



## PATRON OF THE STUDY OF THE BOGOMILS PORTRAIT OF SIR DIMITRI OBOLENSKY

### I. Introduction

Anyone engaged in the study of medieval Bogomils (approx. 950–1450) cannot avoid consulting Obolensky's absolute masterpiece, published in 1948: *The Bogomils. A Study in Balkan Neo-Manichaeism*. Whenever an interested colleague asks me for a book in which he can find reliable and well-organised information regarding the Bogomils, the answer is invariably: *The Bogomils* by Obolensky.

Completed as a dissertation over eighty years ago (1942)<sup>1</sup>, it appeared revised in print six years later. It has been reprinted twice and (only) in 1998 it experienced a translation into Bulgarian, followed by a Croatian translation in 2008. After all these years, *The Bogomils* is still an undisputed standard work.

In this contribution, we outline the author's very particular colourful life history, larded with a few anecdotes. In doing so, we try to give his bogomilian research a place amidst his seemingly endless scholarly output as a byzantinist.

It then focuses on the significance and exemplary role his work still has today. All this is followed in the appendix by a bibliography.

### II. Education and life

#### On the flight

Prince Dimitri Dimitrievich Obolensky was born 1 April 1918 in Petrograd (St Petersburg). Both his parents were of ancient and distinguished lineage. Countess Maria Shuvalova was the daughter of the City Governor of Moscow. Her mother Alexandra had many years earlier received a proposal of marriage from the future Nicholas II which she turned down with a great presence of mind: *What a good idea! I will marry Paul Shuvalov and you will appoint him your equerry!*

Obolensky's father Prince Dimitri Alexandrovich Obolensky was an observant, nature-loving landlord who took his public duties seriously. The humour and stoicism running through the memoir remained with him through the vicissitudes that followed the October Revolution. Such is the impression given by his son's affectionate reminiscences which recount – inter alia – his misapplied zeal as a night-watchman in Paris. Later on more about his father.

<sup>1</sup> D. OBOLENSKY, *A History of Bogomilism in Bulgaria* (diss., Cambridge 1943).

# BREAD OF EXILE

## A RUSSIAN FAMILY



DIMITRI OBOLENSKY  
With an Introduction by Hugh Trevor-Roper

**Fig. 1.** Baby Prince Dimitri in the arms of his father.

The “brief unhappy marriage” of his parents ended. Maria re-married Count Andrey Tolstoy and from 1923 they lived in Nice. These years Obolensky described as “the happiest years” of my life. In 1929 Count Tolstoy was pressured to transfer the ménage a Paris because of financial problems.

We return to one-year-old Dimitri, who had thus already had to leave his homeland in 1919 to escape the Bolsheviks, after the family, like thousands of others, had first fled to Kyiv. Dimitri boarded a British Navy ship sent to Crimea to bring

Empress Widow Maria and Grand Prince Nicholas II to safety. Mikhail Bulgakow<sup>2</sup> writes about this poignantly in his novel *The White Guard: Endless flow of refugees from the north, many with forged (forged) papers acquired to cross the frontier, begging for visas, dreaming of Paris, some grateful for the reassuring presence of the German army all united by their hatred of Bolshevism*. The city of Kyiv changed administrations fourteen times during that chaotic period.

In Crimea, little Dimitri initially had a safe haven in the famously impressive Vorontsov Palace of Alupka, which had been built as a residence for his ancestor, Anglophile Governor General Prince Michael Vorontsov. In retrospect, however, Dimitri looked down on the Romanows with disdain. Rather, he considered himself a distant descendant of Riurik, the ninth-century Viking chieftain who settled in Ladoga (currently: Staraya Ladocha) and whose descendants established the Kyiv Empire. The semi-legendary Viking prince Riurik occupies a special place in Russian history. Around 862, he is said to have established the dynasty of Riurikids or Riuriken in Novgorod. According to that reading, Riurik (meaning “famous regent”) is said to be at the cradle of the Kyiv Empire, the early-medieval of today’s Russia, Ukraine and Belarus<sup>3</sup>.

