecclesiastical orders are not given by God, and why do you abuse the Church and the priests, calling them "Blind Pharisees"? And why do you constantly bark at them like dogs after a horseman? You, being blind in your spiritual eyes, cannot understand the epistles of Saint Paul who appointed bishops, priests, and others of the clerical order over all the world. But according to what is written, "For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves to the righteousness of God" (Romans 10:3).

(p.14) Although the Orthodox priests live a lazy life as you say, blaming them, they do not, however, blaspheme God as you do and they would not commit any secret wickedness. Listen to what the apostle says, "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant?" (Romans 14:4). "But in a great house there are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood and of earth; and some to honor, and some to dishonor. If a man therefore purge himself from these he shall be a vessel unto honor, sanctified, and meet for the master's use, and prepared unto every good work" (II

(p.15) Timothy 2:20-21). You, heretics, do not believe that the orders of the clergy are always sanctified by God; listen to what the great apostle writes to the Philippians: "Paul and Timothy, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are in Philippi, with the bishops and deacons: Grace be unto you and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ" (Philippians 1:1-2). And to Titus he writes, "For this cause left I thee in Crete that thou shouldst set in order the things that were wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery" (I Timothy 4:14); and again, "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially those who labor in the word and in teaching" (I Timothy 5:17).

(p.16) The heretics on hearing these words reply: "If you were sanctified, as you say, why do you not

carry out your life according to the law and to the words of Paul? "A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, orderly, of good behavior, given to hospitality, apt to teach, not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre, not a brawler, not covetous; one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity.

Likewise, the deacons must be grave, not double-tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre; holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience. And let these also first be proved; then let them use the office of being a deacon, being found blameless' (I Timothy 3:2-4, 8-10). The priests do just the reverse of

(p.17) this. They are given to drink, rob and secretly commit sin and there is nobody to prevent them. For the apostle Paul says, 'Them that sin rebuke before all, that the others may fear.' (I Timothy 5:20). The bishops, who are not able to contain themselves, cannot stop the priests from doing wrong." We shall answer them, "Read what Jesus the Lord says to the apostles" (Matthew 23:2-3).

(p.20) What falsehood have you found in the prophets and why do you blaspheme them and not recognize the books written by them? Why do you pretend to love Christ, and reject the prophecies of the holy prophets about Him? The prophets did not speak their own words, but they proclaimed what the Holy Ghost had ordered them to speak.

(p.22) The heretics dishonor John the Baptist, the forerunner, the dawn of the Great Sun: they call him the forerunner of Antichrist, although God declared him to be the greatest of all the prophets, saying, "Verily I say unto you, among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist" (Matthew 11:11). Even He bent his divine head down and was baptized by him.

The heretics do not venerate the holy mother of our Lord Jesus Christ, but talk nonsense about her; their words and insolences are so bad that they must not be written in this book.

(p.23) They read Saint Paul who says about idols, "For as much then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the godhead is like unto gold or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device" (Acts 17:29); and, finding justification in this, they think that it is spoken about the icons, and for this reason they seek in these words ground for not reverencing icons in private.

But, being afraid of the people, they attend the church and kiss the crucifix and icons. We have learned this from those who returned again to our Orthodox faith. They say, "We do all this because of the people, and not from sincerity. We hold to our faith secretly."

(p.25) "We reject David and the prophets. We admit only the Gospel; we do not carry out our lives according to the law of Moses, but according to the law given through the apostles."

Hear what Jesus Christ says, "Think not that I came to destroy the law, or the prophets; I have not come to destroy, but to fulfill" (Matthew 5:17; and again, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rise from the dead" (Luke 16:31); and again, "But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" (John 5:47).

(p.26) What falsehood and evil do you see in the law and the prophets, and why do you blaspheme them and reject the Scriptures? Here is what the Lord God says of the pious men who had lived according to the first law, "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and yourselves cast forth without" (Luke 13:28). Why do you say that the prophets were not holy and had not prophesied through the Holy Ghost? Can you not read in Matthew 22:42-45, what David through the Holy Ghost predicted? Who can explain this matter better than Peter, the great apostle, who says, "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man but holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." (II Peter 1:21-2:2).

