
A Monk, a Preacher, and a Jesuit: Making the Life of Milíč

David C. Mengel

(Cincinnati, Ohio)

Milíč of Kroměříž (d. 1374) requires no introduction among scholars of the Bohemian Reformation. We remember him, after all, as the “Father of the Bohemian Reformation.”¹ The story of Milíč’s life has been told and re-told by historians and theologians, its main features so well-known that they need not be rehearsed here in great detail. Nevertheless, a few highlights are worth remembering. Hailing, as his name clearly indicates, from Moravia, Milíč held a series of positions within the imperial chancery before appearing as a canon and sacristan at St. Vitus’ cathedral in the year 1363, at which time he also exercised the duties of the Prague archdeacon. Yet Milíč suddenly rejected all of this, abandoning the life of a comfortable prelate in favour of the impoverished existence of a public preacher. He was soon preaching in Prague, to small and later to large audiences. This untrained but dedicated preacher even learned German in order to reach those who could not understand his Czech or Latin sermons. Milíč enjoyed the warm regard of Prague’s archbishop and the enthusiastic support of many of his listeners. On the other hand, his public expression of controversial beliefs about the Antichrist twice landed him prison—once in Prague and once in Rome. Near the end of his life, Milíč established Jerusalem, a religious community that brought together repentant prostitutes and preaching clerics. Frequent communion, communal property, and an emphasis on preaching characterized this community, which soon encountered a hostile coalition of local parish priests and mendicant friars.² In 1374, Milíč headed to Avignon to defend himself before the pope against a series of charges emanating from his Prague enemies. There the saintly preacher was exonerated, but died before he could return to Prague.

We know, in fact, quite a lot about Milíč’s life, thanks in large part to two fourteenth-century biographies, one anonymous and one by Matthias of Janov, both conveniently reprinted by Emler in the *Fontes rerum bohemicarum*.³ The anonymous *vita* in particular, at more than six times the length of Janov’s life, provides the lion’s share of our historical information about Milíč. Scholars have noticed the hagiographical character of this text and even occasionally discounted a

¹ “Father of the Bohemian Reformation” is the subtitle of František Loskot’s 1911 biography, *Milíč z Kroměříže* (Prague, 1911).

² For a recent account of Jerusalem and further historiography on Milíč, see my “From Venice to Jerusalem and Beyond: Milíč of Kroměříž and the Topography of Prostitution in Fourteenth-century Prague,” *Speculum* 79 (2004) 407-442.

³ The so-called “Narracio de Milicio” appears in the third book of Matthias of Janov’s *Regulae veteris et novi testamenti*, ed. Vlastimil Kybal (Prague, 1911) 3:358-67. The earlier edition by Josef Emler, FRB 1:431-436, continues to be cited in most of the literature. Emler printed the anonymous *vita* in the same volume 403-430.

detail or two for this reason.⁴ Yet in general, this life—the so-called *Vita venerabilis presbyteri Milicii, praelati ecclesiae Pragensis*—has been treated as the best, most reliable, and nearly contemporary, witness to Milíč's life. Recently, however, Peter Morée has argued that this text may in fact represent an adaptation of a mediaeval source by Bohuslav Balbín, rewritten to conform to the seventeenth-century Jesuit's own agenda.⁵ For this reason, and because of further discoveries by Zdeněk Uhlíř, Jana Nechutová's recent catalogue of mediaeval Latin texts from Bohemia takes a cautious view about the text's origin.⁶ In this paper, I would like to evaluate Morée's suggestion in the light of new information: namely, that this *vita* borrows quite extensively from other mediaeval sources — sources that, to my knowledge, no one has before noticed. After revealing a few of these numerous, word-for-word correspondences, I will discuss how this biography may have been compiled and who the compiler might have been. Finally, I will point to some of the implications for our knowledge of the life of Milíč. What elements of the standard story now become suspect, or even manifestly false? Which parts can be salvaged? To answer these, we must look more closely not at one life, but at three—the lives of a monk (Bernard of Clairvaux), a preacher (Milíč), and a Jesuit (Balbín).

Part I

Balbín first printed the text of the *Vita*, ostensibly from a manuscript he found in Třeboň,⁷ in his *Miscellanea historica regni Bohemiae*, the relevant volume of which appeared in 1682.⁸ Josef Emler, unable to locate any such manuscript two centuries later, had no choice but to reprint Balbín's text, almost without change.⁹ Nor has anyone since located the manuscript, despite the transfer of the Třeboň

⁴ Miloslav Kaňak, for instance, argued that Milíč came from a noble Moravian family, discounting the *vita*'s assertion that his family was undistinguished as a hagiographic commonplace (*Milíč z Kroměříže* [Prague, 1975] 12-13).

⁵ *Preaching in Fourteenth-century Bohemia: The Life and Ideas of Milicius de Chremsir (†1374) and his Significance in the Historiography of Bohemia* (Heršpice, Czech Republic, 1999) 42-69.

⁶ Zdeněk Uhlíř, "Legenda Oriente iam sole II v hagiografické tradici 13. – 15. století," *Acta Universitatis Carolinae. Philosophica et historica* 2 (1981) 143-47; Jana Nechutová, *Latinská literatura českého středověku do roku 1400* (Prague, 2000) 127-28.

⁷ *Epitome historica rerum Bohemiarum* (Prague, 1677) 407-408: "Vitam Joannis Milicii (non de Miliczin, quod nomen Weleslavinum decepit) inter vetustissimos Bibliothecae Trebonensis Codices membraneos inveni, ex qua discimus gravissimis accusationibus apud Pontificem, per Magistrum Universitatis Carolinae Joannem Klonkoth Romae accusatum, sed ab Archiepiscopo Pragensi, Joanne, Praegae, & à Cardinali Albanensi, (ad quem moriens Epistolam perelegantem, & spiritu plenam, cujus exemplar habeo, dictavit) Romae defensum, & ab Urbano Papa absolutum. Fuit Milicius Archidiaconus Pragensis Ecclesiae, sub Archiepiscopo Ernesto, sed humilitatis amore (quanquam Ernestus sanctissimus Praesul, Consilium Milicii non probaret, ut in hujus Vita legere est) dignitatem hanc sponte exiit, totumque se privatus homo, ad animas concionibus sacris DEO adducendas, ut impetus ferebat, contulit."

⁸ This was the date of the fourth book of Decas 1; the entire work began appearing in 1679 (A. Rejzek, *Bohuslav Balbín T. J.: Jeho život a práce* [Prague, 1908] 240-41).

⁹ Most of Emler's text follows Balbín's text exactly with only minor orthographical changes and the omission of Balbín's marginal comments. In one passage, however, Emler emended the text. Evidently having noticed a parallel between Milíč's "Libellus de Antichristo" and the *Vita* printed by Balbín, Emler changed the text of the *Vita* to more closely correspond with the "Libellus". Specifically, Emler reintroduced a reference to Antichrist that Balbín's less controversial text lacks ("Libellus de Antichristo," in Matthias of Janov, *Regulae* 3:369-71; *Miscellanea historica Regni Bohemiae*, Decas 1, lib. 4, pp. 49-50; FRB 1:411. For a comparison of the three texts, see my "From Venice to Jerusalem and Beyond," 429, n. 103).

collection to the Klementinum. It would seem to be irretrievably lost. So it comes as some surprise, then, that a search for the text's *incipit* in various indices and databases returns dozens of matching manuscripts, spread throughout European and even North American libraries.¹⁰ The entire opening paragraph reads as follows:

I call upon the aid of your love, O Lord, which inspires me to write the life of your servant, if you will allow it, in order to honour you. Through him, it pleased you to make the church of our day shine once again with the ancient splendour of apostolic grace and power. What person, having any breath at all, and witnessing the testimony of your glory shining forth in the world in our times — a testimony so brilliant, so faithful, so unaccustomed — what person would not be inspired by your love to act, to give every effort, so as to ensure that this light, kindled by you, should not be hidden from any of your people? Who would not want to let it shine forth to all who dwell in your house, even though no human writing can reveal and exalt this light so well as you do through the power of your works.¹¹

A moving piece of rhetoric, to be sure; yet no student of Milíč penned these words. They were written more than two centuries earlier, by William of St. Thierry, who used them to open his life of Bernard of Clairvaux. The dozens of manuscripts beginning with this passage contain Bernard's life, not that of Milíč. Let me be clear on this point. Precisely the same paragraph begins the so-called *Vita prima* of Bernard of Clairvaux and the *Vita Milicii* printed by Balbín (parallel parts underlined below):

¹⁰ The incipit: *Scripturus vitam servi tui ad honorem nominis tui*. For the manuscripts and a discussion of the *Vita prima* of Bernard of Clairvaux, see Adriaan Hendrik Bredero, "Études sur la «Vita prima» de Saint Bernard (I), *Analecta sacri ordinis Cisterciensis* 17 (1961) 3-72; 215-260.