### Bread of exile

Much information about the life of Dimitri Obolensky can be found in the book *Bread of Exile. A Russian Family* in which Obolensky looks back on his life. It is an intellectual autobiography, an account of his gradual recovery, in exile, through personal friendship and historical study. The title alludes to Dante’s verse: *Thou shalt leave everything loved most dearly, and this is the shaft which the bow of exile shoots first. Thou shalt prove how salt is the taste of another man’s bread and how hard is the way up and down another man’s stairs (Paradiso, Canto XVII)*<sup>4</sup>.

In *Bread of Exile* two opposing worlds jostle and succeed each other: the world of privilege and power of imperial Russia, struggling to survive communist persecution and military attack and a life of dispossession and exile, covers his infancy

<sup>2</sup> Author of one of the masterworks out of the world literature, *Master i Margarita*, trans. in Dutch by M. FONDSE, Amsterdam: Arbeiderspers 1968. MIKHAIL BULGAKOW, *The White Guard*, trans. R. CROCKRELL, Richmond Alma Classics 2000.

<sup>3</sup> H. THUIS, *Nestorkroniek. De oudste geschiedenis van het Kievse Rijk* [Nestor chronicle The oldest history of the Kiyv Empire], Nijmegen 2015, p. 18–20 and *passim*.

<sup>4</sup> D. OBOLENSKY, *Bread of Exile. A Russian Family*, trans. from Russian H. WILLETS, praef. H. TREVOR-ROPER, London 1999. In addition to this book, in depicting Obolensky’s life course, I have been guided by: J. SHEPARD, *Dimitri Dimitrievich Obolensky, 1918–2001*, PBA 124, 2004, p. 342–266; P. BAHNERS, *Der wahre Demetrius*, “Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung” 28 Januar 2002, no. 23, p. 47; A. BRYER, *Obituary: Professor Sir Dimitri Obolensky*, “The Independent UK” 31 December 2001; M. BOURDEAUX, *Sir Dimitri Obolensky Distinguished Scholar of Byzantium whose Infectious Enthusiasm Drew Students to the Fields of Russian and Balkan History*, “The Guardian” 4 Januar 2002; S. FRANKLIN, *Sir Dimitri Obolensky 1 April 1918 – 23 December 2001*, PAPS 148.1, 2004, p. 139–144.

in the Crimea and childhood in Nice, his time at an English preparatory school, his studies in Paris and his experiences as a teacher at Cambridge and Oxford.

In Nice, he enjoyed four years (from age 7 to 11) of excellent private education in Russian literature and religion. In Versailles, too, he received free personal tuition. Meanwhile, the young Russian prince developed as a “normal” young man with a passion for football and especially tennis, a sport he dreamed of doing great things in one day!

The move to Paris would prove important because Paris was the most important centre of the Russian emigration. It was there that political, literary artistic activity, as well as the religious life of the émigrés was in the main concentrated. Their leaders were convinced that they were the standard bearers of Russian culture. This was “proved” with award of Nobel Prize in literature to Ivan Bunin. He was in the company of people like Berdaev, Lossky, Chagall, Kandinsky, Stravinsky, Grabar and the chess player Aljechin. Bulgakow also had plans to come to Paris but after a telephone conversation with Stalin, he refrained from going abroad. Émigrés put pressure on each other in the French capital to maintain their no small cultural tradition. *For those of us who have lost our country, Russian literature is our final homeland, all that Russia was and will be*, Obolensky writes about it.

### **Altar boy in the Orthodox Church**

Dimitri was religiously educated in Paris (Neuilly) under the influence of his life-long admired mother in the Orthodox Church where he was an altar boy and a member of the Russian Orthodox Church. He was later reluctant to speak openly about his religious beliefs but his faith was “deep and abiding”, according to Shepard. He would continue to receive the sacraments regularly until his death. The priest Father George Florovsky was by then a household name in patristics and it was this celebrity that shaped him religiously. These were influences that would help define Dimitri for a lifetime.