(p.27) The wretched ones think that they know the depth of the Scriptures and, being willing to comment upon them, they give a wrong meaning to them. But all this they do for their own destruction, as Peter says (II Peter 3:15-17).

Since we know the heretics well, let us drive them away, because they are the enemies of the holy cross. Blaspheming all the ordinances given to the holy church, they count their teaching to be sacred, babbling certain fables, which their father, the devil, teaches them. Although it is unbecoming, as I said, everything under the sky is defiled by them; nevertheless I have already related to you a little. The rest I will not tell you, because as the apostle says, "For it is a shame even to speak of those things which are

done by them in secret" (Ephesians 5:12).

(p.28) Many people do not know what their heresy is, and think that they suffer for the sake of righteousness, and will be rewarded by God for their chains and imprisonment. Let such persons hear what Paul says, "And if a man also strive for masteries, yet is he not crowned, except he have striven lawfully" (II Timothy 2:5). How can they arouse anybody's sympathy for their great suffering if they call the devil the creator of man and of all God's creatures; and because of their extreme ignorance, some of them call the devil a fallen angel, and the others account him an unjust steward? These words of theirs are only ridiculous for those who possess intelligence, because these words, like a rotten garment, cannot be tied together. And they worship the devil to such an extent that they call him the creator of the divine words and ascribe the divine glory to him. They have forgotten what God said through the prophet, "I am the Lord; that is my name; and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images" (Isaiah 42:8).

(p.29) Having read that the deceitful devil said to Jesus: "All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me" (Matthew 4:9), the heretics trust the devil and take him as a sovereign of the creatures of God. And again having read, "Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out" (John 12:31), and, "I will not talk much with you; for the prince of this world cometh" (John 14:30), they call the devil the ruler and the prince of God's creatures.

(p.30) Because the heretics have alienated themselves from the cross of Christ and rejected it, the devil leads them easily according to his will. As those who fish with a fish-hook cannot fish unless they use worms as bait, so the heretics conceal their poison with their hypocritical humility and fasting; and also carrying the Gospel with them, and putting a wrong construction upon it, they are able to seduce the people. They do this to their own perdition; and they purpose to destroy all love and Christian faith. But in vain do they try to do this; and in vain are their prayers. Paul says, "Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever you do, do all to the glory of God" (I Corinthians 10:31).

(p.31) And to what meaning of the Scriptures do they not give a wrong sense? What do they not blaspheme

- in this world, which was established by God? They blaspheme not only the earth but also the heaven, saying that everything exists by the will of the devil; the sky, sun, stars, air, earth, man, churches, crosses; everything which emanates from God they ascribe to the devil; in general, they consider everything on the earth, animate and inanimate as devilish. Having read in the Gospel what our Lord says in the parable of the two sons, they claim that Christ is the older and the devil, who has deceived his father, is the younger. They give the name of the latter as Mammon and admit that he is the creator and author of earthly things. They say that he has ordered
- (p.32) people to marry, to eat meat, and to drink wine. In general, in blaspheming all our things, they think themselves to be inhabitants of the heavens, and call those who marry and live in this world the servants of Mammon. And, feeling aversion for all these things, they do not admit them, not for the sake of temperance as we do, but because we consider them to be pure. Here is what the Holy Ghost, through the mouth of Paul, says: "Forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats, which God created to be received with thanksgiving by them who believe and know the truth. For every creature of God is good, and nothing is to be refused if it be received with thanksgiving" (I Timothy 4:3-4). Do ye hear, heretics, these words of the Holy Ghost who says that legal marriage is pure before God and moderate eating and drinking never destroy a man? (I Corinthians 10:31; cf. also Titus 1:15.)
- (p.35) Do you see, brothers, how thoroughly damned they are, rejecting holy baptism and feeling an aversion to baptized children? If it happens to them by chance to see a child they shrink from it as from a bad smell. Being themselves a bad smell for angels and people, they turn away, spit, and cover their faces. Although they want to tell a lie according to their habit, saying that they are Christians, you must not believe them because they
- (p.36) are deceivers like their father, the devil. How can they call themselves Christians, as they do not make the sign of the cross, do not write down the prayers of the priests, and do not honor ministers? They hate children, about whom the Lord Jesus says, "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matthew 18:3), and again, "Suffer the little children, and forbid them not to come

unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven" (Matthew 19:14); and they call them little mammons, little devils, and little wealthy men, thinking that riches are from Mammon.

