

Similiter predicator

The Relation of the Postils of Milíč of Kroměříž to his Work and the Jerusalem Community

Peter C.A. Morée
(Prague)

The Bohemian Reformation first achieved a somewhat distinct shape with Milíč of Kroměříž (c.1320 – 1374), preacher and founder of a community characterised by the frequent communion of all its members – ordained or lay. It might have been for that reason that some have called him the “Father of the Bohemian Reformation”.¹ As the second of the preachers of a reform of spiritual life and religious practice, he discovered the power of preaching in the line of Conrad Waldhauser and the medieval reform preaching movement. A community grew from this practice which had in its time a unique character – the liturgical practice of frequent communion for all the faithful. The preaching of reform of religious practice created a community where it was put into effect but, due to the unexpected death of its founder, “Jerusalem” was dissolved by the Emperor Charles IV who had, himself, supported Milíč during his reform efforts.

The life of Milíč can therefore be divided into at least three periods. The first period concerns Milíč’s life before his conversion of 1363, when he made a career in the service of the Bohemian authorities where, eventually, he received a comfortable and influential position at the court of Charles IV, whom he also accompanied on his trips through the Empire.² In terms of his social status, Milíč belonged to the upper tenth of the social elite of his time as he had access to the highest political and social circles of the second half of the fourteenth century. This network of relations that Milíč established at this time was to become of key importance for his future life. The support of not only the Emperor but also the aid of Archbishop Arnošt of Pardubice enabled him to realise his plans during the next two of his life periods as preacher and founder of the “Jerusalem” community. This means that, after 1363, Milíč did not entirely abandon the world of which he had been a part before his conversion, but, to the contrary, he intentionally made use of his former “social capital” for his projects of reform.

1 František Loskot, *Milíč z Kroměříže, otec české reformace* (Prague, 1911) 7. It has to be taken into account that Loskot’s remark has a strong nationalist background as, in his eyes, the Bohemian Reformation is the cradle of the Czech nation.

2 See e.g. František Kavka, *Vláda Karla IV. za jeho císařství (1355-1378)* [The reign of Charles IV as emperor] I, (Prague, 1993).

In 1363 Milíč left his position in the service of Charles IV and started to preach in Prague's Small Town (Malá Strana) and, later, in the Old Town as well. According to the *Vita venerabilis presbyteri Milíčii, praelati ecclesiae Pragensis*³ Milíč severely criticised the clergy of his day. In his opinion, their behaviour was not in accordance with their pastoral duties and Milíč believed that many of them were living a luxurious life, grabbing property where they could, and enriching themselves at the expense of the poor and ordinary people. In Milíč's view their obsession with power and influence brought the church into serious crisis. In his later letter to Pope Urban V⁴, Milíč saw these signs of the moral crisis of his time in the conflicts between various areas of the Empire and in certain insurgences against the Emperor Charles IV. To him these were all signs of the end of time in which the forces of evil were trying to take control over the world and the church. Everything had to be done to turn the tide and to liberate the world from these evil powers.

Milíč's answer to the crisis that he saw was first to mobilise those forces in his world whom he trusted. To him preaching was an instrument to evoke a change of life and religious practice. To that end, he invested much energy to convince church leaders that the time to purify the church from the influences of evil and sin was now at hand.

Abortivus

Milíč's conversion to a life as a preacher of reform is marked by the postilla *Abortivus*, which addressed the needs he identified in his budding practice of preaching. This sermon collection can be dated to the years when Milíč began his work of preaching (1363-1365).⁵ *Abortivus* contains sermons in the fashionable form of the time, i.e. in a scholastic structure in which elaboration is the major purpose of the genre.

The sermon usually introduces only about one verse from the pericope for the given Sunday or saint's day. Based on that verse, the central theme of the sermon is developed, which is itself divided into several (usually two) threefold distinctions. This scholastic frame for a sermon results in a stress on the theme of the sermon. Therefore, the sermon is in a sense a logical discourse which aims at developing a line of thought along thematic lines. As such, the scholastic sermon is a very convenient form in a setting where a need exists to distinguish between good and evil, right and wrong, sin and virtue, since making distinctions, analysing and concluding belong to the very nature of the scholastic sermon.

3 Edited by J. Emler in: FRB 1:403-430.

4 *Epistola ad Papam Urbanum V*, F. Menčík ed., "Milíč a dva jeho spisy z roku 1367," [Milíč and two of his writings from 1367] VKČSN (1890) 318-325.

