

<https://doi.org/10.53656/phil2025-02S-03>

DUALISTIC PRINCIPLES AND FORMULATIONS IN THE TEACHING OF THE PAULICIANS AND BOGOMILS THROUGH THE EYES OF PRESBYTER COSMAS AND EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS

Dimo Penkov

Sofia University "St Kliment Ohridski"

Abstract. This paper aims to present, from a comparative perspective, the dualism underlying the teachings of the Paulicians and Bogomils. A theological study of this subject is inextricably linked to several important and still insufficiently explored aspects of the worldview of Paulicianism and Bogomilism. With regard to Paulician dualistic doctrine, the theological-apologetic analysis will be based on the 24th title of Euthymius Zigabenus' "Dogmatic Panoply". Concerning the Bogomil doctrine, the analysis will be conducted through the perspective of Presbyter Cosmas in his "Discourse Against the Bogomils" and the 27th title of Euthymius Zigabenus' work.

The publication will also briefly examine the ancient dualistic heresies of the East, which directly or indirectly influenced the teachings of the Paulicians and Bogomils. By comparing these two heretical movements, both of which were widespread in Bulgarian lands, the study outlines their fundamental dualistic principles and propositions while also identifying clear distinctions between them, particularly in terms of the nature of their dualism – whether extreme or moderate.

Keywords: Dualism; Heresy; Paulicianism; Bogomilism; Manichaeism; Docetism

We live in a century marked by numerous paradoxes and contradictions. Modern civilisation is highly complex and differs significantly from all past civilisations and cultures (Bigovich 2003, p. 293). At the same time, many ancient myths, legends, and alluring neo-pagan religious concepts, in which the boundaries between good and evil, truth and falsehood are blurred or even erased, are being revived. The contemporary religious landscape is witnessing the resurgence and reinterpretation of various dualistic and heretical teachings that seek pseudo-spiritual realisation in the minds and hearts of modern individuals. We live in an era in which heresy is

no longer regarded as an aberration or innovation but is instead framed as “tolerant pluralism,” purportedly superior to “rigid” orthodox doctrine (Dragas 2006, p. 121).

The approach to the issue under consideration is not only concerned with reconstructing certain aspects of the dualistic worldview of Paulicianism and Bogomilism, taking into account their uniqueness and specificity, but also with offering a contemporary theological-apologetic interpretation based on the polemical writings of Presbyter Cosmas (10th century), Discourse Against the Bogomils,¹ and Euthymius Zigabenus’ (c. 1050 – 1120) Dogmatic Panoply.² These writings contribute to an awareness of the significant danger posed by these inherently dualistic teachings, which are deemed heretical because they advocate conceptual, categorical, and value systems that are fundamentally opposed to Orthodox doctrine. Dmitry Obolensky is undoubtedly correct in observing that “dualism gave life to a large number of heresies from the time of all Christian antiquity until the end of the Middle Ages, where they were the Church’s most dangerous adversaries, against whom she was forced to wage an almost continuous battle, both in Eastern and Western Europe” (Obolenski 1998, p. 16).

The Paulician doctrine during the time of Euthymius Zigabenus appears as a syncretic system incorporating elements from various religious and philosophical traditions of antiquity, with Manichaeism being particularly prominent. Euthymius Zigabenus explicitly states that Paulicianism is “part of the madness of the Manicheans” (Radeva 2015, p. 522). It follows a consistent line of reasoning that can be summarised as a categorical rejection of the belief that the natural order of this world is the work of God.

The cosmogonic Manichaean myth is founded on absolute dualism. Blessed Augustine (354 – 430) observed that the Manichaeans “introduced two natures—one good, which they called God, and the other evil, which was not created by God” (Bojadzhiev 2023, p. 19)³. The founder of this doctrine, Mani (216 – 274), taught that there are two unbegotten, self-existent, and eternal gods who are fundamentally opposed to each other. The first is the god of good or light, while the second is the god of evil or darkness. Even before the creation of the heavens, the earth, and all things, these two opposing natures existed: one good and the other evil. The good nature, referred to as the Father of Greatness, resides in the Realm of Light, which consists of five abodes—reason, knowledge, thought, intellect, and consciousness. The evil nature, which Mani calls the King of Darkness, inhabits the Dark Realm, comprising five worlds: smoke, fire, wind, water, and darkness. According to this myth, the dark forces invaded the domain of the good god. The First Man waged battle against them but was ultimately defeated. The dark god then ruled over all humanity until the coming of Christ (Radeva 2015, p. 56). Mani taught that all physical matter is inherently evil, except for the spiritual elements trapped within it. Manichaeism spread throughout the Roman Empire from the late third century until its condemnation and subsequent persecution under Emperor