(p.37) The heretics try to destroy also that which the holy apostles have built up, and what they have taught with much effort. What David says about them (Psalms 36:20) is right. How can they not be counted as enemies of God and of man, if they reject the miracles of God? Because they call the devil the creator, they deny that Christ has performed miracles. On reading the evangelists who write about miracles, they put a wrong construction on the words, to their own ruin, saying, "Christ neither gave sight to the blind, nor healed the lame, nor raised the dead, but these are only legends and delusions which the uneducated evangelists understood wrongly." They do not believe that the multitude in the desert was fed with five loaves of bread; they say, "It was not loaves of bread, but the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles."

The prayers of their flattery are a thousand. Shutting themselves up in their huts, they pray four times a night and four times a day, and they open the five doors, which are to be closed. Bowing, they recite "Our Father," but for this they must be condemned, because only in words do they call the creator of the heaven and earth, father; elsewhere they ascribe his creation to the devil. When they worship, they do not make the sign of the cross. We ask them, saying, "Who ordered you to fast on Sunday, the day of the Resurrection, to bow and to work?" They answer that this is not written in the Gospel, but it is arranged by men, and therefore they reject all holy days, and do not revere the memory of saints, and martyrs, and fathers.

(p.39) They try to conceal themselves by the words of the Gospel in which our Lord says, "When thou prayest, thou shalt not be as the hypocrites are, for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men" (Matthew 6:5). They disfigure their faces in order that they may appear unto men to fast. On reading the words of Jesus, "When thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut the door, pray to thy Father who is in secret; and thy Father who seeth in secret shall reward you openly. But when ye pray, use not vain repetitions as the heathen do." (Matthew

6:6-7); they give them a wrong meaning and consider "the corners of the streets" to be churches, and the liturgies and other ceremonies to be babbling.

(p.40) And hear their other words, through which they seduce the souls of uneducated people, saying as follows: "It is unbecoming for a man to labor and to do earthly work, as the Lord God says, 'Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we eat, or What shall we drink, or Wherewithal shall we be clothed? (for after all these things do the heathen seek;) for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things" (Matthew 6:31-33). That is why some of them do not want to do anything with their hands, wander from house to house and devour the property of the people deceived by them. But according to the words of the Lord God, they shall receive greater condemnation. Let us hear what Paul, who never received his bread as a gift, says, "Ye yourselves know that these hands ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me" (Acts 20:34). And about the lazy people he writes, "If any would not work, neither shall he eat" (II Thessalonians 3:10).

The heretics are condemned to a double condemnation, because, spreading a different teaching as new apostles and forerunners of the Antichrist, they prepare people for admiring the Son of Perdition. They teach their own people not to obey their masters; they blaspheme the wealthy, hate the tsar, ridicule the elders, reproach the nobles, regard as vile in the sight of God those who serve the tsar, and forbid servants to obey their masters.

(p.45) I wish to tell you another heretical story, with which the devil, who despises human beings, catches them. When they read the words of James, the brother of Jesus, who says, "Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed" (James 5:16), they do not understand that this is said to priests. Furthermore, "Is any among you sick? Let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him" (James 5:14-15). The heretics confess and give absolution one to another, for their sins, although they themselves are bound with the chains of the devil,



and this is done not only by men but also by women, which action is worthy of condemnation. The apostle says, "Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence" (Timothy, I, 2:11-12), and James says to the men, "Be not many masters, my brethren, knowing that we shall receive the greater condemnation" (James 3:1)."