5 P.C.A. Morée, "The Dating of the Postils of Milíčius de Chremsir," *Listy filologické* CXXI (1998) 64-83.

For whom did Milíč write his first postilla? This question is not easy to answer. We do not know whether Milíč started to attract followers from the very beginning of his preaching career or only later gathered an organised group of friends around him. None of the *Vitae*⁶ say anything about this. It might be safe to suggest that, in his early phase as a preacher, Milíč attracted a certain type of person around him; perhaps mainly students of Prague university who were interested in the reforms of the charismatic preacher. In this environment the choice for the scholastic form of sermon in *Abortivus* would be logical, as it was the fashion in the academic world of the second half of the fourteenth century. Milíč chose the mode of discourse of his audience in order to reach them and to convince them about his visions and project.

The next step Milíč undertook in order to secure his idea of reform was to convince church leaders about his intentions and the solutions he proposed. It must be emphasised that Milíč not only accepted the authorities in the church and society of his lifetime, but he also trusted them in their roles of leadership and guidance. For him they were necessary for the functioning and improvement of the human society in its several aspects. For that reason, Milíč always maintained good relations with the archbishop of Prague, the king of Bohemia and with the pope in Rome or Avignon. According to the *Vita venerabilis presbyteri Milíčii*, Archbishop Arnošt of Pardubice was even the initiator of Milíč's preaching career.⁷ It was Arnošt who made the suggestion, after Milíč's departure from the Emperor's chancery, that Milíč should undergird a model of church reform with a preaching campaign in some central churches in Prague. Without doubt, Milíč's initiatives to cleanse the church of what he identified as deviation and corruption from the true mission of the church would not have been possible without the support of the archbishop. As a sign of his trust the archbishop also invited Milíč several times to preach on the occasion of the synod of the archdiocese of Prague where Milíč strongly criticised the life of his colleagues.⁸ On a third instance some years later, Arnošt of Pardubice assisted the preacher in establishing his community of Jerusalem.

These same qualities are true of the relationship between Milíč and Charles IV for whom Milíč had earlier worked. For the emperor, Milíč represented a legitimate and much needed element in the church of the late Middle Ages if the church were to strengthen its moral profile and credibility. The emperor enabled Milíč to purchase the house where his Jerusalem community was to be established.

6 Besides the *Vita venerabilis presbyteri Milicii* we have the *Narracio de Myliczyo* of Matthias of Janov, edited in *Regulae* 3:358-436.

7 Emler, FRB 1:404.

8 *Sermones Synodales*, Vilem Herold and Milan Mráz edd., *Iohannis Milicii de Cremsir Tres sermones synodales* (Prague, 1974).

In turn, Milíč expressed himself on several occasions positively about Charles whose reign he understood as a part of God's rule over the world. He interpreted insurrections against Charles's authority as a sign of the appearance of Antichrist.⁹

The two *Vitae* about Milíč do differ on this point. The shorter one (by Matthias of Janov) stresses the tensions Milíč experienced in his relations to the authorities. As a culmination of these problematical relations, Matthias refers to an event in which Milíč once publicly called the Emperor Antichrist. The longer *Vita*, which was intended to stress the position of Milíč as one who was close to the high authorities in both the ecclesiastical and secular realms, omits this event. The strategy might have been to show Milíč as an orthodox reformer of the fourteenth century, closely cooperating with the moderate reform powers of the leadership of both church and state. The events of the establishment and operation of the Jerusalem community show that the *Vita venerabilis presbyteri Milicii* was much closer to the truth, despite its hagiographic tendencies. Milíč could never have worked as reformist preacher without the enduring consent and active support of the archbishop and the emperor.

The relation of Milíč to the papal authority is a confirmation of his basic confidence in the authorities in church and society at large. To him the pope was a reliable partner and leader for the necessary reforms in the church as he showed on the occasion of his two visits to Urban V in Rome. This pope especially gained credibility in the eyes of Milíč because he took the decision to move his residence from Avignon back to Rome. Milíč called on Urban to take the initiative by organising a general council of the church and commissioning preachers to spread the word about penance and reform of the life of the church.