His father led a professionally adventurous and extremely colourful life in Paris as an émigré: purser on the transatlantic Isle de France, training instructor horse riding, trader in rabbit skins, guide for wealthy Americans in Parisian nightlife, secretary to a curious Scot who wanted to buy up the rivers of Corsica for salmon fishing, a night watchman patrolling the area around the Paris Opera. All this united in one person. The majority of émigrés in Paris were impoverished but reliable Russians. His uncle Peter, for instance, was a taxi driver in Paris: out of 17,000 drivers, 7,000 were Russian at the time.

### **Trinity College**

Meanwhile, there were also ample periods when Dimitri went to England for his education. To gain admission to the famous Trinity College in Oxford, he had to take exams in French and Russian, Latin and English, and in what I would call

“Knowledge about UK”. The latter could well be a stumbling block. He got an admirable tutor in the healthiest town in UK Didcot (Berkshire) south of Oxford, where people reach the highest average age in the whole of UK: 86 in good health.

The tutor taught him a lot about English culture by always reciting from memory the best English poets. Returning to Paris one afternoon, Dimitri could welcome a telegram from Oxford: *A hundred pounds scholarship – congratulations*. That posed some problems for the stateless Dimitri who needed at least 220 pounds to live. But Trinity was generous: for the next five years he would be fully supported by Trinity. At first he wanted to do philosophy, where he also met Wittgenstein but, on reflection, that was not so prospective. So he returned to modern languages: French and Russian.

He was given two study leaders. The first was Elizabeth Hill, lecturer in Slavonic Studies who looked out for students who knew or wanted to learn Russian. Elizabeth Hill was a committed teacher and invited her students, for example, to her home in the evening to sing Russian songs. Obolensky mentions that it was Elizabeth Hill who provided him with the topic of the Bogomils for his dissertation. It was an inspired choice in which Obolensky could express his knowledge of Slavic languages, his fascination with the Orthodox Church and its past. It was also a subject that involved him in his personal life questions of Good and Evil that the Bogomils themselves had tried to answer. His work on the dissertation progressed astonishingly fast. He completed it in less than three years and demonstrated in it that he had a magisterial command of the nevertheless extremely complicated subject. The formidable problems concerning bogomilian beliefs, the origins of those beliefs and the reliability of the mostly hostile sources about so called heretics are handled with great clarity and insight. The story goes that at the same time Sir Steven Runciman was working room to room on his famous *The Medieval Manichee* but that is not correct. Runciman had already finished this book at the outbreak of war in 1940 and did not publish it until 1947. The gentlemen did become good – though characterologically very different – friends.

It was soon clear to French study leader Rev H. Stewart that Dimitri needed a knowledge of English literature rather than French. On his advice, Dimitri read some English classics including *Vanity Fair* by Thackeray which in turn was taken from John Bunyan’s allegorical *The Pilgrim’s Progress*. The latter book significantly deepened his understanding of inner Christianity.

Working at the British Museum, Obolensky got to know Czech scholar Francis Dvornik<sup>5</sup>. His oecumenical approach and meticulous scholarship appealed to him. He learned from Dvornik the technique of organising complicated matters in texts and providing “signposts” for the average reader. All this added to Obolensky’s unspeakable talent for quickly mastering complicated matters and explaining them clearly and simply. In short: simplicity, overview and focus would become his academic hallmark.

---

<sup>5</sup> D. OBOLENSKY, *Father Francis Dvornik*, HSS 2, 1954, p. 1–9.



Fig. 2. Professor Dimitri Obolensky fotoportret.

### Prince turns Professor

Colourful details provide Obolensky's wartime adventures as a soldier! He had himself trained as a soldier. As an officer, he should soon be able to qualify but it was not easy. To become an officer, you had to be a British subject. A stateless person like soldier Dimitri could only join the staff with Czech refugees. The Cambridge authorities would probably not be so enthusiastic about his military potential: *I proved quite hopeless in dismantling and reassembling the Bren gun, and less than harp in drilling a platoon of recruits.* After observing his activities, an officer approached him head-shaking: *Obolensky you don't sound convincing.* But during a survival, things improved again when he was singing songs familiar to the men and the sergeant major not without irony attributed "leadership qualities" to him. But that was all. Exit Obolensky as a soldier!