Then there follow the anathemas which are important as throwing light on Bogomilian teaching:

- "He who does not love our Lord Jesus Christ, cursed be he!
- He who does not believe in the Holy Inseparable Trinity, cursed be he!
- He who does not admit the Holy Communion and the blood of Christ, cursed be he!
- He who does not pray with hope to the virgin Mary, cursed be he!
- He who does not bow before the holy cross with hope, cursed be he!
- He who does not kiss the icons of our Lord, of the Holy virgin, and of all the saints, with veneration and love, cursed be he!
- He who does not honor the words of the Gospel and Apostles, cursed be he!
- He who believes that the holy prophets have not spoken through the Holy Ghost, but have prophesied of their own initiative, cursed be he!
- He who does not honor all the saints and does not revere their relics with love, cursed be he!
- (p.68) He who blasphemes the holy liturgy and all prayers given to the Christians by the apostles and the holy fathers, cursed be he!
- He who does not believe that all visible and invisible creatures are created by God, cursed be he!
- He who puts a wrong construction upon the Gospel and the words of the apostles, and does not read them as the holy men have interpreted them, cursed be he!
- He who does not carry out the commandments of Moses as given by God, and talks evil, cursed be he!
- He who does not believe that the ecclesiastical orders are established by God and the apos-

bles, cursed be he!

He who blasphemes lawful marriage and the rich  
who wear wedding garments with respect,  
cursed be he!

He who reproaches those that eat meat and drink  
wine according to the law, and who thinks  
that they are not worthy to enter into the  
kingdom of God, cursed be he!"

## APPENDIX C

The Biography of the Noted Saint Hilarion, from which selections are here translated from the old Bulgarian, bears the long title:

Zhitie i Zhizn prepodobnago ottsa nashego illariona, Meglenskago, v nem zhe i kako prenesen bist v preslavni grad Trnov supisano Evtimiem, patriarkhom Trnovskim.<sup>1</sup>

"After a short time, while the saint was preaching and teaching, he found out that a considerable part of the Christians of the diocese were Manicheans, Armenians, and Bogomils, who were trying in the dark to shoot orthodox believers in their heart. These heretics were reviling him and plotting against him; they robbed and led astray the Orthodox believers like cattle. Having seen that they were increasing in number, he suffered great sorrow and prayed God to stop their inveterate tongues. He always kept on preaching to his people, teaching and strengthening them in the Orthodox faith. On hearing his sermons, the heretics were enraged in their hearts and gnashed their teeth like wild beasts, besides causing him various troubles. They were very fond of disputing and wrangling with him, but Hilarion, the good shepherd of the sheep of Christ, having God as his stronghold, tore their intrigues and idle talks like a spider's web, and at this all the believers rejoiced.

At times the champions of the filthy Manichean heresy, just like wolves in sheep's clothing, ap-

. . . . .

1. As the title states, this biography of Hilarion, bishop of Meglen, was written by Euthymius, the last Bulgarian patriarch (1375-1393 A.D.), who was a great writer of biographies, among which is this one. The manuscript has been edited several times. The translation of the passages referring to Manicheism made here is based upon the edition of the text by Emil Kaluzhniacki: "Werke des Patriarchen von Bulgarien Euthymius, nach den besten Handschriften" (Vienna, 1901).

proached him timidly and tempted him as the Pharisees did the Lord Jesus. They wanted to catch him in some word, but their iniquity proved its own censure. They fell into the traps which had been laid by them and the lie was animadverted by truth. For instance, they asked him, 'When we preach that the good God created the heavens and say that earth and all that is on it is a production of another, an evil creator, why do you philosophize, not agreeing with but contradicting the truth?' Saint Hilarion answered, 'Listen to Christ who says in the Gospels, "I have not spoken of myself, but the Father who sent me" (John 12:40). I am not talking to you from myself, but from the Gospels of Christ which you claim to follow and also from the Apostles; therefore, if you wish to pay any heed to my words, give up your pride. How is it that you affirm that the good God alone is himself the creator of the heavens but there is another creator of the earth and earthly beings? There are even some of you who say that the sky itself and everything that is found there is an enemy's creation. If then the heavens, according to your opinion, are the production of the evil one, how is it possible that the good God may abide there? How did your Savior give us that wonderful and awesome prayer and teach us to pray in this manner, "Our Father who art in heaven, Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth"; and, "If ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you"; and, "Whoever shall do the will of my Father who is in heaven, he is my brother and sister and mother"? Who dare say anything against the fact that the Savior revealed to us the Heavenly Father who is in heaven? Is there anything clearer than the words in which it is said, "I confess before thee, O Father, Lord of the heavens and earth"? Not only the Lord of the heavens is worshipped but also the Lord of the earth. Do you see how the words of the Gospel, on which you found your doctrine, refute you? Why did the Savior say to Peter, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven" (Matthew 16:19)?"