Justinian I (527 – 565). In Iraq and Persia, the movement survived until the tenth century, from where it spread to Central Asia and China (Radeva 2015, p. 60). Among all Gnostic teachings, Manichaeism is regarded as a pessimistic dualistic heresy. In his *Hexaemeron* written during the reign of Simeon I (893 – 927), John the Exarch included a passage commenting on the dualistic views of “the advocates of heretical perversions” (i.e., the Manichaeans – TN), who “are not ashamed to say that the devil is older than the Son”. (John the Exarch 1981, p. 52.). Byzantine writers classified all later dualistic heresies, such as Paulicianism and Bogomilism, as “Manichaean.”

Like the Manichaeans, the Paulicians believed that two opposing principles, good and evil, were at war in the universe. These principles were created independently of each other, with evil as the creator and ruler of the present, visible world, and good as the creator and ruler of the world to come (Angelov 1993, p. 83). Euthymius Zigabenus observes: „Their heresy consists not of one delusion, but of numerous and diverse [delusions]. They admit two beginnings, as do the Manichaeans. They say that one beginning is God, the heavenly Father, whom they acknowledge as the creator of the whole universe. They surrender to Him authority only over the future. The other [beginning] is the creator of the world, to whom they attribute dominion over the present“ (Radeva 2015, p. 524). This form of absolute dualism, derived from the Manichaean heresy, underwent a transformation within Paulician doctrine in the ninth century, most likely influenced by the teachings of Sergius, who called himself Tychicus (801 – 835). He replaced the term “evil god” with “devil,” thereby assigning evil a lesser, subordinate role more aligned with orthodox concepts (Angelov 1993, p. 85). This transformation is also noted by Jordan Ivanov in his 1925 study, where he writes: “Paulicianism is a transformed Manichaeism, adapted to Christianity” (Ivanov 1925, p. 10). A similar view was expressed by V. Kiselkov regarding Bogomilism: “As a religious doctrine, it does not contain any new elements, as everything within it is borrowed from Christian teachings, Eastern dualistic doctrines, and Byzantine iconoclasm” (Kiselkov 1921, p. 13). In his revised and expanded preface to the 1943 edition of Presbyter Cosmas’s writings, he further clarifies: “However original the doctrine may appear at first sight, in reality, the Bogomil heresy represents a fundamental form of Eastern religious dualism, which entered our country through Byzantium, disguised under the forms of Manichaeism, Paulicianism, and Messalianism” (Kiselkov 1943, p. 9).

Like Paulicianism, Bogomilism emerged from the Gnostic-Manichaean heresy, meaning that its adherents also viewed the material cosmos as the creation of Satan rather than God. They regarded this world as a prison in which spirits undergo multiple cycles of existence in an attempt to transcend it (in line with Gnostic thought). They preached salvation through inner enlightenment, the rejection of birth and death, the renunciation of procreation, and the denial of the flesh (Hart 2020, p. 151). According to their beliefs, God created “innumerable thousands