¹¹ "Scripturus vitam servi tui ad honorem nominis tui, prout tu dederis d. deus, per quem ecclesiam nostri temporis in antiquum apostolicae gratiae et virtutis decus voluisti reflorescere, eum invoco adiutorem, quem jam olim habeo incentorem, amorem tuum. Quis enim de amore tuo, quantumcunque spiraculum vitae habens et videns testimonium gloriae tuae tam praeclarum et tam fidelem temporibus nostris mundo insolitum effulsisse, non agat et satagat, non det operam, quantumcunque poterit, ne lumen a te incensum tuorum quempiam lateat? sed quantum humano stylo fieri potest, quod melius ipse tamen per virtutem operum facis manifestum et exaltatum, velit, ut luceat omnibus, qui sunt in domo tua?" (FRB 1:403).

Vita venerabilis presbyteri Milicii...

Scripturus vitam servi tui ad honorem nominis tui, prout tu dederis d. deus, per quem ecclesiam nostri temporis in antiquum apostolicae gratiae et virtutis decus voluisti reflorescere, eum invoco adiutorem, quem jam olim habeo incantorem, amorem tuum. Quis enim de amore tuo, quantumcunque spiraculum vitae habens et videns testimonium gloriae tuae tam praeclarum et tam fidelem temporibus nostris mundo insolitum effulsisse, non agat et satagat, non det operam, quantumcunque poterit, ne lumen a te incensum tuorum quempiam lateat? sed quantum humano stylo fieri potest, quod melius ipse tamen per virtutem operum facis manifestum et exaltatum, velit, ut luceat omnibus, qui sunt in domo tua? (FRB 1:403)

*Vita Prima Bernardi*¹²

Scripturus vitam Servi tui ad honorem nominis tui, prout tu dederis, Domine Deus ipsius, per quem Ecclesiam temporis nostri in antiquum apostolicae gratiae et virtutis decus voluisti refluere, eum invoco adiutorem, quem jam olim habeo incantorem, amorem tuum. Quis enim de amore tuo quantumcunque spiraculum vitae habens, et videns testimonium gloriae et honoris tui tam praeclarum et tam fidele mundo insolitum effulsisse, non det operam, quantumcunque poterit, ne lumen a te accensum, tuorum quempiam lateat; sed quantum humano fieri stylo potest (quod melius ipse tamen per virtutem operum facis), manifestatum et exaltatum luceat omnibus qui sunt in domo tua? (PL 185:225A)

That is just the beginning of the correspondences. For example, if we turn to the concluding paragraphs of the life (see Appendix 1), we can see that here verbatim borrowing (the underlined text) makes up the majority of the text. The long passage from Gregory the Great is in fact identified as such. The rest, unattributed, comes from the first life of Bernard of Clairvaux. This includes almost the entirety of the final paragraph, which reflects upon the grief caused by Bernard's death and sings the praises of his holy life. In the words of Bernard's former secretary, the monk's death brought "a tempest of thoughts among us, shipwrecks of souls" — a line that some have offered as proof that the author of Milíč's life was a contemporary, someone living among his followers at the time of his death.

What do these borrowings amount to? So far, I have found unacknowledged quotations that together account for more than one-sixth of the text of Milíč's life, or five pages out of twenty-nine in my transcription. The source for the overwhelming majority of these borrowed passages is the *Vita prima* of Bernard. The Second Life of Bernard also serves as a source, as does the chronicle of Cosmas of Prague — which supplies a description of asceticism originally written for the so-called "Five brothers."

¹² Here cited from the *Patrologia Latina* 185:225A-266B.

Vita venerabilis presbyteri Milicii...

Cosmas of Prague, *Chronica Boemorum* (on the “Five Brothers”)

O quantae vero devotae orationes diurnales et nocturnales quotidie fiebant! O quantae lacrimae sine cessatione fundebantur! O quanta flagella omni nocte! nunc sonant pectora tusionibus crebris, nunc sudant corpora nimiis genuflexionibus fessa, nunc vero manibus expansis et oculis in coelum erectis (FRB 1:419).

Nunc sonant pectora crebris tusionibus livida, nunc sudant corpora innumeris genuflexionibus fessa, nunc manibus expansis et oculis erectis, vivat ut in celis, precibus unusquisque instat anhelis. . . (MGH Scriptores NS 2, 68-69).

Most of these sources have never been publicly identified. The primary exception is a series of excerpts from Milíč’s own *Libellus de Antichristo*, which Peter Morée, and Palacký before him, noticed.¹³ There may well be more sources yet to be identified. And that is to say nothing of the acknowledged quotations, Scriptural allusions, and more general hagiographic commonplaces and echoes one can discern. I would hardly be the first, for instance, to note that aspects of this anonymous biography make Milíč sound remarkably like Francis of Assisi.¹⁴

Part II

There can now be no question that a significant portion of Balbín’s text was borrowed directly from other mediaeval sources. But what about the remainder? Where did it come from? How were the various elements combined, and by whom? A few examples will begin to allow the compiler’s sources and methods to emerge. In addition to the long block quotations we see at the opening and closing of the life, there are also numerous brief quotations where the compiler’s intervention is more evident.

¹³ Morée, *Preaching in Fourteenth-century Bohemia* 51-54.

¹⁴ E.g., Howard Kaminsky, *A History of the Hussite Revolution* (Berkeley, 1967) 12.

Vita venerabilis presbyteri Milicii...	Source texts
<p><u>Inter haec vero indignum se iudicans verbum dei populum dei seminare, cogitare coepit, quod perfectius esset, mundum totaliter relinquendo religionem aliquam debere intrare et crucem suam tollere</u></p> <p><u>et carnem crucifigere et relinquere et abnegare se ipsum, et ibi temporibus vitae suae deo serviendo poenitere, sed prohibitus fuit omnibus sibi consulentibus, ne religionem intraret, ut nec fugere deberet praedicationem, a qua tamen praedicatione omnibus consiliariis reclamantibus abstinuit per multum tempus,</u></p> <p>juxta doctrinam b. Gregorii super Ezechielem, qui docet, ut tacendo praedicator proficiat ad altiora praedicanda. (FRB 1:410-11)</p>	<p><i>Vita prima Bernardi</i></p> <p>(1) <u>Inter haec tamen cogitans et pendens...; fugam meditari coepit ... Perfectius vero relinquere mundum deliberans, coepit inquirere et investigare, ubi certius ac purius inveniret requiem animae suae sub jugo Christi. Inquirenti autem occurrit Cistercii innovatae monasticae religionis nova plantatio...</u> (PL 185:231B-C)</p> <p>Milíč, <i>Libellus de Antichristo</i></p> <p>(2) <u>Ideo dixit michi spiritus in corde, ut tollerem crucem et crucifigerem carnem meam et reliquerem et abnegarem me ipsum et intrarem religionem, et nichil amodo de me sentirem nec predicarem, cum non essem ad hoc ydoneus. Et prohibitus sum ab omnibus consulentibus, ne intrarem religionem nec fugerem praedicationem. A qua tamen predicacione omnibus consiliariis meis reclamantibus abstinui per multum tempus</u> (in Matthias of Janov, <i>Regulae...</i>, ed. Kybal, 3, 369)</p> <p>Gregory the Great, <i>Homiliae in Ezechielem</i></p> <p>(3) COMPARE: Sed ad altiora mens praedicatorum proficit cum per eos sensus audientium ad omnipotentis Dei desiderium commovetur (PL 76:903A).</p>

Here within the space of a few lines, the compiler brings together three different sources, only one of which he acknowledges. Peter Morée already noticed the similarity here between the *Vita* and Milíč's own description of what nearly amounted to his second conversion, this time from the life of a public preacher to that of a cloistered monk. Intermixed here are parts of a description of Bernard of Clairvaux's conversion to the religious life. Then the compiler adds an apposite quotation from Gregory the Great. We see here the compiler hard at work, combining two passages, changing the grammar of the *Libellus* from first-person to third-person, cutting out the more controversial parts - namely, Milíč's reference to the "spiritus," which spoke to him in his heart - and finally adding a patristic gloss. From here, the *Vita* continues with a long quotation from the *Libellus* chronicling Milíč's decision to travel to Rome to preach about Antichrist.