Milíč's visits to Rome in 1367 and 1369 stand in between the two sermon collections (*Abortivus* and *Gratiae Dei* which will be discussed below) and between two periods in the life of the reformer in terms of the scope of his reform programme. The visits themselves carried a strong apocalyptic tone, which made Milíč's appeal to the pope even more urgent.¹⁰ In his earlier and later work the figure of Antichrist as an explanation of the situation in the world does not play a role, though some of his sermons, especially the postilla *Abortivus*, are profoundly eschatological. If there was an impact of the visits to the pope on

9 See the *Epistola ad Papam Urbanum V*.

10 From the visits to Rome we have three documents that are, perhaps, the most well known concerning Milíč. Both the *Sermo de die novissimo* – which Milíč intended to preach, but was prevented from so doing – as well as his apologia (*Libello de Antichristo*) speak about Antichrist, who is about to take over power on earth. In the *Epistola ad Papam Urbanum V* from the same period the idea of Antichrist is not present, but the urge to purify the church is similarly strong. All three documents are published in: M. Opočenský, J. Opočenská edd., *The Message for the Last Days, Three Essays from the Year 1367, Milíč of Kroměříž* (Geneva, 1998).

the work of Milíč, then it was the start of a concrete reform project – the foundation of a community of his followers and converts which was motivated by the idea of a new spiritual life in the light of the eschatological age. This community, called “Jerusalem”, manifested Milíč’s most lasting legacy which was the practice of frequent communion for both clergy and laity.¹¹ In that sense we might call the years between 1370 and 1374 the culmination of Milíč’s efforts.

From this time we know more about the audience and followers of Milíč. Not only people with a spiritual or theological background were to be found among them, but also former prostitutes. It was the combination of these two groups that gave Jerusalem a specific character. Prostitution was a widespread phenomenon in the society of Prague in the fourteenth century.¹² The authorities tried to control the practice by regulation. A number of brothels were officially permitted but some illegal brothels remained in existence. Especially the women working these illegal brothels might have been vulnerable. According to the *Vita venerabilis presbyteri Milicii*, many of them changed their lives under the influence of the preacher and became members of the group that surrounded him, where they could have found the shelter and material support they may have needed as they left their occupation.

In 1372 one of the official brothels called “Venice” was transferred to Milíč. This place became the heart of his community for the next few years. Here, his followers, both ecclesiastics and lay people (among them many former prostitutes) lived together in a compound of two large houses in the street today called Konviktská, close to the Bethlehem Chapel.¹³

On 19 September 1372 the foundation stone was laid for a chapel which was to be a part of Milíč’s community compound. It was dedicated to St. Mary Magdalene, the symbol and patroness of an unorganised movement in Europe which focused on communities of former prostitutes. Milíč’s community was specific in several aspects and received the name “Jerusalem”, a clear sign that the founder of the community saw it in an eschatological light. In a context full of sin and corruption the city Jerusalem of the Apocalypse of St. John was the inspiration.

Gratiae Dei

In this period Milíč took another step to give his community guidance. He compiled a second postilla, this time bearing the name *Gratiae Dei*. The collection is much more extensive than *Abortivus* as more saint’s days and other feasts are

11 See P.C.A. Morée, “The Eucharist in the Sermons on Corpus Christi of Milicius de Cremsir,” *BRRP* 5/1, 65-76.

12 See David Mengel, “From Venice to Jerusalem and Beyond: Milíč of Kroměříž and the Topography of Prostitution in Fourteenth-century Prague,” *Speculum* 79 (2004) 407-442.

13 See Tomek, *Dějepis* 3 (1893).

included. The main difference between *Abortivus* and *Gratiae Dei* is, however, not in the number of sermons but in their structure and form. *Gratiae Dei* contains sermons in the classical form from Patristic times, i.e. the homily. Here, the main thought around which the sermon is conceived is not a single verse extracted from the biblical text as in the scholastic sermon but, rather, the basis for the homily is the entire pericope. In its appearance, the homily is a kind of commentary on an entire pericope for the day. Each individual verse is usually quoted followed by a shorter or longer explanation, depending on the significance of the verse.

The homily as a whole is not dependent on a central theme, which it wants to explain with the help of further distinctions, but it is a much more open form of sermon which gives more space and opportunity to react to the direct needs of the context in which it is preached. This is perhaps the most important feature of the sermon collection *Gratiae Dei* in the context of the new Jerusalem community. *Gratiae Dei* as a postil derived from the practical circumstances of the community and reflects some of its actual or pressing questions. The aim of the structure of the sermon is intended to be helpful in this regard.