of angels” and appointed “a second after Himself and chief governor, Samael (Satanael).”⁴. God was also acknowledged as the creator of „heaven and earth,” meaning they accepted the first verse of the first chapter of Genesis. However, their subsequent narrative became both illogical and blasphemous. They attributed to Samael (Satan) several divine characteristics, such as „image and raiment,” a throne, the power to create, and reverence as a „second god.” He was said to have conspired with many angels to rebel against God but was discovered, and all were cast down to the earth. Retaining his divine image and creative power, Samael (Satan) began to fashion an alternate world – a second heaven and a firmament, separating the waters from the face of the earth, creating Adam’s body, and so forth. However, he lacked the ability to create life and therefore petitioned God for a soul, promising that humanity would be shared and that its offspring would ultimately repopulate the heavens from which the fallen angels had been cast out. (Ekzarh Stefan 2012, pp. 65 – 66; Angelov, Primov, Batakliiev 1967, p. 32). Presbyter Cosmas also refers to these beliefs, writing: “They must therefore be condemned, because they call the Creator of heaven and earth ‚Father’ in name only and regard His creations as the work of the devil” (Prezviter Kozma 2017, p. 56). Similarly, Euthymius Zigabenus, in his Dogmatic Panoply, poses the rhetorical question: “And how would the good God fulfil the enemy’s desire to send a soul into the body made by him, so that man might become common? So what has light to do with darkness?” (Zigabenos PG 130, col. 1300; GIBI 1980, p. 56). In their confused, illogical, and often contradictory beliefs, the Bogomils ultimately reject divine foreknowledge and providence, while equating God in creative power and authority with Samael (Satan), whom they describe as “the unrighteous governor of the world” or “a fallen angel,” in the words of Elder Cosmas. (Prezviter Kozma 2017, p. 47; Angelov 1993, p. 125). Moreover, in following this line of reasoning about the world and its structure, the Bogomils arrived at the idea of the “second deception” of Samael (Satan), through which he obstructed humanity’s path to God. According to their beliefs, this deception was only “realised” by God at a later stage – after the fall of Adam and Eve, after Cain’s first murder, and after an unspecified number of generations had been “cruelly destroyed.” Only then did God “emit in the five thousand and five hundredth year a word from His heart, that is, a son and a god,” whom they identified with the Archangel (Angelov, Primov, Batakliiev 1967, pp. 74 – 75). Thus, the Bogomils denied the role of God the Word in creation (cf. John 1:1 – 2), assigning Him a diminished status as a „necessary response” to the actions of Samael (Satan). Their ideas are succinctly summarised by Elder Cosmas, who observes: “Not only on earth but also in heaven do they blaspheme, saying that all is according to the will of the devil” (Kisselkov 1943, pp. 42 – 43; Angelov 1948, pp. 6, 46). The dualistic conceptions of the Bogomils provoked his strong condemnation, leading him to declare that they were „worse than the demons”, since even demons did not deny that the world was created by

God: “What rabid man ever defied the Godhead or dared to blaspheme God’s world like the heretics? And what do they say – that God did not create the heavens, the earth, and all visible things?” (Primov 1960, p. 97). In his *Dogmatic Panoply*, Euthymius Zigabenus categorically states that “Satan is not the creator of any of the creatures of the world” and further clarifies that “God has not made him ruler of the world nor lord of any creature in it” (Zigabenus PG 130, col. 1300; GIBI 1980, p. 56).

Proceeding from their dualistic beliefs, the Bogomils rejected church sacraments, rites, and symbols, as well as Orthodox places of worship. Presbyter Cosmas expressed his indignation, stating: “The churches – the heretics consider to be crossroads, and the liturgies and other services performed in them to be verbosity” (Kiselkov 1943, p. 50). Their aversion to the temple of God was in keeping with their heretical worldview, according to which church buildings were under the power of Satan, who, together with his demons, dwelled within them. This belief is alluded to in the *Discourse Against the Bogomils*, where Presbyter Cosmas summarises: “Heaven, sun, stars, air, earth, man, church, crosses, and everything of God are given to the devil” (Kiselkov 1943, p. 43). A similar notion appears in the 27th title of Euthymius Zigabenus’ *Dogmatic Panoply*: “They say that in all sacred temples dwell the devils, who have divided them according to their rank and power. For Satan of ancient times had chosen for himself the most illustrious temple in Jerusalem, and after its destruction, he appropriated for himself the excellent and universally renowned temple of Divine Wisdom in that queen of cities. For, they say, the Most High did not inhabit man-made temples, since He had heaven for His dwelling” (GIBI 1980, p. 60; Angelov, Primov, Batakliiev 1967, p. 77; Angelov 1993, p. 183).

Faced with such speculative interpretations, Euthymius Zigabenus presents an extensive polemic in his treatise *Dogmatic Panoply*, grounded in the traditional biblical teaching expressed in the opening words of Genesis: „In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth“ (Gen. 1:1). Thus, the central tenet of *Dogmatic Panoply* is the doctrine that God is the Creator of the heavens, the earth, and everything within them. Euthymius Zigabenus unequivocally asserts that no other god exists who creates material reality as something separate from spiritual reality. In the spirit of the anti-heretical polemic of St Irenaeus of Lyons (130/140–203), expounded in his treatise *Against Heresies*, Euthymius affirms that this same God, the Creator of all things “visible and invisible,” brought all things into existence by His own intention and will. He freely determined His creative acts, for He alone is Lord, Creator, and Father. He alone sustains all that exists and is the sole First Cause of all things (Tenekedzhiev 2008, pp. 208 – 209).