1961 was the year when Obolensky's great abilities and his social function finally began to coincide. He became a professor at Oxford. As proof of his transformation, he had "Prince" painted over by "Prof." on the door of his room in the then famous Christcollege. This went even further when he was knighted by Elizabeth II as vice-president of the British Academy in 1984. The title of his famous 1971 book – *The Byzantine Commonwealth* – was an expression of his thanks to the country that saw its commonwealth gradually crumble and of which he had become a citizen in 1948. And not only that: *Obolensky's vision of the Byzantine Commonwealth as an international society of personal ties and basic Christian values was one by which he sought to live out his own life* (Shepard). It was a kind of life programme!

His personal life was less smooth than his scientific career. On 1 October 1947, he married Elisabeth Lopukhin, a Russian whose parents had emigrated to Paris via Manchuria and the US. The childless marriage lasted for 42 years until they divorced in 1989.

Dimitry Obolensky died at The Cotswold Home, near Burford in the Cotswolds, on 23 December 2001. During the Memorial Service Bunyan's known poem *To be a pilgrim* rang out and there was a reading from Six Byzantine Portraits.

### III. Works and opinions

#### To be a pilgrim in the past

A scientist of such aristocratic descent who had had to fight himself through the loneliness of hard life, a scientist also with a broad knowledge also of the history of Eastern Europe and Byzantium, additionally equipped with a special knowledge of languages, was ideally suited to do pioneering work in the research on the Bogomils. He could hardly rely on recent studies because the works of Slavists he held in high esteem such as Franjo Racki and Ivanov<sup>6</sup> were by now firmly dated<sup>7</sup>.

Because of his aristocratic origins and his experiences in exile, he had developed an unerring antenna for the class difference between Bulgarian countrymen and the Byzantine upper class. These feudal relations were one of the genesis factors of Bogomilism. Obolensky therefore explained the persistence with which the Bogomils maintained themselves in Bulgaria as a national resistance to Byzantium's domination. So much so that this political interpretation threatened to push somewhat into the background the appeal of the actual programme of the Bogomils' strict asceticism and criticism of the land-owning church. That Obolensky had a razor-sharp grasp of the aforementioned class difference and its effects

<sup>6</sup> D. OBOLENSKY, *A History of Bogomilism...*, p. 287.

<sup>7</sup> F. RACKI, *Bogomili I Patareni*, RJAZU 7, 8, 10, 1869–1870, p. 161–627; IDEM, *L'hérésie des Bogomiles en Bosnie et en Bulgarie au Moyen Âge*, trans. L. LÉGER, Paris 1870, p. 479–517; J. IVANOV, *Livres et Légendes bogomiles. Aux Sources du Catharisme*, trans. M. RIBEYROL, Paris 1976.

was evident, for example, in a beautifully written review which he provided with the all-important headline *Cads and Aristocrats*<sup>8</sup>.

But that is not the whole story. Obolensky explains the growing attention to the classic question *unde malum et quare?* (Whence evil and why?) in tenth-century Bulgaria from the dire social situation<sup>9</sup>. *It is an era of great social and economic crises, of invasions, of atrocities against the people, and among the peasantry. Then the question naturally arises as to why we are suffering, as individuals and as a society.* And this is precisely where the philosophy of Bogomils offered solace, and Obolensky makes an essential connection here.

### Evil is the absence of good

The Bogomils consider evil as the privation of good, Obolensky stated. This evil exists in good and depends for its existence on good. Hence the cause of evil is found to be in good. This good is man's free will which is a gift of God. Man's abuse of his free will caused his finite condition. His state of inferiority as a creature in relation to his creator has resulted in his separation from God. This separation resulted in a state of privation, which has brought about disorder, suffering, corruption and other manifestations of evil. In short: evil is the absence of good<sup>10</sup>.

The seat of evil is the visible material world where disorder and suffering are dominant. Hence also – in response – the well-known mantram of Manichean origin: *Love not the world but the father*. Man mirrors this fundamental dualism: the soul is of divine origin, the body is ineradicably evil<sup>11</sup>.

<sup>8</sup> D. OBOLENSKY [rec.:], *Cads and Aristocrats*. R. Browning, *Byzantium and Bulgaria. A Comparative Study Across the Early Medieval Frontier*, TLS 2, 1975, p. 477.