## APPENDIX D

### SINODIK TSARIA BORISA

The Sinodik Tsaria Borisa is an old Bulgarian document, of value as bearing on the general subject, and dating early in the thirteenth century.

On February 11, 1211 (Anno Mundi 6718) the Bulgarian tsar, Boril, convoked a council in the capital, the city of Tirnovo, and the Bogomils were condemned to persecution. The Sinodik gives a description of that council, and besides containing a long list of the Bulgarian tsars, bolyars, patriarchs, and bishops, it gives the anathemas of the church against the Bulgarian Bogomils.

The manuscript of the Sinodik is a fourteenth century copy, and is preserved in the National Library at Sofia. It has been edited by M. Drinoff,<sup>1</sup> N. Palauzoff,<sup>2</sup> and M. Popruzhenko.<sup>3</sup> An extract is here translated from this work; namely, the portion containing the anathemas, as printed in the "List of the Manuscripts and Old Printed Books in the National Library of Sofia" by Professor B. Tsoneff.<sup>4</sup>

1. Because our guileful foe spread the Manichean heresy all over the Bulgarian land and mixed it up with Messalianism, let him and all the leaders of

this heresy be accursed.<sup>5</sup>

2. The priest, Bogomil, who during the reign of the Bulgarian tsar Peter adopted the Manichean heresy and spread it all over the Bulgarian countries, and also his disciples who believe that our Lord Jesus Christ was seemingly born, and seemingly separated from the body which He threw into the air; and all those that call themselves his apostles, let them be cursed.

3. Cursed be everything of the heretics: their customs, meetings at night, sacraments, and their pernicious teachings, and those that follow them.

4. Cursed be those who are associated with them, eat and drink with them, and accept gifts from them as from their co-religionists.

5. Cursed be those who on the twenty-fourth of June, the birthday of John the Baptist, practice magic and ceremonials with fruits, and perform foul sacraments at night, similar to Hellenistic ceremonies.<sup>6</sup>

6. Cursed be those who call Satan the creator of all visible things, and assert that he is the steward of rain and hail<sup>7</sup> and of everything that comes from the earth.

7. Cursed be those who say that a woman becomes pregnant in her womb through the act of Satan, who assists her constantly even until the birth of her child, and who cannot be driven away by holy baptism, prayer, and fasting.

8. Cursed be those who blaspheme John the Baptist and say that he together with his baptism was from Satan; and who have an aversion to baptism, baptize themselves without water, reciting only the "Our Father."

9. Cursed be those who have an aversion to the church, to the hymns, and to the house of God, and who simply recite "Our Father," singing it on the corners of the streets.

10. Cursed be those who reject and abuse the holy liturgy and the sacred orders, saying that these are an invention of Satan.

11. Cursed be those who reject and abuse the eucharist with the venerated body of our Lord Jesus Christ, and also reject salvation through the sacrament.

12. Cursed be those who reject the reverence of the honored cross and the holy icons.

13. Cursed be those who admit such heretics into the church of God before they repent of their accursed heresy.

14. Cursed be Basil, the physician, who spread this thrice-accursed heresy into Constantinople during the reign of the Orthodox emperor Alexis Comnenus.

15. Cursed be Constantine of Bulgaria, the ex-metropolitan of Kerkir who instructed falsely and wickedly about the true God our Savior Jesus Christ.