The dualistic doctrines were condemned as early as the 10th century by the Patriarch of Constantinople, Theophylact (933 – 956), in a letter to the King of the Bulgarians, Peter (927 – 969), in which he anathematised all those who claimed that

“...the evil devil is the creator and ruler of matter and of this whole visible world and of our bodies” (Angelov, Primov, Batakliiev 1967, p. 43). In contrast to dualistic heresies, particularly Paulicianism and Bogomilism, the Church regards the body as God’s good creation (cf. Gen. 1:31), a fitting vessel for the spirit, and worthy of being “a temple of the Holy Spirit” (1 Cor. 6:19). Humanity, therefore, requires sanctification so that individuals may be restored to their true dignity – as bearers of divine glory and as transformed members of the Kingdom of God (Hart 2020, pp. 267 – 268). Reflecting on the heretical teachings of the Bogomils, Exarch Stephen bitterly observes: “Instead of placing man in the dignity of master of the universe as the most rational and perfect creature on earth, as Christian doctrine teaches us, the doctrine of the Bogomils made man a slave to all superstitious legends” (Ekzarh Stefan 2012, p. 88).

The dualistic view of creation preached by the Paulicians and Bogomils, which held that the material, corporeal world was subject to the evil principle personified by Satan, inevitably led to the belief that Christ was purely a heavenly being,⁵ incapable of assuming flesh from the material realm. As Euthymius Zigabenus records: “When, forced to admit that Christ originated from the Virgin... they say monstrous things: that He [Christ] received His body from heaven and only passed through her [the Virgin] as through a pipe” (Radeva 2015, p. 525). Consequently, they believed that He only appeared to take human form and only seemed to suffer on the cross. For the Paulicians, Christ brought His body from heaven, and thus they denied the glory of the Theotokos, asserting that she did not give birth to the Lord and was therefore not worthy of veneration (Radeva 2015, p. 51). Their inconsistencies and contradictions regarding the Theotokos are further evident in the wording presented in Title 24 of the Dogmatic Panoply: “We believe in the holy Theotokos, into whom the Lord entered and from [whom] He came forth” (Radeva 2015, p. 525). The Paulicians adopted these beliefs from Manichaean doctrine, which taught that Christ assumed only an imaginary form of body and suffered merely in appearance. Consequently, according to them, His suffering on the cross had no redemptive significance. Only His teachings – misunderstood and incorrectly recorded by the apostles – held any true importance (Koev, Bakalov 2001, p. 157). In this regard, the dualistic heresy of Paulician doctrine maintains that human salvation consists in liberation from the evil order of this world. Here, we encounter a pronounced Docetism, rooted in the belief that Christ’s heavenly origin implies only the appearance of the Incarnation. As a result, the Holy Virgin is not regarded as the Mother of Christ but is instead identified with the “Heavenly Jerusalem.” (Radeva 2015, p. 64).

The vulgarised form of Docetism found in Bogomil doctrine is met with a decisive and emphatic refutation in Euthymius Zigabenus’ Dogmatic Panoply, which reaffirms both the indisputability and originality of Christian historical realism. His exposition of the Bogomils’ docetic views provides a revealing insight into their