The establishment of Jerusalem, the religious community of poor priests and reformed prostitutes in Prague, arguably represented the most important achievement of Milíč's career. Yet a significant portion of the long passage in the *Vita* describing its foundation (reproduced in Appendix 2) was written long before the Prague preacher's birth. The underlined passages are drawn, word-for-word, from an account of the monastery founded by Bernard at Clairvaux. The hand of the compiler is once again evident; where the life of Bernard proclaims that the transformation of a sleepy valley into a renowned place of religion was a wondrous miracle, the life of Milíč proclaims that the conversion of public prostitutes through preaching was a wondrous miracle. It was only necessary to change a few words. However, the compiler also provides several other details here about Milíč's early community, details for which we have no other source. These include: the name of the Moravian woman whose house the first converted prostitutes occupied; the fact that they celebrated the Eucharist within this house (with the archbishop's permission); the number of converts (more than 300); and the name of a landlord (or bawd) who donated to Milíč two properties on Venice street. As it happens, and as scholars have already noticed, property records confirm that a woman of the same name (Hoffart) did in fact own property on Venice street at this time.¹⁵ It seems highly unlikely, though, that the *Vita*'s compiler — whenever he was working — used this property record as the basis for a fictional donation. This is the best evidence I know that our compiler did not completely fabricate everything that he did not borrow. Where then, did he find this material?

We now know some of the sources with certainty: the two lives of Bernard of Clairvaux, the chronicle of Cosmas of Prague, and Milíč's *Libellus de Antichristo*. Other sources of Milíč's life may also have provided the compiler with useful information. These include manuscript copies of Milíč's sermons, Matthias of Janov's biography (if the compiler was writing after around 1380) and entries into various registers (like the *Libri confirmationum*, the *Libri erectionum*, and the acts of the Prague consistory court, for instance). There are also the twelve articles drawn up against Milíč in 1374, and the response to them by Pope Gregory XI.¹⁶ Then there were Milíč's letters. The *vita* mentions four such letters, addressed to Archbishop Jan Očko of Vlašim, to the Emperor Charles IV, to the Rožmberk, and to Anglic Grimoard, the cardinal of Albano and brother of Pope Urban V. Letters by Milíč to all four of these recipients, as well as to Pope Gregory XI and Archbishop Arnošt of Pardubice, still existed in the later eighteenth century. Balbín once explicitly claimed to have a copy of the letter to Cardinal Grimoard.¹⁷ Palacký, however, was unable to locate these letters seventy-five years later,¹⁸ and they may now be lost forever.

¹⁵ Geruša Hoffart (Hofarta in the *vita*) bought two lots on Venice in 1353, and last appears as the owner in 1364 (*Základy starého místopisu pražského*, ed. Václav Vladivoj Tomek, 2 vv. (Prague, 1866, 1875) 1:102 no. 309a).

¹⁶ These two texts, with a partial refutation of the views attributed to Milíč, are preserved in a fourteenth-century Prague manuscript, Knihovná metropolitní kapituly MS. I 40/2, ff. 128b-129a, 137a-139b. František Palacký printed them from this manuscript in *Über Formelbücher zunächst in Bezug auf böhmische Geschichte*, 2 vv. (Prague, 1842-47) 2:182-86.

¹⁷ *Epitome*, 1.4.407-8.

¹⁸ *Die Vorläufer des Husitentums in Böhmen* (Leipzig, 1846) 30, citing *Bohemia docta* 2:183, in which Raphael Ungar, the editor of Balbín's unfinished work, published 1776-1780: "Supersunt Milicii manuscriptae epistolae ad summos quosque praesules et principes: ad Gregorium XI. papam,

The compiler of the *Vita* clearly knew and used these letters. We can see just how artfully he integrates them in a passage near the end of the text (see Appendix 3). The *Vita* here relates how Milíč, feeling himself to be dying, writes two letters — letters that reveal to any careful reader the tranquility of his mind and serenity of his soul as he faced death. In fact, the compiler borrowed this story, and the words in which it is told, from the life of Bernard, combining descriptions of two different letters written by the dying twelfth-century monk.¹⁹ What of the testimony that the Eucharist sustained Milíč in his last days, and that he hardly ever missed its celebration? Milíč may well have cultivated a particular devotion to the Eucharist, but these words were in fact originally written about Bernard. Here and there the compiler changed a word, in order, for instance, not to claim sainthood for the Prague preacher: where Bernard is the *vir sanctus*, Milíč is the *vir dei*; likewise Bernard's *sacrum pectus* becomes Milíč's *beatum pectus*.²⁰ The majority of the passage, however, follows Bernard's life verbatim. Nearly all that remains is a brief description of the letter to the Rožmberk brothers and a report of what Cardinal Grimoard said upon reading his own letter from Milíč. Almost this entire passage, in other words, could have been written by someone who possessed a copy of the *Vita prima* of Bernard of Clairvaux and these two letters of Milíč, perhaps dated from Avignon in the late Spring or early Summer of 1374.

We unfortunately do not know the precise content of these letters. However, even together with the life of Bernard and the other sources we know for Milíč's life, they probably cannot account for all the material in the *Vita*. Where did the rest originate? There is the touching story of Milíč purchasing paper to enable poor students to copy books and the account of Milíč asking his companion, Stephen, to give his outer garment to a miserably dressed woman on the streets of Prague, since Milíč himself had only a single tunic. We learn of Milíč's companion in Rome, Theoderic the hermit, and of the woman who prepared food for both of them in prison there. Then there is Anka, a Prague convert of Milíč whose extreme ascetic penitential practices comforted the preacher in his own suffering.²¹

I do not believe that all of this was invented, in part because of the incidental confirmation of that property record I mentioned, and in part because there is no discernible motive for fabricating such details. I would not, of course, want to discount the possibility that further elements — perhaps relating to some of Milíč's ascetic practices — were borrowed from other saints' lives. (After the first public presentation of this material at the conference, for example, Zdeněk Uhlíř informed me of a correspondence that he had already discovered between the biography and one life of St. Wenceslas).²² Yet it seems to me that we must still posit the existence

Carolus IV. imperatorem, cardinalem Albanensem, Arnestum et Joannem Ocellum archiepiscopos Pragenses, Udalicum et Joannem de Rosenberg etc." It is not clear from this testimony how many letters were written to these six recipients. Nor can it be ruled out that letters to other recipients were also known.

¹⁹ "... exstat epistola, quam ad amicum quemdam paucissimis diebus ante sacram a nobis professionem suam ipse dictavit: quam nimirum huic nostrae narrationi duximus inserendam, quod videlicet etsi aliena quoque de ipso, amplius tamen nos ipsius de se verba delectent" (PL 185:356C-D).

²⁰ He does the same thing elsewhere, e.g. FRB 1:417; PL 185:242A.

²¹ FRB 1:410-12; 420.

²² See n. 6 above.

of a further lost source or group of sources about Milíč's life. There may well have been an account written by a contemporary — perhaps Stephen of Kroměříž, the follower of Milíč whom František Bartoš considered the most likely author of the entire anonymous *Vita*.²³ There is even tantalizing evidence that a copy of such a text may have still existed in the eighteenth century.²⁴ There may also have been an Apology for Milíč, written in response to the twelve articles drawn up against him. The *Vita*, for example, twice explicitly counters the charge that Milíč had dressed both his female and male followers in special, quasi-monastic habits.