One example of this practical perspective in *Gratiae Dei* is reflected in the sermons for *Corpus Christi*.¹⁴ The question of how to celebrate the Eucharist became very relevant in a community where religious people and former prostitutes lived together, a combination unheard of in the late Middle Ages. In the church of the time these two groups had different access to the Eucharist. Whereas ecclesiastics received communion relatively frequently and priests received communion at the mass they celebrated every day, lay people at the time went to communion rarely often only between once and three times a year.

This difference in access and relation to the Eucharist became a central question to Milíč and his community. In an environment where everyone was accepted as a full member of the community, during the Eucharist a fundamental difference appeared between the two groups. Milíč's answer to this is to be found in the sermon for the Feast of Corpus Christi in *Gratiae Dei* and is about the frequency of communion for all. Here, the main thought is that everyone should participate fully in the Eucharist by receiving Holy Communion frequently, daily if possible. In the Jerusalem community access to the communion was to be equal for all, including its lay members.

It is the structure of the sermons in *Gratiae Dei* which enabled Milíč to comment on an actual need of his community and to respond to it. Another interesting sermon from *Gratiae Dei* in this respect is the one for All Saints. The

14 See Morée, "The Eucharist".

homily we find in the postil is likely to have been written only a few weeks after the dedication of the chapel in September 1372. In this very long and extensive sermon Milíč comments on the verses from the Sermon on the Mount from Mt. 5. Substantial parts of the sermon discuss the preacher and the way he is supposed to work with his audience.

The sermon opens almost classically, according to Milíč's habit, with an address to the preachers among his audience – or perhaps the users of the sermon collection. Here it is a strong encouragement to preach and to stimulate others to the work of preaching, since this is the way change is brought about in the world. The preacher is even compared to the apostles who, while they were only twelve, caused a great movement in history:

Let us therefore set each other aflame, let one provoke the other into attending sermons that, even if the priests do not want to preach, you, nevertheless, excite their will. From a tiny spark a huge fire is born, and from a tiny preaching a huge fire of divine love is lit in many people. As only twelve apostles were sent out into the whole world, let that be fulfilled in us that the whole world may be filled.¹⁵

When commenting on the first verse of the beatitudes, where Christ sets the scene of his sermon on the mount, Milíč draws again a parallel with the preacher who must be aware of the situation and mood of his audience. It is a part of his strategy to understand what his audience is about and what the needs of the listeners are.

Listen how any preacher must be meek towards the meek, and rigid towards the obstinate – towards the adversaries of the truth – just as Christ was meek to the apostles and others to whom he was preaching, but rigid to the obstinate, especially to the Pharisees who resisted him so much that he called them hypocrites, sons of the devil.¹⁶

This attitude is not without risk, as the example of Christ has made clear. The preacher might have to experience danger, oppression, suffering and even death because of his effort to address the sins practiced among his audience. Nevertheless, he cannot give up his mission, but must find his encouragement in the life and fate of the saints who died for Christ.

So the holy martyrs conquered all kingdoms by meekness. Some were killed

15 “Ut ergo et nos mutuo accendamus, unus alium provocet ad sermonem ambulare, ut etiam si sacerdotes nolint predicare, tamen et vos excitetis eorum voluntatem. Ex parva enim scintilla magnus ignis nascitur, et ex parva predicatione magnus ignis divini amoris in multo populo accenditur. Sicut per XII solos apostolos totus mundus fuit accensus, quod ut in nobis et toto orbe terrarum impleatur.” MS. Prague National Library XII D I f. 140 b.

16 “Audi qualiter quilibet predicator debet esse mitis contra mites, et rigidus contra obstinatos, contra adversarios veritatis, sicut Christus mitis fuit, erga apostolos et alios, quibus predicavit, sed rigidus erga obstinatos, et precipue pharizeos, qui sibi resistebant, ita ut vocaret eos ypocritas, filios dyaboli.” Ibid. f. 142 b.

by the sword, some burnt by flames, others beaten with whips, others pierced by rods, some tortured on a cross, some drowned in the sea, others skinned alive, others put in prison, some robbed of their tongues, some stoned, others afflicted by cold, others tortured by hunger, others, truly as a spectacle of injury, placed naked before the public, their hands cut off or other members of their body severed, because they bore the name of the Lord. Therefore, they shall inherit the earth because of their meekness.¹⁷