<sup>9</sup> *Hérésies et Sociétés dans l'Europe pré-industrielle 11<sup>e</sup>–18<sup>e</sup> siècles*, ed. J. LE GOFF, Paris 1968, p. 117, 118 – Obolensky's minuted oral contribution to a discussion after a lecture of Ch. THOUZELLIER, *Tradition et résurgence dans l'hérésie médiévale: considérations*, p. 105–116.

<sup>10</sup> This approach by Obolensky represents an important intermediate step towards a more modern approach to dualism that reached a provisional peak at the beginning of this century in the study by Yuri STOYANOV, *The Other God. Dualist Religions from Antiquity to the Cathar Heresy*, New Haven–London 2000, p. 196 and 197. Paraphrased Stoyanov's approach to dualism boils down to the following: Dualism as a concept has only been in existence for two centuries and it can be applied to almost all gnostic systems. There are two completely separate worlds: the divine world created by God and this world, being the world of Satan and the world of evil. These worlds are often designated as the realm of light and the realm of darkness. Analogically, the human being is also of dual nature. He is matter, but there is also a divine principle in him which reminds him of his divine origin and, when his consciousness rises, guides him back to his divine source. Satan in bogomil-ian and catharist dualism was created by the higher God and because of his rebellion was casted out of heaven and created the material cosmos. Conversely, in medieval radical dualism Lucifer proceeds immediately from the eternal principle of evil, from an evil god, who was coeternal and coexistent with the good God.

<sup>11</sup> The British author Timothy Freke calls the body "the nightclub of the soul"! [T. FREKE, P. GANDY, *The Jesus Mysteries*, New York 2000, *passim*].



Building on this, Obolensky distinguishes two basic trends in Bogomilism

1. The first is the aforementioned dualistic cosmology which is of foreign origin and according to him imported from the Near East.
2. The second is largely autochthonous: based on the dissatisfaction with the reigning church, the Bogomils wanted to reestablish a universal religion in a desire to return to the purity and simplicity of the apostolic age.

Obolensky's reading is such that he can point out with his authority three features<sup>12</sup> of Bogomilism which are original:

- the doctrine of the two sons of God, the Devil and Christ;
- the teaching on the introduction of the soul into the body of Adam, the first man;
- the exclusive use of the Lord's Prayer. Obolensky: *These features cannot be explained by any outside influence and are original.*

### Foundation for continued studies

Dimitri Obolensky's "pilgrimage into the past of the Bogomils" saved this hitherto relatively unknown heretical movement from oblivion. This is Obolensky's greatest achievement with regard to the study of the Bogomils. He has done a thorough job of making the subject comprehensible and clear for Western researchers. Together with Steven Runciman<sup>13</sup>, Henri Charles Puech<sup>14</sup> and Milan Loos<sup>15</sup>, he laid the foundation for continued studies in medieval "heresies" after 1945.

To be sure, Racki and Ivanov (see note 7) had also thoroughly researched the subject long before Obolensky but due to language and cultural barriers, their work reached only a limited readership. And we have to go back as far as 1700 to find the first distinguished historian who was not only the first to introduce Bogomils but also to appreciate them. The brilliant German theologian/historian Gottfried Arnold<sup>16</sup> (1666–1714) posthumously stood up for them in no uncertain terms: *The bloodily persecuted Bogomils were the classic example of the fact that the so called heretics were merely witnesses of the truth. It is the clergymen who should be called heretics.* Arnold had an "epigone" in the theologian/historian, Johann

<sup>12</sup> D. OBOLENSKY, *A History of Bogomilism...*, p. 138.

<sup>13</sup> S. RUNCIMAN, *The Medieval Manichee. A Study of the Christian Dualist Heresy*, Cambridge 1947.

<sup>14</sup> H.-Ch. PUECH, A. VAILLANT, *Le traité contre les Bogomiles du prêtre Cosmas*, Paris 1945.

<sup>15</sup> M. LOOS, *Dualist Heresy in the Middle Ages*, Den Haag 1974.