<i>Vita venerabilis presbyteri Milicii...</i>	<i>Articuli domini Milicii</i>
<p>Quidquid vero talium piorum (operum) in sua poenitentia faciebant, <u>non sub aliqua regula alicujus ordinis, nec sub aliqua obedientia ordinis novi</u>, sed sponte ad poenitendum se offerebant, <u>neque habitus erat spiritualis pro eis deputatus</u>, sed quidquid dominus administrabat illis simpliciter, tanquam vere poenitentes sine aliqua palliatione utebantur. (FRB 1:420) ... non in aliquibus observantiis obedientiae regularis, nec spiritualis habitus pro eis deputatus, <u>sed sicut unicuique dominus administrabat, imo nec duo in aequali habitu inveniebantur, nec etiam aliquod nomen speciale eorum congregationi fuit impositum</u> (FRB 1:421).</p>	<p>(6) Item quod ipse in loco prostibuli ecclesiam aedificavit, cui nomen Jerusalem imposuit, et ibidem unam congregationem mulierum meretricum fecit, quas quidem meretrices mulieris <u>habitu singulari quasi monastico vestivit</u>, et earum superior exstitit et eas etiam sub clausura firmissima tenuit ... Et ibidem etiam fecit quandam congregationum sacerdotum, <u>quos habitu speciali vestivit et eis ordinem novum imposuit</u>, quem de vita apostolorum nominavit (Palacký, <i>Über Formelbücher 2</i>, 183).</p>

This accusation supported the claim that Jerusalem amounted to a new, unauthorized religious order, something strictly forbidden since Lateran IV. The author of this passage — perhaps drawn from a longer Apology — cannot be determined. It may have been the compiler; or perhaps a contemporary follower of Milíč eager to defend himself and his master against local prosecution; or it may have been Milíč himself. It is conceivable, for instance, that his lost letter to Pope Gregory XI amounted to a point-by-point refutation of the twelve articles.

To this point, I have avoided any attempt to identify the author of the text printed by Balbín. In fact, I have repeatedly referred to him not as an author, but as a compiler, in order to draw attention to the demonstrable way in which he brought together various sources in composing this life. But who was he? We know with certainty that he had access not only to materials related to Milíč's life, some of

²³ "Původce života Milíčova," 1956. Bartoš wrote this two-page, unpaginated article for a pamphlet accompanying an exhibition in Kroměříž. Peter Morée and Ota Halama kindly helped me to find a copy of the text in the library of Professor Bartoš, now preserved by the Evangelical (Protestant) Theological Faculty of the Charles University in Prague.

²⁴ I am in the process of investigating whether or not an eighteenth-century reference to an extant (and apparently otherwise unknown) life of Milíč can be confirmed.

which are now lost, but also to two different biographies of Bernard of Clairvaux and the chronicle of Cosmas of Prague. These texts may have been available in manuscript to a fourteenth-century Prague cleric. Therefore, we cannot yet rule out absolutely the possibility that a fourteenth-century follower of Milíč compiled all of this material, that, two centuries later, Bohuslav Balbín printed the text precisely as he found it in a Třeboň manuscript, and that the manuscripts subsequently went missing. It is possible. However, I find this scenario highly unlikely. Moreover, I believe that now the burden of proof lies with those who would defend the entirety of this text as the work of an anonymous, fourteenth-century follower of Milíč. The circumstantial evidence fingering a seventeenth-century compiler, most likely Balbín, is simply too strong.

In his doctoral dissertation, Peter Morée already made a strong case for Balbín's involvement in the creation of this text. Balbín certainly had the opportunity. No one since him has seen the manuscript he claimed to use as his source. The close parallel to the Jesuit's influential life of John of Nepomuk should also make us suspicious. As Vít Vlnas has pointed out, the manuscripts upon which that life were supposedly based have also proved conveniently impossible to find.²⁵ The content of that biography has also aroused suspicions. Vlnas and others have thus concluded that Balbín partly invented Nepomuk's biography in the service of his larger aim. This aim, as Morée puts it, was "to rehabilitate his country in the eyes of the Hapsburg empire."²⁶ Balbín's historical works on pre-Hussite Bohemia together paint a picture of a genuinely Roman Catholic nation with more than its fair share of saints. His *Bohemia sancta*, for instance, answered the 1615 *Bavaria sancta* of Matthäus Rader, another Jesuit.²⁷ Czechs were no less catholic than Bavarians and not, as some claimed, innately inclined towards heresy. Nothing demonstrated this better than the patriotic Jesuit's great gathering of 134 lives of saints and martyrs from the Czech kingdom within his *Miscellanea*, a collection that included the biographies of Milíč and of John of Nepomuk.²⁸

Balbín retold the lives of Nepomuk and many other Bohemian saints in order to publicise (and perhaps embellish a little) their saintly qualities. Making Milíč into a saint, on the other hand, required serious historical revisionism. For as Balbín himself explains in his 1677 *Epitome historica rerum Bohemiarum*, Roman Catholic and Protestant historians agreed that Milíč had been a forerunner of Jan Hus. To the Protestant Matthias Flacius Illyricus, Milíč was a faithful preacher, inspired by the Holy Spirit;²⁹ to his Roman Catholic counterparts, he had been a dangerous heresiarch.³⁰ Balbín, eager to sever the connection between Milíč and Hus (whom he considered an heretic) pointed out that the famous 1374 letter of Pope Gregory XI against Milíč's supposed teachings had not in fact pronounced his

²⁵ *Jan Nepomucký: Česká legenda* (Prague, 1993) 80-97.

²⁶ *Preaching in Fourteenth-century Bohemia* 44.

²⁷ Vlnas, *Jan Nepomucký* 86.

²⁸ The full title page of this volume, published at Prague in 1682, reads: "Miscellanea historica regni Bohemiae Decadis I. Liber IV. Hagiographicus seu Bohemia Sancta continens sanctos et beatos Bohemiae, Moraviae, Silesiae, Lusatiae, tam eos qui publicis fastis, aut ipso immemorabilis temporis decursu in censum divorum venrunt; quam eo, qui licet hoc titulo careant, aut morte ob Christi fidem fortiter tolerata, aut innocentia vitae in antiquitate claruerunt, aut a scriptoribus idoneus virtutum & sanctimoniae merito commendantur."

²⁹ Cited by Loskot, *Milíč z Kroměříže* 167 n. 19.

³⁰ Balbín, *Epitome* IV.1.408

excommunication. Balbín's best evidence, though, came from the anonymous life he claimed to have found in Třeboň. It proved, he claimed, that Pope Urban had eventually absolved the Bohemian preacher of the charges against him. (As we will see later, this is not in fact precisely the story related by the *vita* later printed by Balbín, ostensibly from the same manuscript.)

We know that Balbín had a motive; we know that he had the opportunity; he almost certainly also had the means at hand to compile the biography of Milíč. This would probably not have been true of a fourteenth-century follower of Milíč. Balbín had, he claims, a manuscript life from Třeboň. He almost certainly also possessed Milíč's letters. Cosmas of Prague's chronicle was probably accessible to Balbín in manuscript, although one could probably say the same for a hypothetical fourteenth-century compiler. Balbín, though, would also have had access to Freher's 1607 edition of the chronicle.³¹ The two biographies of Bernard would have been harder to find in the fourteenth century. None of the first life's surviving manuscripts are in Bohemia today. Nor was there a copy listed, for instance, in any of the fourteenth-century catalogs of the Prague cathedral chapter. Furthermore, the passages borrowed from the biographies of Bernard are very close indeed to the edition printed by Migne in the *Patrologia Latina*, closer than one might expect if our compiler was working from a manuscript. Migne reprinted the text of Mabillon's edition of Bernard's *Opera omnia*; the two biographies appear in the sixth and final volume. These lives had been previously printed,³² but it seems to me extremely likely that Balbín would have had access in Prague to Mabillon's text, which was printed in Paris in 1667 — that is, fifteen years before Balbín printed the anonymous biography of Milíč.

Balbín, in short, had a strong motive for "improving" Milíč's biography, he had access to the sources that the compiler used, and his claim to be reproducing a manuscript has never been verified. There are admittedly some pieces of evidence that seem to point elsewhere. Balbín's marginal notes, not reproduced by Emler, occasionally refer to physical characteristics of his source manuscript and even to apparent problems in the source text. Are we to believe that Balbín's deception extended to false codicological descriptions? Less troubling for me is the apparent implausibility of Balbín brazenly copying the opening passage from such a well-known and sure-to-be-recognized text as the biography of Bernard. Surely, one might object, he would have expected the borrowing to be recognized. Yet someone unquestionably copied the text, and no one has caught the fact before now. If Balbín was not the origin of the correspondence, then the well-educated Jesuit himself must have missed the "obvious" borrowing. Despite these and other possible objections, I believe that the available evidence points to Balbín as the most likely compiler of the text that he printed. I envision the great Jesuit sitting at his desk, surrounded by books and papers — here the *Opera omnia* of Bernard, there the chronicle of Cosmas, with other works like Gregory the Great's homilies on Ezechiel, cited twice in the *Vita*, sitting nearby (see the schematic representation in Appendix 4). Then there were his own notes from the monastery library of Třeboň,

³¹ *Cosmae Pragensis Ecclesiae Decani Chronicae Bohemorum...*, ed. M. Freher (Hanovia [Haynau], 1607).