In the section of the sermon which comments on Mt.5:4 (Blessed are those who mourn) Milíč addresses the question of which way the preacher should bring his audience to the right spiritual conduct. They should do everything in their speech to prevent their audience from choosing the path to the ‘outer darkness’:

So now some preachers preach flatteringly and therefore despise the many that follow them. To those, though, they say in the coming judgment: “We piped for you, and you did not dance” up to heaven, but actors have piped for you and you danced into hell. Others are preachers who grieve in the heart, weep, humiliate themselves in ashes and sackcloth, cry from the moaning of their heart, preach tears and prevent the people from going “into the outer darkness, where men will weep and gnash their teeth.”¹⁸

The preacher is a major focus of interest in the sermon on All Saints Day in *Gratiae Dei*. In Milíč’s comments, the beatitudes are applied to the preacher. It is he who is following Christ and must sacrifice much of his life in order to spread the word of Christ. But Milíč’s preacher is not an abstract phenomenon, but a concrete person, whom Milíč addresses in the sermon, who is following him on his path of reform and belongs to his community. The sermon addresses a concrete situation of people who are in the first phase of establishing a community of spiritual life in which student-preachers and preachers play a major role.

This *Sitz im Leben* of the sermon, the interwovenness of the sermon with the concrete life of the community becomes especially apparent in the comments on the first beatitude “Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom

17 “Sic sancti martires per mansuetudinem omnia regna vicerunt. Alii ferro perempti, alii flamma exusti, alii flagris verberati, alii vectibus perforati, alii cruciati patibulo, alii pelago submersi, alii vivi decoriati, alii vinculis mancipati, alii linguis privati, alii lapidibus obruti, alii frigore afflicti, alii fame cruciati, alii vero truncatis manibus sive ceteris membris cesis spectaculum contumelie in populo nudi, propter nomen Domini portaverunt. Ideo propter mansuetudinem possident terram.” Ibid. f. 142 b. cf. Heb. 11:35-37.

18 “Ita et nunc predicatorum quidem blande predicabant et quia eos sequi multi contempnunt. Ideo eis dicent in futuro iudicio: ‘Cecinimus vobis et non saltastis’ [Mt. 11:17] supra ad celum, sed cecinerunt vobis hystriones et saltastis ad infernum. Alii (in marg. sunt) predicatorum qui lugent in corde, plorant oculis, in cinere et cilicio se affligunt, rugiunt a gemitu cordis sui, predicant lacrimas et precavent populo, ne eiciantur ‘in tenebras exteriores, ubi est fletus et stridor dentium’ [Mt. 8:12].” Ibid. f. 143 b.

of heaven.” Here Milíč discusses at length the issue of poverty, a hot question in the late Middle Ages. Many radical voices, mainly from the camp of the Franciscans, called for a church living in poverty. The central question was whether the church as such or individual members of the clergy or members of a religious order were allowed to own property. Milíč does not advocate a radical position here but, more importantly, links the issue to his community which has no official status at all.

In his sermon Milíč distinguishes between three kinds of poverty:

The poverty that you do not choose, but in which you must live. Milíč does not glorify this poverty at all, but calls it a miserable poverty.

The second type of poverty is poverty of the spirit, not directly dependent on outer circumstances. This is to be shown in good deeds.

The third type of poverty is voluntary and is of great importance to Milíč. He discusses whether people who entered a religious order are allowed to have individual possessions.

His answer is the classical one:

Those who take a vow of poverty so that they have no personal property can hold it in common. Every order is based on this, that whatever they own, belongs to the community, so that nobody can say that something is his and nobody among them need be in need, as is written in Acts 4. Wherever members of a religious order call themselves the poor of Christ but nevertheless have riches belonging to the community that they usurp as their own, they are robbers of the patrimony of Jesus Christ and thieves and bandits. Let their superior be on his guard not to allow them anything that might give them some property, some income or special benefit or diet. In this case, therefore, whatever they have in private is not theirs but belongs to the community. When, therefore, something is allowed to one without very good reason, it is an injustice to others, and the vow and the oath are broken. The only exception when someone deserves something from the community is when the lector needs books. Let him have an allowance so that he has the use of the books from the allowance; so, too, concerning the preacher.¹⁹