audacious and unrestrained flights of imagination. According to the Bogomils, Jesus Christ: “descended from heaven and was infused through the right ear of the Virgin, receiving flesh that was only seemingly corporeal and resembling a human body. In reality, however, it was incorporeal, and He emerged again from where He had entered, without the Virgin perceiving either His entrance or His exit. She simply found Him inside the cave, wrapped in swaddling clothes. And He carried out His work in the likeness of flesh, doing and teaching what is recorded in the Gospels, yet only appearing to endure human suffering. He was crucified and supposedly died, then rose again – completing the scene, revealing the drama, and taking off the mask...” (GIBI 1980, p. 57; Angelov, Primov, Batakliiev 1967, p. 75). Their denial of the human nature of Jesus Christ leads them to a distorted understanding of the Incarnation of God: “The Son was clothed in flesh – an incorporeal and divine flesh that requires no nourishment...” (Angelov, Primov, Batakliiev 1967, p. 77). In his anti-heretical work, Euthymius Zigabenus accurately observes that the Bogomils’ doctrine of “incorporeal flesh,” along with their denial of Christ’s true birth from the Virgin, was borrowed from “the Manichaeon folly and from similar heresies before it.” (GIBI 1980, p. 58). Following their heretical belief that Jesus Christ could not belong to the material world – that is, to human nature – they arrive at even more blasphemous and absurd ideas: “The heretics assert that this ‘Word and Son’ is the Archangel Michael. ‘And his name shall be called,’ they say, ‘the Messenger of Great Counsel.’ He was called an archangel because he was more godlike than all the angels, Jesus because he healed every disease and affliction, and Christ because his body was anointed.” (Angelov, Primov, Batakliiev 1967, p. 75). Here, they were likely influenced by the *Corpus Aeropagiticum*, particularly the treatise *On the Celestial Hierarchy*, where it is emphasised that Christ, as the God of revelation, is called the “Angel of the Great Counsel” (Sv. Dionsij Areopagit 2001, p. 31). A similar connection is noted by Euthymius Zigabenus in his treatise denouncing the Bogomils, in which he states that they identified the Son of God with the Archangel Michael, specifically as “the Angel of the Great Counsel” (Zigabenus PG 130, col. 1301; Florovski 2009, pp. 160 – 161). This theological interpretation led the Bogomils to an ambiguous and distorted conclusion – that it was entirely possible for Christ to be an angel not only in ministry but also in nature. Euthymius Zigabenus records that, according to the Bogomils, “the Archangel Michael was by nature the Son of God and Lord, who, in human form, took care of the salvation of human beings” (Zigabenus PG 130, col. 1305; GIBI 1980, p. 58). Thus, they not only denied the human nature of Jesus Christ (as seen in Paulicianism) but also diminished His divine nature, reducing it to that of an angel – essentially a created being. In response, Euthymius Zigabenus poses the rhetorical question: “... if the Archangel is created and is a slave, as are all the heavenly powers, how is he by nature a Son and consubstantial with the Father?” (Zigabenus PG 130, col. 1305; GIBI 1980, p. 58). From its earliest days, the Church, drawing on the

New Testament, has affirmed with absolute conviction the fullness and reality of Christ's human nature, while never regarding Him as merely a man. The confession that Christ is God in no way undermines the recognition of the completeness of His human nature (Florovski 2009, p. 322).

In contrast to the docetic views of Christ found in various heretical teachings – such as Docetism, Gnosticism, and Manichaeism of the 1st–3rd centuries, as well as Paulicianism and Bogomilism of the 7th – 13th centuries – Christians affirm that the saving revelation of God is realised through the body, life, suffering, death, and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth, who is the God-Man, the Son of Man, and the Son of God. For this reason, Christians do not regard the Gnostic-Manichaean heresy and its later expressions in Paulicianism and Bogomilism as mere variations of their faith, but rather as attempts to deprive their God-revealed religion of its very foundation. St. Jerome (circa 347 – 420) observes that as early as the time of the holy apostles, when the blood of Christ had not yet dried in Judea, some were already proclaiming that His body was only imaginary – „phantasma Domini corpus asserebatur“ (Hieronymus PL 23, col. 186; Marinov, Velichkov 1959, p. 333). The earliest response to Docetism is already evident in some of the epistles of St John the Theologian. He warns: „...for many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist.“ (2 John 1:7; cf. 1 John 4:3). The docetic beliefs of the Paulicians and Bogomils result in a cutting asunder and distortion of the Church's doctrine of the God-Man, as they separate Jesus from Christ. This dualistic position ultimately denies the possibility of the God-Man nature and, more broadly, the Godhead itself, thereby rejecting the possibility of the salvation of fallen human nature (Florovski 2009, p. 304).