³² On the editions, beginning with one in 1480, see Bredero, "Études sur la «Vita prima» de Saint Bernard" (see n. 10 above),

some probably dating from his extended stay there more than thirty years before, notes summarizing and transcribing Milíč's letters and one or more anonymous accounts of the preacher's life.³³ Perhaps he even had before him some the original mediaeval folia from Třeboň. The result of Balbín's labours was a magnificent biography of a man he believed to be — knew to be — a great Czech saint. In the esteemed tradition of mediaeval hagiography, Balbín simply filled in the missing details, which he took, appropriately enough, from the biographies of a canonized saint.

Part III

I have shown here a few of the many passages in the biography of Milíč that were borrowed verbatim from other mediaeval sources. I have argued that these borrowings, and my reconstruction of the compiler's methods, strongly support the hypothesis that Peter Morée presented in his book: that Balbín adapted a mediaeval source to fit his own nationalist, Roman Catholic agenda. Further, I have offered my own hypothesis about the character of those missing original sources used by Balbín. One important step remains. What does all this mean for our knowledge of Milíč's life? Must we discount as untrue or suspect everything in this life not verified by other sources? No, I think not. But nor can we continue to read this text as a straightforward and trustworthy contemporary biography. I plan to continue the process of identifying sources and analyzing the textual structure, eventually publishing an annotated text that reveals all the borrowings and echoes that I can uncover. This should help us to distinguish between the fabricated or borrowed elements and those likely to represent relatively reliable, contemporary accounts. For now, I would like to suggest a few principles for determining which parts of the text should make us particularly suspicious, and then begin to apply these principles. First of all, all testimony lacking independent confirmation — in other words, much of the life — must be questioned. This is particularly true for testimony that contradicts other sources. Second, we should be wary of anything supporting Balbín's known nationalist and religious agenda. Third, internal inconsistencies and repetitiveness should be treated as possible indicators of the compiler's work. Finally, we must discount the inherently implausible — the same elements we would normally discount in a mediaeval chronicle or saint's life. (There are several suspicious instances of reported speech, for instance, which all happen to provide evidence for the orthodoxy of Milíč).

For the present, I would like to consider two of the more suspicious claims made in the biography, both of which have long been cherished by Milíč's modern biographers. First and perhaps most significant is the claim that, shortly before he died, Milíč was exonerated by the pope of the charges brought against him. We have several reasons to doubt this. First, there are some surprising contradictions between Balbín's 1677 account of the Třeboň manuscript biography and the text itself as printed in 1682. Arguing against both Roman Catholic and Protestant historians, Balbín claimed in his *Epitome* that Milíč appealed to Rome against the charges cited in Gregory XI's 1374 letter, that he was subsequently accused at Rome by John Klenkot, but defended, at Rome, by the archbishop of Prague and

³³ He was there for a time in 1644 when still a student and again in 1657 (Rejzek, *Bohuslav Balbín* 72, 142, 172).

Cardinal Grimoard, and finally absolved there by Pope Urban.³⁴ The papal curia at this time, however, was not in Rome at all, but back at Avignon. By 1374, furthermore, Urban V had been dead for four years. It seems that in his *Epitome* Balbín may have conflated the Prague preacher's two different trips to Rome, assigning details to 1374 that the *Vita* associates with an earlier trip. According to the *Vita*, Milíč was released from prison in Rome in 1367 through the intervention of Cardinal Grimoard, Pope Urban V's brother, shortly after the papal curia arrived in the Eternal City.³⁵ There are problems with this account too, not least because there is evidence that Cardinal Grimoard did *not* accompany his brother to Rome in 1367.³⁶ But for now I want to focus on the *Vita*'s account of Milíč's 1374 defense at the papal court. Unlike Balbín—and most subsequent historians—the *Vita* never explicitly mentions any exoneration, although it implies as much (see Appendix 1). John Klenkot, his “major adversarius,” was called before Cardinal Grimoard and asked his opinion of Milíč. He claimed to have nothing against the preacher; he had simply passed on to the pope the accusations he received from a certain Prague parish priest. Milíč then preached before the cardinal, after which he was honoured at the cardinal's table with a place only three seats away from the eminent prelate. (According to the *Vita*, by the way, all of this occurred at the *curia Romana*, leaving ambiguous whether the city was Rome, as Balbín had previously and erroneously written, or Avignon).³⁷

The *Vita* continues by relating Milíč's response to Klenkot's illness and death, telling how he prayed for his enemy, even asking God that he might suffer in purgatory on Klenkot's behalf. The compiler quotes from the letters Milíč sent to the Prague archbishop and the emperor after Klenkot's death, letters in which the preacher claims to take no joy in the death of his enemy, who he describes as the defamer of Bohemia itself.³⁸ The implicit contradiction here should give us pause. In the preceding paragraph, the *Vita* established that Klenkot was never really Milíč's enemy, but only a messenger of someone else's accusations. Nearly all subsequent biographers of Milíč have construed this passage as evidence that Klenkot came to acknowledge Milíč's innocence before he died. But then we have an excerpt from Milíč's letter, written after Klenkot's death, in which Klenkot remains the preacher's great enemy. The letter makes no mention of a change of heart. Indeed, the entire point of the passage, which includes a nearly page-long quotation from Gregory the Great, is to highlight Milíč's virtuous behaviour towards even his greatest enemy.

Nearly all of the remainder of the *Vita* was borrowed from the lives of Bernard. The exceptions are the date of Milíč's death and the account, mentioned earlier, of the two letters dictated before his death. We find a brief *précis* of the letter to the Rožmberk, but no hint at the content of Milíč's letter to Cardinal Grimoard. Instead

³⁴ *Epitome* IV.1.407-8.

³⁵ FRB 1:413.

³⁶ The Cardinal writes a letter from Avignon on 24 December 1367, by which time he had been named the Papal Legate for the papal states and ordered to reside in Bologna (Ludwig Vones, *Urban V (1362-1370)* [Stuttgart, 1998]. 91; Daniel Williman, *Calendar of Letters of Arnaud Aubert Camerarius Apostolicus 1361-1371* [Toronto, 1992] 256-58 n. 460).

³⁷ FRB 1:424; cf. Balbín, *Epitome* IV.1.408.

³⁸ Morée speculates that Balbín may have invented this line: “It might not be too presumptuous to attribute this quotation to the Baroque historian” (*Preaching in Fourteenth-century Bohemia* 57). I am inclined, however, to give more credence to precisely the text presented as the direct quotation of a letter, a letter that seems in fact to have existed.

we read a report of the Cardinal's spoken response to the letter: "Even though my brother, Pope Urban, is becoming famous for his miracles, I believe that this Milíč should be canonized before my brother."³⁹ It is a remarkable, even incredible statement, especially from a man involved in the establishment of the cult of Urban V. Here, I submit, we not only see Balbín's hand, but also hear his voice. For at the time of his writing, neither Urban nor Milíč had been canonized, and the Bohemian Jesuit was making a case that the preacher from Prague was the more deserving of the two.⁴⁰

What of Milíč's exoneration, then? Balbín, I believe, almost certainly invented the account of Klenkot's change of mind and quite possibly also of Milíč's dinner with the Cardinal. The Jesuit would have had at hand the letters of Milíč, revealing to him that the preacher's main accuser had been Klenkot (who we know to have been the papal penitentiary in Avignon at this time). He also had the letter to Cardinal Grimoard. We have no idea of its contents, but I think that there is a strong possibility that it related to events of the year 1367 rather than 1374.⁴¹ As for other sources, nothing except this *Vita* gives the slightest hint of an exoneration. Writing in 1380, Matthias of Janov claimed that Milíč had been persecuted up to and beyond his death.⁴² In Prague, the bull of Gregory XI against Milíč was read publicly in July, *after* Milíč's death, and his followers were prosecuted for failing to publicly condemn the teachings contained in the twelve articles.⁴³ Within a few months, the emperor signed over Jerusalem with all its rights and properties to the Cistercians. It is safe to assume, in short, that Milíč was never declared innocent, but instead died at Rome before the final resolution of his case.