<sup>16</sup> G. ARNOLD, *Unpartheyische Kirchen- and Ketzer-Historie vom Anfang des neuen Testaments bis auf das Jahr Christi 1688*, Frankfurt a. M.–Leipzig 1699.

Conrad Füssly<sup>17</sup>, sometimes called the Swiss Gottfried Arnold, who also included the first bibliography of the Bogomils in volume III of his comprehensive work.

Back again to the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Yuri Stoyanov (see note 10) and Bernard Hamilton<sup>18</sup> have written penetrating accounts on Bogomils and interesting publications appear regularly. But after eighty years the subject, meanwhile, deserves a newly updated, eye opening handbook!

### A Kindred spirit

Personally, I never experienced Dimitri Obolensky. That he had a beautiful sonorous voice with which he could mesmerise the lecture hall, that he could make the Slavonic texts ring loud and clear in every corner of a large church with beautiful articulation, that he could make his students super enthusiastic about Byzantium, that he was a frantic motorcyclist and that he harboured a great love for Greece... I have it all from ear and eye witnesses.

But finally, when You ask me to characterise him somewhat characterologically, I know of no hesitation and am immediately reminded of his portrait of Theophylact of Ohrid (~1055–1107) in *Six Byzantine portraits*<sup>19</sup> which stylistically and psychologically is a highlight of his oeuvre.

In it, he perfectly senses how Bishop Theophylact, appointed as head of the Bulgarian church, was experiencing his “exile” and yet was able to make commitment for his flock in solitude. Theophylact was an aristocratic Byzantine intellectual. He had served the court in Constantinople for many years as the educator of the young sovereign-who experienced his position in Ohrid as a tormenting task due to his homesickness. He must have felt rather schizophrenic in Ohrid. He despised his “barbaric” environment, he was annoyed by the “rude manners” of his faithful and by the “barbaric Slavic language”. Nevertheless he had the inspiration to write meanwhile brilliant commentaries on the four Gospels and the epistles of Paul.

<sup>17</sup> J.C. FÜSSLY, *Neue und unpartheyische Kirchen- und Ketzerhistorie der mittleren Zeit*, vol. I–III, Frankfurt a. M. 1770–1774. For the remark about the bibliography I am thankful to the late Prof. Georgi Vasilev (personal e-mail from Sofia, July 2014). Füssly (1704–1775) wrote two dissertations about the migration of medieval heretics as Cathars, Waldensians and Patarenes to England and to Italy in Latin (*Dissertatio de fanaticis seculo XII in Anglia repertis; Dissertatio de fanaticis seculo XII in Italia repertis*, Bern 1761). This “Swiss Gottfried Arnold” was a relative of the Swiss painter Johann Heinrich Füssli (called Henry Fuseli in England) who worked in England and had much influence on the dualist motifs in the paintings of his spiritual friend the famous painter William Blake (G. VASILEV, *Heresy and the English Reformation Bogomil-Cathar Influence on Wycliffe, Langdale, Tyndale and Milton, Jefferson (North Carolina)*, London 2008, p. 159).

<sup>18</sup> HUGH ETERIANO, *Contra Patarenos*, ed. B. HAMILTON, J. HAMILTON, S. HAMILTON, Leiden 2004 [= MMe, 55], *Historical Introduction* by B. HAMILTON, p. 1–102; B. HAMILTON, J. HAMILTON, *Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World c.650 – c.1405*, Manchester 1998.

<sup>19</sup> D. BOBOLENSKY, 2. *Theophylact of Ohrid*, [in:] *Six Byzantine Portraits*, Oxford 1999, p. 34–82, *passim*.

So sharp and brilliant were these that Erasmus initially mistook him for a fourth-century church father<sup>20</sup>. On the other hand he gradually received more sympathy for the simple faithful that surrounded him and he became impressed by their pious devotion towards God. In social regard, he was warmly committed to the fate of the poor farmers. Theophylact agitated against the rapacious Byzantine tax collectors. He also became deeply involved in local cultural development.

The empathy Obolensky displays for this particular Byzantine “expat” bishop shows that he himself could somewhat identify with Theophylact’s special “split” personality, indeed: that he may well have recognised an early kindred spirit in Theophylact. Both aristocrats, both erudite intellectuals, both highly talented authors, both deeply religious, both alienated from their roots, both more or less foreigners in their world.