In Bulgarian history, the Bogomil heresy was condemned and repeatedly anathematised at the Church Council of 1211, whose decisions are recorded in the Synod of the Bulgarian Church, also known as the Synod of Tsar Boril (1207 – 1218). In Bulgarian history, the Bogomil heresy was condemned and repeatedly anathematised by the church council of 1211, whose decisions are reflected in the Synod of the Bulgarian Church, also known as the Synod of Tsar Boril (1207 – 1218). The council declared the following: “To Pope Bogomil, who, under the Bulgarian King Peter, adopted the Manichaean heresy and spread it throughout the Bulgarian land, adding to it that Christ our God was only seemingly born of the Holy Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, and seemingly crucified, and that He ascended with deified flesh, leaving it in the air; to his former and present disciples who uphold this belief and call themselves apostles – anathema... To the thrice-accursed Bogomil... and to the rest of his disciples and followers who blaspheme that Christ's Incarnation was merely an illusion and that He did not receive His flesh from our holy and most pure Lady – to all these, anathema.” (Bozhilov, Totomanova, Biljarski 2012, pp. 302, 311; Podbrani izvori 2004, pp. 253 – 254).

An echo of the polemic waged at various times against the Docetists, Gnostics, Manichaeans, Paulicians, and Bogomils can be found in the liturgical texts of the Orthodox Church. One such example is *Glory, and Now, O Lord, I Cried Out (to Thee)*, Mode 5, from the Vespers of 6 February, which proclaims the historicity and reality of the Incarnation of God: „Search the Scriptures, as Christ our God said in the Gospels, for in them we find Him being born, being swaddled in swaddling clothes, being laid in a manger and nursed with milk, receiving circumcision and being carried by Simeon – not in thought and not in an imaginary form, but truly appearing to the world. To Him let us cry out, ,O eternal God, glory to You.” (Minej februarij 2021, p. 103). In this way, Orthodox worship affirms the truth of the Incarnation – that the Lord Jesus Christ enters history seemingly as a phantom, “disguised” in human form merely to teach humanity how to free their spiritual selves from the so-called humiliating “prison” of the body, as the Paulicians and Bogomils claimed, but as the God-Man, granting redemption and salvation to the whole human race (Hart 2020, p. 384).

The aforementioned propositions in the heretical doctrines of the Paulicians and Bogomils clearly reveal their dualism—the dual nature of their existential principles and the ontological-value polarity that stands in direct opposition to the Church’s professed belief in “one God, the Father Almighty, who created the heavens, the earth, the seas, and all things, and in one Jesus Christ, the Son of God, incarnate for our salvation...” (Sv. Irinej Lionski 2021, pp. 97 – 98).

The *Discourse Against the Bogomils* and the *Panoplia Dogmatica* clearly and emphatically highlight the close association of Paulicianism and Bogomilism with dualistic doctrine. Their dualism, whether absolute or moderate, is genetically linked to Manichaean teachings, which often serve as an “ideological conduit” for any doctrine that regards matter as the creation of evil. At the same time, both works draw a sharp distinction between certain behavioural tendencies of the Paulicians and the Bogomils. The militant Paulicians exhibit radically different behaviour from the Bogomils, whose doctrine is rooted in secret preaching, asceticism, and clandestine activity (Radeva 2015, pp. 61, 479).

The dualistic heretical teachings of the Paulicians and Bogomils constrain and distort the Church’s centuries-old theological tradition, seeking to interpret Truth according to the “elemental spiritual forces of this world” (Col. 2:20) rather than according to Christ.

NOTES

1. *The Discourse Against the Bogomils*, written in the second half of the 10th century, is the earliest apologetic-polemical work in Old Bulgarian. It begins with a brief historical overview of various heresies, after which the author proceeds to his primary objective: exposing the heresy of priest Bogomil and his followers,

which had recently emerged in Bulgaria, in order to protect those insufficiently versed in Christian doctrine from their influence. The work consists of two parts. The first is polemical, presenting and criticising the fundamental beliefs of the Bogomils regarding the creation of the world, the role of the devil, the rejection of church hierarchy, and Christian symbols. The second part is didactic in nature, addressing certain deviations and harmful practices among the clergy and medieval society. See Petkanova 2003, p. 65 – 66; Petkanova 1986, p. 333 – 340.