I would like to call into question one final, in some respects rather minor, element of the *Vita*. Yet almost none of the many modern accounts of Milíč's life fails to mention this apparently small detail: that the Moravian preacher did not learn the German language as a child or a young man, but only studied it as an adult, so that he could preach to a wider audience.⁴⁴ Once again we know this only from this *Vita*. Balbín, an ardent nationalist who composed a defense of the Czech language, published posthumously, presented Milíč as a sterling example of a native Czech saint. What better way to make this point than to emphasize that this was a Czech-speaking Bohemian, and not a German-speaker like Conrad Waldhauser? Yet we know that Milíč had previously worked for several years within the imperial

³⁹ FRB 1:429.

⁴⁰ The cult of *beatus* Urban V was sanctioned in the nineteenth-century, but he was never canonized.

⁴¹ I base this hunch primarily on the apparent duplication in the *Vita* in the stories of Milíč's two experiences at the papal court in 1367 and 1374; compare also the confusion in Balbín's account in the *Epitome*, where he claims to have a copy of the letter to the cardinal (see n. 7 above).

⁴² "Nam Avinione exulans est mortuus. Sed et mortuum quoque sunt persecuti et super dolorem vlnorum eius addiderunt (*Regulae* 3:364, using language from Psalm 68.27).

⁴³ Ferdinand Tadra, ed., *Soudní akta konsistoře pražské (Acta judiciaria consistorii pragensis)* (Prague, 1893) 1:95-96.

⁴⁴ Et ita erat sollicitus de salute populi, quod licet nunquam in juventute teutonicum profecerat, volens ergo majorem populum domino suo acquirere, coepit jam in senectute studiose idioma teutonicale inquirere a suo scholari, et ab aliis, quibus notum erat, et multoties totum sermonem, quem praedicare debebat, in teutonico conscripsit, et sic incepit in teutonico praedicare, et per hoc magis per divinam gratiam in verbo dei accensus, etiam studentibus et aliis viris litteratis latine, qui miro affectu et devotione ad ipsius sermones confluebant... (FRB 1:408).

chancery, writing, correcting, and registering the emperor's official letters.⁴⁵ Most of these were in Latin, but some were in German. It seems to me highly unlikely that such an official, whose duties involved handling and creating German documents, would not have been proficient in that language. Might this oft-repeated characteristic of Milíč stemmed from the wishful thinking of an ardent Czech apologist in the seventeenth century?

I have introduced here new information about the *Vita venerabilis presbyteri Milicii*, long considered the best and most reliable source for the life of Milíč. I have argued that this information lends strong support to Peter Morée's thesis that Bohuslav Balbín adapted and altered mediaeval material to create the text that he printed. I have identified some of those sources, and shown how they were combined. Further, I have sketched a few of the implications for our knowledge of Milíč's life. More work remains to be done before I can offer more definitive conclusions about the identity and methods of the compiler who produced the biography of the fourteenth-century Prague preacher. Yet I believe that the evidence outlined here firmly establishes at least one conclusion: it is time to rewrite the life of Milíč of Kroměříž.

⁴⁵ For the evidence and precise dates, see Morée, *Preaching in Fourteenth-century Bohemia* 61.

Appendix 1

The end of Milíč's life, from *Vita venerabilis presbyteri Milicii*, FRB 1:426-430.

Underlined text indicates borrowing from other known source; bolded text added for emphasis.

Talem vero virtutem et gratiam deus contulerat sibi, quod et inimici videntes ejus personam sibi pacifice loquebantur, in nullo eum accusabant; et istud manifeste apparet in adventu ejus in curiam Romanam, licet prius nimium criminose accusatus fuisset, postmodum eo veniente omnes sibi benefavebant, et ejus major adversarius, magister videlicet Klonkoth, **cujus mentio superius facta est, cum fuisset per d. cardinalem Albanensem vocatus et quid de Militio sentiret interrogatus, dicebat:** ego nihil mali invenio in homine isto, sed solum id est: cum fuissem litteratorie per quendam plebanum [p. 427] Pragensem monitus et rogatus de articulo talibus, eosdem d. apostolico porrexi. **Et hoc fiebat ex gratia illa, quam nimiam ad inimicos suos habebat. Tanta vero praedicationis gratia fuit sibi a domino collata, ut a praedicatione meretricum iverit ad praedicationem cardinalium et a mensa publicanorum ad mensam cardinalium et episcoporum;** et talis reverentia fuit sibi exhibita non desideranti post praedicationem, quam fecerat coram d. cardinali Albanensi in die S. Spiritus, ut eodem die idem cardinalis in tabula eum tertium a latere suo collocarit.

Et nunquam tantum vigilanter et tantum orabat pro se ipso sicut pro inimicis suis, ita ut rugitus viscerum ipsius a devotis et fide dignis in hac oratione audiretur; sicut et manifestum est in infirmitate adversarii; cum enim de infirmitate majoris ejus adversarii sibi dictum fuisset, nimium coepit turbari et suos familiares rogare, ut quivis eorum prostratus ad modum crucis pro eo ferventer orarent, ipsemet vero in suo commodo prostratus devote coepit misericordiam dei implorare, ut dominus daret sibi pro eo mori, vel hic vel in purgatorio patet; **et id manifeste continetur** in literis, quas post mortem ejus adversarii d. archiepiscopo et d. imperatori scripserat: **et tenor in eisdem literis est talis: Serenitati vestrae significo, quia unus ex illis, qui scenam omnis virtutis et pulchritudinis formam regni Bohemiae infamando in me obtenebrare volebant, ab hac luce migravit, videlicet magister Johannes Klonkoth, cujus deus animam habeat!** Non autem ad gaudium hoc intimo, quia mortuus est, nam deum oravi, ut deus faceret me mori pro ipso vel pati in hoc mundo vel in purgatorio, **et sicut bene convenit cuilibet fideli praedicatori, ut aliquando bona opera sua tempore exigente Christi fidelibus manifestet, sicut declarat b. Gregorius super Ezechielem homil. IX in initio sic dicens: hinc est enim, quod justi atque sapientes aliquando virtutes suas praedicant, bona, quae divinitus acceperunt, narrant, non ut ipsi apud homines sua ostensione proficiant, sed ut eos, quibus praedicant, exemplo suo ad vitam trahant. Unde Paulus apostolus, quoties fustibus caesus, quoties lapidatus [p. 428], quoties naufragium pertulit, quanta pro veritate sustinuit, quod ad tertium coelum raptus, quod in paradysum ductus, sic Corinthiis narrat, ut eorum sensum a falsis praedicationibus avertat, ut dum se innotesceret, qualis esset, illi eis vilescerent, quos ab eis cognoverat inique venerari. Quod perfecti cum faciunt, id est cum virtutes proprias loquuntur, in hoc quodam modo omnipotentis dei imitatores sunt, qui laudes suas hominibus loquitur, ut ab hominibus**

cognoscatur. Nam cum per scripturam praecipiat, dicens: *laudat te os alienum et non os tuum, quomodo facit ipse, quod prohibet? Se si virtutes suas omnipotens deus taceret, eum nullus agnosceret, si eum nullus agnosceret, nullus amaret, si nullus amaret, nullus ad vitam rediret; unde per psalmistam dicitur: *virtutem operum suorum annuntiabit populo suo, ut det illis haereditatem gratiarum.* Virtutes ergo suas annunciat, non ut laudibus suis proficiat, sed ut hi, qui hunc ex sua laude cognoverunt, ad perpetuam hereditatem perveniant. Justi itaque perfecti non solum tantum cum vituperationis suae verba reprehendunt, sed etiam cum virtutes suas, quas habent, infimis loquuntur, reprehensibiles non sunt, quia per suam vitam, quae referunt, aliorum animas ad vitam quaerunt: de quibus tamen sciendum est: quia nunquam bona sua detegunt, nisi eos, ut dixi, aut proximorum utilitas, vel certe nimia necessitas cogat. Unde Paulus apostolus, cum virtutes suas Corinthiis narrat, subjunxit: *factus sum insipiens, vos me coëgistis.* Haec ille.*