#### IV. Closing remarks

##### **The Beauty of a medieval Balkan model of Gnose**

Thanks to his cosmopolitan upbringing, Obolensky was a man of many worlds. This is precisely an indispensable quality when dealing with a subject like the Bogomils. According to its historical and literary qualities and the cosmopolitan view of the world of the author his publications have surely no peer among the writings of the Bogomils. I never cease to marvel at the acuteness of his mind and the wittiness of his statements.

Making history is reshaping the world in the rear-view mirror. It is a kind of collective effort of “survivors” who need each other to bring the past to life.

In this sense, Dimitri Obolensky is one of the most valuable researchers I ever met. He did not want to demonstrate only the oldness, the beauty and the power of a medieval Balkan model of Gnose. In a beautiful style he taught his audience to be interested in the past as far as we have a present and a future. Here I may quote the Chinese master Lao Zi who was living five centuries before Christ: *The experts of the past are the masters of the future.*

Goirle NL – Łódź PL, 13 May 2023

---

<sup>20</sup> M. SCREECH, *Ecstasy and the Praise of Folly*, London 1980, *passim*.

## V. Appendix

### SELECTED PUBLICATIONS OF OBLOENSKY ON THE BOGOMILS<sup>21</sup> during the course of his career

**1943**

*A History of Bogomilism in Bulgaria* (dissertation, Cambridge 1943).

**1945**

*The Bogomils*, "Eastern Churches Quarterly", p. 1–23, reprint in: *Byzantium and the Slavs. Collected Studies*, praef. I. Dujcev, London 1971, p. 1–23 and in: *Byzantium and the Slavs*, New York 1994, p. 259–280.

**1948**

*The Bogomils. A Study in Balkan Neo-Manichaeism*, Cambridge, reprint: Twickenham 1972 and New York 1978.

**1950**

*Bogomilism in the Byzantine Empire*, [in:] *Actes du VI<sup>e</sup> Congrès International d'études byzantines, Paris 27 juillet–2 août 1948*, Paris, p. 289–297.

**1954**

*Father Francis Dvornik*, "Harvard Slavic Studies" 2, p. 1–9.

**1963**

*Sts Cyril and Methodius, Apostles of Slavs*, "St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly" 7, p. 1–13, reprint in: *Byzantium and the Slavs. Collected Studies*, London 1971, p. 1–13 and *Byzantium and the Slavs*, New York 1994, p. 205–217.

**1964**

*Le Christianisme oriental et les doctrines dualistes*, [in:] *Atti del Convegno Internazionale sul tema. L'Oriente cristiano nella storia della civiltà*, Rome, p. 643–651.

**1968**

*Bogomils*, [in:] *Encyclopaedia Britannica Anniversary Edition*, vol. III, Chicago, p. 844–845.

**1969**

Knowles D., Obolensky D., *The Middle Ages*, London.

**1971**

*The Byzantine Commonwealth. Eastern Europe 500–1453*, London, reprint: London 1974 and Crestwood–New York 1982.

**1983**

*Papas Nicetas: A Byzantine Dualist in the Land of the Cathars*, "Harvard Ukrainian Studies" 7, p. 489–500.

<sup>21</sup> For these selected publications I am partly indebted to D. HOWELLS, *The Publications of Sir Dimitri Obolensky*, OSP 31, 1998, p. 1–11.

**1988**

*Six Byzantine Portraits*, London.

**1994**

[rec.:] *Review of N. Malcolm, Bosnia: A short History (London 1994)*, "The Times Literary Supplement" 8, p. 15–16.

**2008**


*Bogumili studija o balkanskom neomaniheizmu*, trans. Z. Filippi, Zagreb.