2. *The Dogmatic Panoply* is an authoritative anti-heretical compendium comprising 28 chapters (titles) and a substantial doctrinal preface of seven chapters. It was composed by the Constantinopolitan scholar and monk Euthymius Zigabenus between 1111 and 1115 at the order of the Byzantine Emperor Alexius I Komnenos (1081 – 1118). This work is among the most significant contributions to the dogmatic-polemical corpus of Byzantine literature. To some extent, *The Dogmatic Panoply* serves as a continuation of the dogmatic writings of St John Damascene (675 – 749). See more in Angelov, Primov, Batakliiev 1967, p. 73 – 74.
3. In his *Confessions*, Saint Augustine writes: “But others say that Thou hast neither made them nor even joined them together, such as all flesh down to the smallest animal and all that clings by the root to the earth, but that the enemy’s thought and other nature, not created by Thee but opposed to Thee, creates and forms them in the lower parts of the world...”. In: Avgustin 1993, c. 275.
4. This variation in form arises from different spellings of the name in the *Πανοπλία Δογματική*, where it appears as *Satanael*, and in *Euthymii Zigabeni De Haeresi Bogomilorum Narratio*, where the name *Samael* is used – TN.
5. In these formulations of the teachings of the Bogomils and Paulicians, the influence of Gnosticism is evident, particularly in the sharp distinction drawn between the temporal, earthly Jesus and the heavenly, eternal Christ. Gnostic dualism undermines the very foundation of Christology. If matter – especially the human body – is not the product of the divine will but of another, opposing principle, then it follows that neither matter nor the human body can serve as a means for the revelation of the supreme God. Consequently, Christ, who comes to reveal this God to humanity, must be entirely separate from the flesh. Stefanov 2008, pp. 278 – 279.

Acknowledgement

This research was supported and funded by the Bulgarian National Science Fund, Project № КП-06-Н80/8 (08.12.2023) “Bogomilism in History and in the Present Day”. The opinions expressed in the publication are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the view of the National Science Fund.

REFERENCES

ANGELOV, D., 1948. *Prezviter Kozma i besedata mu protiv bogomilite*. Sofia: Narodna kultura, 1948.

- ANGELOV, D.; PRIMOV, B. & BATAKLIEV, G. 1967. *Bogomilstvoto v Bulgaria, Vizantija i Zapadna Evropa v izvori*. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1967.
- ANGELOV, D., 1993. Angelov, D. *Bogomilstvoto*. Sofia: Bulvest – 2000. [in Bulgarian] ISBN 954-8112-50-70.
- AVGUSTIN, A. 1993. Avrelij Avgustin. *Izpovedi*. Sofia: Narodna kultura. [in Bulgarian] ISBN 954-04-0034-1.
- BIGOVICH, R., 2003. *C'rkva i obshtestvo*. Sofia: Omofor. [in Bulgarian] ISBN 954-9700-32-1.
- BOJADZHIEV, C. 2023. *Srednovekovni filosofi*. T. 1. Sofia: Zahari Stojanov. [in Bulgarian] ISBN 978-954-09-1755-9.
- BOZHILOV, I.; TOTOMANOVA, A. & BILJARSKI, I. 2012. *Borilov sinodik. Izdanie i prevod*. Sofia: PAM p'blishing k'mpani [in Bulgarian] ISBN 978-954-2973-03-4.
- DRAGAS, G., 2006. Dragas, protopr. G. Pravoslavnoto bogoslovie v savremennija sviat. In: T. KOEV, A. OMARCHEVSKI & P. PAVLOV (eds.) *Pravoslaviето i svetat dnes*. Shesti kongres na Visshite pravoslavni bogoslovski shkoli. Sofia: UI „Sv. Kliment Ohridski“. [in Bulgarian] ISBN 978-954-07-2337-2.
- EKZARH STEFAN, 2012. Ekzarh Stefan. *Bogomilite i prezviter Kozma*. Vtoro dopalнено izdanie. Sofia: Iztok-Zapad. [in Bulgarian] ISBN 978-619-152-042-8.
- FLOROVSKI, G., 2009. Florovski, prot. G. *Madrost i premadrost*. T. 4. Sofia. [in Bulgarian] ISBN 978-954-9401-35-6.
- GIBI, 1980. *Gr'cki izvori za balgarskata istorija*. T. X. Sofia: BAN, 1980.
- HART, D., 2020. *Ateistichnite deljuzii. Hristijanskata revoljucija i neinite moderni vragove*. Sofia: Omofor. [in Bulgarian] ISBN 978-954-2972-82-2.
- IVANOV, J. 1925. *Bogomilski knigi i legendi*. Sofia: Pridvorna pechatnica, 1925.
- JOAN EKZARH, 1981. *Shestodnevi*. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1981.
- KISELKOV, V., 1921. *Prezviter Kozma i negovata beseda protiv bogomilite*. Karnobat, 1921.
- KISELKOV, V., 1943. *Prezviter Kozma i negovite tvorenija*. Peto izdanie. Sofia, 1943.
- KOEV, T. BAKALOV, G., 2001. *Istorija na religiite*. Sofia: UI „St. Kliment Ohridski“. [in Bulgarian] ISBN 954-07-1622-5.
- MARINOV, B., VELICHKOV, A., 1959. Narachnik na apologeta. Kniga vтора. In: *Godishnik na Duhovnata akademija „St. Kliment Ohridski“*. T. VIII (XXXIV), 1958 – 1959, pp. 319 – 399. Sofia: Sinodalno izdatelstvo, 1959.
- MINEJ FEVRUARIJ, 2021. *Minej fevruarij*. Sofia: Sofijska sveta mitropolija. [in Bulgarian] ISBN 978-619-217-272-5.
- OBOLENSKI, D., 1998. *Bogomilite. Studija varhu balkanskoto novomanihejstvo*. Sofia: Zlatorog. [in Bulgarian] ISBN 954-437-055-2.