Cum vero post tantos labores, ac sudores dominus dilecto suo Militio presbytero diu desideranti pretiosae mortis somnum dare disponderet, fidelem suum introducere in requiem suam, coepit magis ac magis in ipsum promptus proficere spiritus, caro infirma deficere. Cognoscens enim vir dei prop esse jam bravium, solito currebat alacrius, et terrestri habitationis suae dissolutionem sentiens imminere votis uberioribus aspirabat ad habitationem non manufactam aeternam in coelis. Corpus in lectulo decubans variis exercebatur incommodis, animus tamen nihilominus liber et potens, quae dei erant, exercebat invictus, non cessans quoque in mediis doloribus meditari in aliquo aut dictare, quia [p. 429] solum duobus diebus aut paulo plus ante mortem duas epistolas pulcerrimas suo ore scriptori pronunciavit: **unam videlicet dominis de Rosenberg** ferventissime ex scripturis sacris, ipsos ad opera pietatis incitando, et quod nihil omne praesens sit, mentibus eorum inculcando. Epistola autem eadem est in haec verba: (Deest epistola). **Aliam vero venerabilissimo viro d. cardinali dulcissimo Albanensi**, quam idem cardinalis cum magna reverentia recepit et devotione, ipsam cum lacrimis perlegendo, et aliis eandem demonstrando, beatum ipsum multis rationibus asseverando, dicens: **licet frater meus dominus Urbanus papa clarescat miraculis, hic tamen Milicius ante fratrem meum, ut arbitror, deberet canonizari.** Hoc vero exemplar epistolarum, et caetera ejus verba declarant, quae pater deo dilectus jam morte imminent dictarit. Ex cujus nimirum tenore possit diligens lector beatum illius vel ex parte aliqua pectus agnoscere, quanta illi in ipsa sui ruina corporis tranquillitas mentis, serenitas animi, svavitas spiritus in oblatione hostiae salutaris, quam usque ad excessum ultimum vix aliquando intermisit, artus sibi vigore spiritus sustentabat semetipsum pariter offerens acceptabilem hostiam deo in odorem svavitatis. In ipsa vero infirmitate a piis operibus non cessabat, quia quandocumque ab aliquibus devotis sibi aliquid dabatur, pauperibus impertiri jubebat.

Hic est viarum tuarum pater dulcissime finis beatus, et hic labor ultimus in hoc opere vitae tuae. Labores tuos gloriose complevit, qui magnifice semper honestavit te in laboribus tuis, te in suo nomine, et nomen suum in te glorificans rex gloriae d. deus tuus. Anno igitur dominicae incarnationis 1374 in die s. Petri apostoli de mundi hujus naufragio migravit ad dominum, de servitio ad regnum, de labore ad requiem, de morte ad vitam sempiternam, parante d. n. Jesu Christo, qui cum deo patre et spiritu sancto vivit, et regnat per omnia saecula saeculorum, amen.

Post mortem vero tanti patris, quis erat apud nos tumultus cogitationum! quot naufragia animorum, cum thesaurus tam amabilis raperetur a nobis et praesentibus cernentibus, nec [p. 430] spes esset retinendi nec facultas aliqua commeandi. Pater erat, sed qualis pater! qui videbatur abire nobis quodammodo proprius, tamen toti mundo communis. Erat enim omnium bonorum gloriatio et malignantium metus, ut de eo non incongrue videretur esse psallendum: videbunt recti et laetabuntur, et omnis iniquitas oppilabit os suum, quo praesente omni multitudo fidelium jucundabatur, duritia compungebatur, et tunc clamandum; pater mi, pater mi! Currus Israëli, et auriga ejus! auriga agitatur, et currus portat. Currus erat, qui tot mala tolerando sustinuit: auriga, quia populum bonis monitionibus exercebat. Tu fluctuantium portus, clypeus oppressorum, ut de se ipso b. Job loquitur: caeco fuisti oculus et pes claudus. Tu perfectionis exemplar, virtutis forma. Tu gloria Israëli, tu laetitia Jerusalem, oliva fructifera, vitis abundans, palma florida, cedrus multiplicata, platanus exaltata, vas electionis, vas honoris in domo dei. Tu ecclesiae sanctae fortissima, splendissima columna, tu vehemens tuba dei, tu dulcissimum spiritus sancti organum, pios oblectans, desides excitans, debiles portans, cujus medicinalis lingua morbos curabat, cujus erat simplex habitus, supplex vultus, dulcis facies, generosus aspectus, cujus denique vita fructuosa, mors pretiosa, quia tibi vivere Christus fuit, et mori lucrum. Quodsi nobis alterum fortasse utilius, sed iterum multo melius tibi. Et quod tibi jam commodum, nobis si pie sapiamus, non potest non esse jucundum. Ceterum etsi pium est gaudere te pater bone, quia qui in gaudium domini feliciter introisti, non tamen impium super nos ipsos flere, quos nimirum abeunte te solito gravius horror geminus circumscripit, dum nobis est vita taedio, mors timori. Etsi pium est, gaudere te, quod beato transitu mortis ad torrentem voluptatis, quam ardentem sitieras, accessisti, nostram tamen vicem dolere non impium, quibus et vivendi omnis pariter sublata est svavitas, moriendi nondum oblata facultas. Et si pia tibi impenditur congratulatio, felix anima, quae in plenitudine lucis exultas, non tamen impia super non assumitur lamentationem, qui relictis sumus videntes afflictionem populi et desolationem civitatis sanctae Jerusalem.

Appendix 2

Description of Jerusalem from *Vita venerabilis presbyteri Milicii*, FRB 1:417-419.
Underlined text copied verbatim from *Vita Prima Bernardi, Patrologia Latina*
185:260B-261C; bolded text added for emphasis.

Cumque vero tot et tanta per virtutem gratiae divinae praedicando faciebat, ut etiam in multis quasi de impossibilibus possible faciendo, quasi montes transferendo in oculis hominum mirabilis et venerabilis appareret; maximo vero in tantum in eo enitescere coepit virtus praedicationis, ut dura etiam cordis auditorum saepe ad conversionem emolliret, vix aliquando domum vacuus rediret; postmodum vero [p. 418] feliciter proficiente et usu sermonis et exemplo bonae et perfectae conversationis rete verbi dei in manu piscatoris dei tam copiosas piscium rationabilium multitudines coepit concludere, ut de singulis ejus capturis navicula ejus impleri videretur. Inde factum est, ut majori miraculo prae omnibus, quae divina gratia cooperante praedicando gessit miraculis, etiam publicae meretrices de prostibulis per ejus praedicationem ad poenitentiam converterentur; et quae vacuae fuerunt et steriles ab omni bono coeperunt abundare frumento, et de rore coeli et benedictione dei in tantum pingvescere omnia deserta earum et sic multiplicata gente magnificare laetitiam, ut impletum in ea videatur, quod olim dictum est per prophetam ad civitatem Jerusalem: adhuc dicent, inquit, in auribus tuis, filii sterilitatis tuae; angustus est locus, fac majorem, ubi habitemus, et dices in corde tuo: qui genuit istos mihi? Ego sterilis, et non parturiens, et istos quis enutrivit? [Isa. 49.20-21] Et sic vere factum est; quia in principio conversionis earum, cum adhuc paucae erant, tunc in angusto loco, videlicet **in parva domo, cum quadam virgine de Moravia nomine Catharina habitabant in opposito s. Aegidii ecclesiae**, domo, que Pochonis intitulatur; cum vero numerus earum aliquando viginti tantum aliquando octoginta, aliquando magis vel minus, et in hoc causa erat, quia quotidie per probas matronas civitatis Pragensis ad servitia recipiebantur, aliae vero in matrimonium proborum tradebantur; multae vero a parentibus resumebantur. Et omnium earundem ipse majorem curam gerebat in victu, in amictu et omnium aliarum necessitatum. **Ex licentia vero d. archiepiscopi in altari viatico in domo eadem missa pro eis legebatur**, et praedictio omni die pro eis in teutonico, et in vulgari fiebat; multas vero, ne diutius permanerent in peccato, pecuniis, in quibus obligabantur, hospitium earum exsolvebat. **Numerus vero earum omnium conversarum erat bene trecentarum** et plurimum personarum. Haec vero conversio earundem mulierum facta est sub anno domini M^oCCCLXXII^o. Et ita impletum est evangelicum dictum: quia publicani et meretrices praecedent vos in regnum [p. 419] coelorum. Jam enim de locis angustioribus non sine divina dispositione translatae in locum planiorem et spatiosum, ubi prostibulum erat prius Benatky hoc nomine nuncupatum, ut ubi prius peccaverant, ibi honeste existentes poeniterent. Quem vero locum dilectus Militius a d. imperatore impetravit et XXVII areas pecunia exemit, et **duas areas prius habebat, quas quaedam hospita illarum mulierum nomine Hofarta in agone d. Milicio legaverat**. In eodem vero loco de consensu d. archiepiscopi in medio capellam in honorem s. Mariae Magdalenae satis in altum construxit, et **Jerusalem loco illi nomen imposuit**: ita enim in apokalypsi scribitur: cecidit Babylon, et statim sequitur: vidi civitatem sanctam Jerusalem, qui locus eodem nomine in hodiernum diem ita nuncupatur. Domum etiam pulchram et amplam pro se et aliorum presbyterorum secum habitantium usu aedificavit. Illa