16. Cursed be all the adherents of Constantine of Bulgaria and those who grieve and mourn because of his deposition.

17. Cursed be Peter of Cappadocia, the "elder" (dedetz) of Sredets (Sofia).

18. Cursed be those who either by herbs, magic, enchantments, devilish witchcraft or by poison try to injure the tsar, anointed by God.

19. Cursed be those who busy themselves with magic, enchantments, and predictions.

After these anathemas there follows a description of the council, and at the end there occurs a final resumptive anathema:

20. Cursed be the thrice-accursed Bogomil, his disciples Michael, Theodore, Dobri, Stephan, Basil, Peter, and his other disciples and adherents, who babble that Christ was not born of the Holy Virgin, Mother of God, and that he became flesh only in appearance.

. . . . .

1. Cf. M. Drinoff: Zhurnal Ministerstvo Narodnava Prosveschenia, p. 238 (St. Petersburg, 1895)
2. Cf. N. Palauzoff; Vremennik (Moscow, 1855)
3. Cf. M. Popruzhenko: Sinodik Tsaria Borisa (Odessa, 1897)
4. Cf. B. Tsoneff: Opis na rukopisite i staropechatnite Knigi na Narodnata Biblioteka v Sofia, pp. 187-190; also T. Florinskii: "K Voprosu O Bogomilakh" in Sbornik Lamanski, pp. 33-40 (St. Petersburg, 1883)
5. (Lit. "Let anathema be.")
6. This is a festival that has come down from paganism. It is called Yanovden and is still celebrated in many places in Bulgaria. Cf. D. Marinoff; Sbornik Narodni Umotvorenia, 28, pp. 489-506; Deszhavin; Sbornik Narodni Umotvoernia, 29, pp. 167-169; M. Arnoudoff; Die Bulgarischen Festbräuche, pp. 69-73 (Leipzig, 1917); Afanasev; A. Poeticheskia Vozrenia Slavian na Prirodu, 3, pp. 712-724 (Moscow, 1869).
7. The well-known Manichean legend as to the origin of rain is referred to in a polemical passage against Manicheism in the Pahlavi work entitled Shikand Gumanik Vijar, 16, 14 (ed. E. W. West), p. 168, which says: "The rain is to the seed of the Mazandarans (i.e. demons) who are bound to the (celestial sphere" -- (Pazand

(Note continued from page 174:)

version) varân šuŕ (šusr) i Mâzandarâ i pa spîhir bast estend;  
see also C. Salemann: Ein Bruchstück Manichäischer im  
asiatischen Museum, pp. 18-19 (St. Petersburg, 1904);  
cf. likewise West's English translation in Sacred  
Books of the East, 24, p. 244.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### A. Sources and Works which Incorporate Sources

- Blagoeff, N. P.: Bessedata na Presviter Kozma protiv Bogomilite. P. Gloushkoff, Sofia, 1923
- Commena, Anna: Alexiadis, XV. Patrologiae cursus completus, series Graeca (ed. Migne), 131, col. 1167-1186
- Conybeare, Fred. C.: The Key of Truth. The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1898
- Faber, G. S.: An Inquiry into the History and Theology of the Ancient Vallenses and Albigenses. London, 1838
- Ficker, Gerhard: Die Phundagiagiten—Ein Beitrag zur Ketzergeschichte des byzantinischen Mittelalters. Johann Ambrosius Barth, Leipzig, 1908
- Gieseler, John C. L.: A Compendium of Ecclesiastical History. Trans. by Samuel Davidson. Vol. II. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1859
- Glogoff, Anton: Bogomilskoto Ouchenie. The author, Sofia, 1935
- Ivanoff, Jordan: Bogomilski Knigi i Legendi. Bulgarska Akademia na Naukite, Sofia, 1925
- Jireček, Const.: Dějiny národa bulharského (Czech). Translated into Bulgarian as, Istorija na Bulgariite, by A. Diamandieff and Iv. Raeff. V. N. Zlatarski, ed. Strashimir Slaveheff, Sofia, 1929
- Karoleff, R.: "Bogomilstvoto" in Periodichno Spisanie na Bulgarskoto Knijovno Drouzhestvo; Vol. III, pp. 55-83; Vol. IV, pp. 52-73; Vol. V-VI, pp. 103-152; Vol. VII-VIII, pp. 75-106. Braila, 1871-1874
- Kisselkoff, V. Sl.: Beseda protiv Bogomilite ot Prezviter Kozma. Biblioteka Stara Bulgarska Knijnina, Sofia, 1934