- PETKANOVA, D., 1986. *Starobalgarska literatura*. Chast I (IX – XII vek). Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.
- PETKANOVA, D. 2003. Petkanova, D. Beseda protiv bogomilite. In: DOBREV, I., MILTENOVA, A. (eds.) *Starobalgarska literatura. Enciklopedichen rechnik*, pp. 65 – 66. Veliko Tarnovo: Abagar. [in Bulgarian] ISBN 954-427-532-0.
- PODBRANI IZVORI, 2004. *Podbrani izvori za bulgarskata istorija*. T. II. *Bulgarskata darzhava i bulgarite prez Srednovekovieto*. Sofia: TangraTan-NakRa. [in Bulgarian] ISBN 954-9942-40-6.
- PREZVITER KOZMA, 2017. *Beseda protiv bogomilite*. Sofia: Asenevci. [in Bulgarian] ISBN 978-954-8898-88-1.
- PRIMOV, B., 1960. Bogomilskija dualizam. Proizhod, sashtnost i obshtestvenopoliticheskoto znachenie. In: KOSTOV, D., HADZHINIKOLOV, V., ANGELOV, D., BURMOV, A., HRISTOV, H. (eds.) *Izvestija na instituta za istorija*. Kn. 8, pp. 73 – 151. Sofia: BAN, 1960.
- RADEVA, D., 2015. RADEVA, D. *Pavlikjani i pavlikjanstvo v bulgarskite zemi. Arhetip i povtorenija VII – XVII vek*. Sofia: Paradigma. [in Bulgarian] ISBN 978-954-326-241-0.
- ST. DIONISIJ AREOPAGIT, 2001. *Za nebesnata jerarhija. Za c'rkovnata jerarhija*. Prevod Iv. Hristov. Sofia: Lik. [in Bulgarian] ISBN 954-607-501-9.
- ST. IRINEJ LIONSKI, 2021. Sreshtu eresite. In: Panova, N. (eds.) *Antologija po rannohristijanska literatura*. Sofia: Komunitas. [in Bulgarian] ISBN 978-619-224-030-1.
- STEFANOV, P., 2008. Stefanov, arhim. P. *Jaldavaot. Istorija i uchenie na gnosticheskata religija*. Sofia: Omofor. [in Bulgarian] ISBN 978-54-9700-70-1.
- TENEKEDZHIEV, L., 2008. TENEKEDZHIEV, L. *Bogoslovskata misal prez parvite tri veka (dogmatiko-patrologichen analiz). Tom I. Utvarzhdavane na apostolskoto predanie prez II vek*. Sofia: Artgraf. [in Bulgarian] ISBN 978-954-9401-23-3.
- HIERONYMUS. *Dialogus contra Luciferianus*. In: MIGNE, J-P., 1846. PL, col. 186. Paris: Imprimerie Catholique.
- ZIGABENOS, E. *Panoplia dogmatica*. In: MIGNE, J-P., 1865. PG 130, col. 9 – 1359. Paris: Imprimerie Catholique.

✉ **Prof. Dr. Dimo Penkov**

ORCID iD: 0009-0002-7493-3033

Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski", Bulgaria

E-mail: dimokr_penkov@theo.uni-sofia