vero omnia, scilicet loci munitionem, totius capella fundamentum valde profundum, et illam domum presbyterorum longitudine 40 ulnarum perfecit, et alia edificia multa in domo poenitentium mulierum et aliarum domorum; et aliam domum fecit, illam vero satis parvam a festo Mathaei Evangelistae usque festum purificationis b. Mariae. Postmodum in tempore longiori praedictae mulieres et alii poenitentes magnificatae ibi et amplificatae sunt. Et adhuc multitudini habitantium ipse locus angustus erat, ubi per eundem locum cum bestiae silvae homines fiunt et cum hominibus asuetae conversari, et ubi prius cantillas luxuriose et venenose animas mortificantes cantabant, ibi discunt cantare domino canticum novum a studentibus fere omni die festivo post latinum sermonem: haec est dies anni hominibus poenitentibus omni die in domo earum Salve regina.

Appendix 3

Vita venerabilis presbyteri Milicii and Vita prima Bernardi

Underlined text indicates exact correspondences; bolded text added for emphasis.

<i>Vita venerabilis presbyteri Milicii...</i>	<i>Vita prima Bernardi</i>
<p><u>Cum vero post tantos labores, ac sudores dominus dilecto suo Militio presbytero diu desideranti pretiosae mortis somnum dare disponeret, fidelem suum introducere in requiem suam, coepit magis ac magis in ipsum promptus proficere spiritus, caro infirma deficere. Cognoscens enim vir dei prope esse jam bravium, solito currebat alacrius, et terrestris habitationis suae dissolutionem sentiens imminere votis uberioribus aspirabat ad habitationem non manufactam aeternam in coelis.</u></p>	<p>(1a) <u>Cum post tantos et tam multos jam labores ac sudores Dominus dilecto suo Bernardo Clarae-Vallensi abbati diu desideratum pretiosae mortis somnum dare disponeret, et fidelem servum in requiem introducere suam; coepit magis ac magis promptus in ipso proficere spiritus, et caro infirma deficere. Cognoscens enim Vir sanctus prope esse jam bravium, solito currebat alacrius, et terrestris suae habitationis dissolutionem sentiens imminere, votis uberioribus aspirabat ad habitationem ex Deo, domum non manufactam, aeternam in coelis.</u> In cuius purissimo pectore sacri sese desiderii flamma non capiens, crebris erumpebat indiciis, et ignitum eloquium vehementer fervoris interni vehementiam declarabat, sicut in sanctis animalibus per prophetam inter caetera describuntur scintillae quasi aspectus aeris candentis (Ezech. I, 7). <u>Corpus lectulo decubans variis exercebatur incommodis: animus tamen nihilominus liber et potens, quae Dei erant exercebat invictus, non cessans in mediis quoque doloribus meditari in aliquo aut dictare,</u> quia solum duobus diebus aut paulo plus ante mortem <u>duas epistolas pulcerrimas suo ore scriptori pronunciavit: unam videlicet dominis de Rosenberg ferventissime ex scripturis sacris, ipsos ad opera pietatis incitando, et quod nihil omne praesens sit, mentibus eorum inculcando. Epistola autem eadem est in haec verba: (Deest epistola). Aliam vero venerabilissimo viro d. cardinali dulcissimo Albanensi, quam idem cardinalis cum magna reverentia recepit et devotione, ipsam cum lacrimis perlegendo, et aliis eandem demonstrando, beatum ipsum multis rationibus</u></p> <p>(PL 185:351A-B)</p>
<p><u>Corpus in lectulo decubans variis exercebatur incommodis, animus tamen nihilominus liber et potens, quae dei erant, exercebat invictus, non cessans quoque in mediis doloribus meditari in aliquo aut dictare,</u> quia solum duobus diebus aut paulo plus ante mortem <u>duas epistolas pulcerrimas suo ore scriptori pronunciavit: unam videlicet dominis de Rosenberg ferventissime ex scripturis sacris, ipsos ad opera pietatis incitando, et quod nihil omne praesens sit, mentibus eorum inculcando. Epistola autem eadem est in haec verba: (Deest epistola). Aliam vero venerabilissimo viro d. cardinali dulcissimo Albanensi, quam idem cardinalis cum magna reverentia recepit et devotione, ipsam cum lacrimis perlegendo, et aliis eandem demonstrando, beatum ipsum multis rationibus</u></p>	

asseverando, dicens: **licet frater meus dominus Urbanus papa clarescat miraculis, hic tamen Milicius ante fratrem meum, ut arbitror, deberet canonizari.** Hoc vero exemplar epistolarum, et caetera ejus verba declarant, quae pater deo dilectus jam morte imminente dictarit [sic]. Ex cujus nimirum tenore possit diligens lector **beatum** illius vel ex parte aliqua **pectus** agnoscere, quanta illi in ipsa sui ruina corporis tranquillitas mentis, serenitas animi, svavitas spiritus

in oblatione hostiae salutaris, quam usque ad excessum ultimum vix aliquando intermisit, artus sibi vigore spiritus sustentabat semetipsum pariter offerens acceptabilem hostiam deo in odorem svavitatis. In ipsa vero infirmitate a piis operibus non cessabat, quia quandocumque ab aliquibus devotis sibi aliquid dabatur, pauperibus impertiri jubebat.
(FRB 1:428-29).

(2) Hoc exemplar epistolae, quam, ut nos diximus, et ipsa quoque ejus verba declarant, Pater sanctus exitu jam imminente dictavit. Ex cujus tenore posset nimirum diligens lector **sacrum** illius vel ex parte aliqua **pectus** agnoscere, quanta illi in ipsa sui ruina corporis tranquillitas mentis, serenitas animi, suavitas spiritus, quanta sub fiducia culmine radix humilitatis.
(PL 185:357A-B)

(1b) (continued from passage 1 above) **In oblatione Hostiae salutaris, quam usque ad defectum ultimum vix aliquando intermisit, artus sibi vix cohaerentes vigore spiritus sustentabat, semetipsum pariter offerens acceptabilem hostiam Deo in odorem suavitatis.** Quo tempore ad avunculum suum Andream militem Templi, ... epistolam scribens ...
(PL 185:351B-C).

MAKING THE LIFE OF MILÍČ OF KROMĚŘÍŽ († 1374)

BALBÍN'S ACCOUNT

Třeboň manuscript
of an anonymous
14th- century
biography



Vita venerabilis Milicii,
in Balbín, *Miscellanea
historica regni Bohemiae*,
Dec. 1, Lib. 4
(Prague, 1682)

THIS ACCOUNT

manuscript(s)
(in Třeboň?)
containing anon.
account(s) of
Milíč's life?

Gregory the Great,
Opera omnia

Libri erectionum,
*Libri
confirmationum*,
other
documentary
evidence?

other
saints'
lives?

Milíč, *Libellus de
antichristo* (1367) in
Matthias of Janov,
Regulae..., tract. 5, de
Antichristo (c. 1380)

letters of
Milíč to at
least six
different
recipients

14th-
century
apology
for Milíč?

Matthias of Janov,
Narracio de Milicio
(c. 1374-1380) in
Regulae..., Tract. 5, de
Antichristo (c. 1380)

Vita prima & Vita secunda,
Bernard of Clairvaux,
Opera omnia, ed.
Mabillon (Paris, 1667)

Cosmas of Prague,
Chronicon Boemorum,
ed. M. Freher
(Hanau. 1607)

Vita venerabilis Milicii,
in Balbín, *Miscellanea
historica regni Bohemiae*,
Dec. 1, Lib. 4
(Prague, 1682)

12 articles against Milíč
and letter of Pope
Gregory XI (1374)