- Klincharoff, Iv. G.: Pop Bogomil i Negovoto Vreme. S. M. Staikoff, Sofia, 1927
- Perrin, Jean Paul: History of the Waldenses and Albigenses. Geneva, 1619; Griffith and Simon, Philadelphia, 1847
- Popruzhenko, M. G.: Sinodik Tzaria Borila. Series Bulgarski Starini, Ed. Bulgarskata Akademia na Naoukite, Sofia, 1928
- Rački, Fr.: Bogomili i Patareni. Srpska Kraljevska Akademija Posebna Igdanja, Kn. LXXXVII. Droushtveni i Istoriski Spissi, Kn. 38. Belgrade, 1931
- Sharenkoff, Victor N.: A Study of Manichaeism in Bulgaria with Special Reference to the Bogomils. The author, New York, 1927
- Schmidt, C.: Histoire et doctrine de la secte des Cathares ou Albigeois, Vol. I and II. J. Cherbuliez, Paris, 1849
- Zlatarski, Vasil N.: Istorija na Bulgarskata Durzhava prez Srednite Vekove. Vol. I, Part 2. Bulgarska Akademia na Naoukite, Sofia, 1927
- Zygabenus, Euthymius: Panoplia dogmatica, tit. 27, Patrologiae cursus completus, series Graeca (ed. Migne), 130, col. 1289-1332
- " " Confutatio et eversio impiae et multiplicis execrabiliū Massalianorum sectae. Ibid., 131, col. 39-48
- " " Liber invectivus contra haeresim execrabiliū et impiorum haeticorum qui phundagiatae dicuntur. Ibid., 131, col. 47-58
- " " Narratio de Bogomilis. Ed. Gieseler. Göttingen, 1842

#### B. Secondary Sources

- Adeney, Walter F.: The Greek and Eastern Churches. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1908

- Balachev, Georgi D.: Bulgarite prez poslednite deset-godishnini na dessetia Vek. Part. I. Gloush-koff, Sofia, 1929
- Boeff, Boyan: Missiyata na Bogomilstvoto v Svruzka s Missiyata na Slavianstvoto. Nikola Kambouroff, Kazanlik, 1937
- Bompiani, Sophia V.: A Short History of the Italian Waldenses. James A. O'Gonnor, New York, 1910
- Cowan, Henry: Landmarks of Church History. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, n. d.
- Davison, Ellen Scott: Forerunners of Saint Francis. Gertrude R. B. Richards, ed. Houghton Mifflin Co., New York, 1927
- Fisher, George Park: History of the Christian Church. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1888
- " " The Reformation. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1887
- " " History of Christian Doctrine. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1896
- Foakes-Jackson, F. J.: An Introduction to the History of Christianity (A.D. 590-1314). The Macmillan Company, New York, 1921
- Gibbon, Edward: The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. Wm. Smith, ed. Vol. VII. John Murray, London, 1887
- Harnack, Adolph: History of Dogma. Neil Buchanan, trans. Vol. III. Little, Brown & Company, Boston, 1901
- Hulme, Edward Maslin: The Middle Ages. Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1929
- Jones, Rufus M.: The Church's Debt to Heretics. George H. Doran Company, New York, 1924
- Jones, William: The History of the Christian Church. Vol. II. The author, London, 1826
- Katzaroff, G. I.: Kum Religiata na Stara Trakia. Bulgarskata Akademia na Naoukite, Book VIII, Sofia, 1914