**Bibliography**

- ARNOLD G., *Unpartheyische Kirchen- and Ketzer-Historie vom Anfang des neuen Testaments bis auf das Jahr Christi 1688*, Frankfurt a. M.–Leipzig 1699.
- BAHNERS P., *Der wahre Demetrius*, "Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung" 28 Januar 2002, no. 23, p. 47.
- BOURDEAUX M., *Sir Dimitri Obolensky Distinguished Scholar of Byzantium whose Infectious Enthusiasm Drew Students to the Fields of Russian and Balkan History*, "The Guardian" 4 Januar 2002.
- BRYER A., *Obituary: Professor Sir Dimitri Obolensky*, "The Independent UK" 31 December 2001.
- FRANKLIN S., *Sir Dimitri Obolensky 1 April 1918 – 23 December 2001*, "Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society" 148.1, 2004, p. 139–144.
- FREKE T., GANDY P., *The Jesus Mysteries*, New York 2000.
- FÜSSLY J.C., *Neue und unpartheyische Kirchen- und Ketzerhistorie der mittleren Zeit*, vol. I–III, Frankfurt a. M. 1770–1774.
- HAMILTON B., HAMILTON J., *Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World c.650 – c.1405*, Manchester 1998.
- Hérésies et Sociétés dans l'Europe pré-industrielle 11<sup>e</sup>–18<sup>e</sup> siècles*, ed. J. LE GOFF, Paris 1968.
- HOWELLS D., *The Publications of Sir Dimitri Obolensky*, "Oxford Slavonic Papers" 31, 1998, p. 1–11.
- HUGH ETERIANO, *Contra Patarenos*, ed. B. HAMILTON, J. HAMILTON, S. HAMILTON, Leiden 2004 [= *The Medieval Mediterranean*, 55], [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789047405993\\_009](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789047405993_009)
- IVANOV J., *Livres et Légendes bogomiles. Aux Sources du Catharisme*, trans. M. RIBEYROL, Paris 1976.
- LOOS M., *Dualist Heresy in the Middle Ages*, Den Haag 1974.
- OBOLENSKY D. [rec.:], *Cads and Aristocrats. R. Browning, Byzantium and Bulgaria. A Comparative Study Across the Early Medieval Frontier*, "The Times Literary Supplement" 2, 1975, p. 477.
- OBOLENSKY D., 2. *Theophylact of Ohrid*, [in:] *Six Byzantine Portraits*, Oxford 1999, p. 34–82.
- OBOLENSKY D., *A History of Bogomilism in Bulgaria* (diss., Cambridge 1943).
- OBOLENSKY D., *Bread of Exile. A Russian Family*, trans. from Russian H. WILLETS, praef. H. TREVOR-ROPER, London 1999.
- OBOLENSKY D., *Father Francis Dvornik*, "Harvard Slavic Studies" 2, 1954, p. 1–9.
- PUECH H.-Ch., VAILLANT A., *Le traité contre les Bogomiles du prêtre Cosmas*, Paris 1945, <https://doi.org/10.3406/slave.1944.1415>
- RACKI F., *Bogumili I Patareni*, "Rad Jugoslavenske Akademije Znanosti i Umjetnosti" 7, 8, 10, 1869–1870, p. 161–627.

- RACKI F., *L'hérésie des Bogomiles en Bosnie et en Bulgarie au Moyen Âge*, trans. L. LÉGER, Paris 1870.
- RUNCIMAN S., *The Medieval Manichee. A Study of the Christian Dualist Heresy*, Cambridge 1947.
- SCREECH M., *Ecstasy and the Praise of Folly*, London 1980.
- SHEPARD J., *Dimitri Dimitrievich Obolensky, 1918–2001*, “Proceedings of the British Academy” 124, 2004, p. 342–266, <https://doi.org/10.5871/bacad/9780197263204.003.0014>
- STOYANOV Y., *The Other God. Dualist Religions from Antiquity to the Cathar Heresy*, New Haven–London 2000, <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt5vm3q2>
- THUIS H., *Nestorkroniek. De oudste geschiedenis van het Kievse Rijk*, Nijmegen 2015.
- VASILEV G., *Heresy and the English Reformation Bogomil-Cathar Influence on Wycliffe, Langdale, Tyn-dale and Milton, Jefferson (North Carolina)*, London 2008.

**Dick van Niekerk** (Nijmegen; Tilburg)\*

 <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-4746-2575>

---

\* Radboud University Nijmegen; Tilburg University – The Netherlands