- Kurtz, Prof.: Church History. John McPherson, trans.  
Vol. I. Funk & Wagnalls, New York, 1889
- Latourette, Kenneth Scott: The Thousand Years of Uncertainty (A.D. 500-A.D. 1000). Harper and Brothers, New York, 1938
- Lea, Henry Charles: A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages. Vol. I. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1922
- Le Bon, Gustave: The Crowd--A Study of the Popular Mind. T. Fisher Unwin, London, 1910
- Lombard, Alexander: Pauliciens Bulgares et Bones-Hommes. H. Georg, Geneva et Basel, 1879
- McKee, Dean Greer: A Study of the Albigenses in the Light of the Principle of Puritanism (A Thesis). Biblical Seminary, New York, 1928
- Miller, Andrew: Papers on Church History. Vol. I. Pickering and Inglis, London, n.d.
- Mishew, D.: The Bulgarians in the Past. Librairie Centrale de Nationalités, Lausanne, 1919
- Nagler, Arthur Wilford: The Church in History. The Abingdon Press, New York, 1929
- Neander, Augustus: General History of the Christian Religion and Church, Vol. IV. Crocker and Brewster, Boston, 1872
- Newman, Albert Henry: A Manual of Church History. Vol. I. American Baptist Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1904
- " " "Introductory Essay on the Manichaeian Heresy" in Vol. IV - First Series - Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church. Philip Schaff, ed. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1901
- Pastouhoff, Iv., and Stoyanoff, Iv.: Istorija na Bulgarskija Narod. Chr. G. Danoff, Plovdiv, 1929
- Schaff, Philip: History of the Christian Church. Vol. IV. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1887

- Stanev, Nikola: Srednevekovna Bulgaria. St. Atanasoff, Sofia, 1934
- Tozer, Henry Fanshawe: The Church and the Eastern Empire. Series: Epochs of Church History. Mandell Creighton, ed. Anson D. F. Randolph & Company, New York, n. d.
- Trench, Richard Chenevix: Lectures on Medieval Church History. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1878
- Walker, Williston: A History of the Christian Church. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1918
- Warren, Paul Christopher: The Principle of Puritanism and the Significance of its Recurring Manifestations (A Thesis). Biblical Seminary, New York, 1929
- Zenos, Andrew C.: Compendium of Church History. Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-School Work, 1903

#### C. Articles

- Grogan, Elinor F. B.: "Bulgaria," The Encyclopaedia Britannica, 14th ed., Vol. IV. Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., New York, 1929
- Kessler, K.: "Manichaeism," Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge, Vol. III. Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York, 1891
- Lavrin, Janko: "The Bogomils and Bogomilism," in the Slavonic Review, Vol. VIII. Jonathan Cape Ltd., London, 1929-1930
- Mullinger, J. Bass: "Albigenses," Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, James Hastings, ed., Vol. I. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1926
- Powicke, Fred J.: "Bogomils," Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, James Hastings, ed., Vol. II. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1926
- Schmidt, C.: "Paulicians," Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge, Vol. III. Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York, 1891

Weber, N. A.: "Albigenses," (Vol. I); "Bogomili," (Vol. II); "Cathari," (Vol. III); The Catholic Encyclopedia. The Encyclopedia Press, Inc., New York, 1913

Weingarten: "Messalians," Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge, Vol. III. Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York, 1891

Zöckler, O.: "Neumanichäer," Realencyklopaedie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche. Vol. XIII. Leipzig, 1903

..... "Albigenses," (Vol. I); "Bogomils," (Vol. III); "Cathars (Cathari or Catharists)," (Vol. V); The Encyclopaedia Britannica, 14th edition. Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., New York, 1929

..... "Albigenses," (Vol. I); "Bogomiles," (Vol. I); "Cathari," (Vol. II); Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature. John McCintock and James Strong, ed. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1894

..... "Bogomiles," (Vol. III); "Bulgaria," (Vol. IV); "Calvin," (Vol. IV); "Cathari," (Vol. IV); "Manichaeans," (Vol. XV); "Massalians (Messalians)," (Vol. XV); "Paulicians," (Vol. XVIII); "Zwingli," (Vol. XXIII). The New International Encyclopaedia, Second edition. Dodd, Mead and Company, New York, 1925

..... "The Sin of Zornitza" (Grehut na v. Zornitza). Zornitza, Year IX, Issue 11, p. 3; March 13, 1940; Sofia