19 “Quidam autem si vovent paupertatem, ut nichil habeant proprii in speciali possunt tamen habere in commune. Et in hoc fundatur omnis religio ut quidquid habent, sit eis commune, ut nemo dicat aliquid suum esse et quod nemo sit inter eos egens, sicut scribitur Actuum quarto. Ubi cumque ergo in religione pauperes Christi se vocant et tamen divitias habent videlicet quod commune est sibi proprium usurpantes sunt raptores patrimonii Jhesu Christi et fures et latrones. Caveat etiam superior eorum ne eis aliquid indulgeat ut proprium habeant videlicet censum vel speciale comodum vel coquinam. Ex hac causa quia quecumque singuli habent non sunt eorum, sed communitatis. Cum ergo uni conceditur quod omni sine summa causa aliis iniuria infertur, votum frangitur et iuramentum. Nisi quis comunitati deserviret, ut lector indigens libris potest indultum (*in marg.* habere), ut usum librorum habeat ex indulto. Similiter predicator.” *Ibid.* f. 141 a-b.

Once someone enters a religious order, he or she must give up his or her private property and share it with the other members of the community. This is the basis of any religious order, is Milíč's conclusion here. The second part makes clear that those, who do not follow or respect this rule are nothing but thieves, breaking their vow and doing injustice to others.

In general, this position would not be very surprising had the last sentence not been added. It is the short note about the preacher which makes the regulations particularly interesting. They not only are to be applied to those who took a vow of obedience which would be usual but preachers must also follow this rule. It is they who form an important part of the Jerusalem community and are addressed in the other parts of the sermon as well. The formulation of this text therefore suggests that Milíč also applies the basic principle of poverty of religious orders to his own community which, while it does not have the status of a recognised religious community, apparently needs a certain structure and, now that it has been established, is gaining a more definite shape. Milíč finds inspiration for the structure of his community in other religious orders. The Jerusalem community assumes some of the characteristics of a religious order although it wants to be a community of both clergy and lay people.

Sharing is an essential principle to this community. Not only the Eucharist has been fully shared by all members through its frequent reception, but also other resources must be shared – like books, which are mentioned here – based on the general rule of voluntary poverty. Jerusalem is to be a eucharistic and eschatological community.

In the year following the establishment of Jerusalem some of Milíč's fellow clergy in Prague formulated a series of twelve accusations against him which they sent to Pope Gregory XI who was now residing in Avignon.²⁰ They contained the following articles:

Milíč had preached the coming of Antichrist in 1366.

He taught that those who trade in money and real estate are damned.

He declared that the income clergy received from owning houses was usury.

Milíč had ordered lay people to receive Holy Communion every day or even twice a day as a necessity for their salvation, which resulted in the demands of some lay people to receive communion as frequently as a priest.

He ordered some people to receive communion often or even daily as an act of repentance.

The community of Jerusalem had grown into an unofficial religious order with special habits.

Milíč had applied for permission to found a parish and religious order in

20 František Palacký ed., *Über Formelbücher zunächst in Bezug auf böhmische Geschichte*, (Prague, 1847) 2:183-184.

Jerusalem, but when the Prague authorities refused his proposal, he abused the pope, cardinals and every other church authority.

When he was told that he could be excommunicated for founding a new order without permission, he claimed that the emperor would defend him.

He said that the study of the arts is a deadly sin.

He forbade immodest dress and jewellery and even destroyed it.

He said that he had done much more than Christ himself and what he could not finish would be finished with the help of the secular powers.

He preached that priests should not hold property privately but only in common.

As we see, articles 4-8 concern the community Jerusalem, of which various aspects are mentioned. Firstly it is a place where frequent communion is practiced (note that this is not condemned as such, but only the demand that the custom should be applied in other places). Secondly, according to the plaintiffs, Milíč established an unofficial religious community without asking consent from the archbishop and higher authorities. Finally, the last article specifically mentioned the issue of poverty, which Milíč allegedly also applied to priests. The background of that accusation could be that Milíč did indeed broaden the rule by applying it to preachers, as we have seen. Preachers were normally also ordained priests.

Some of the regulations Milíč proposed in his sermon on All Saints Day from *Gratiae Dei*, fuelled the anger of his critics in Prague who accused him of disobedience to the authorities. Whether this was a correct accusation or not, in any case Milíč's Jerusalem became a defined community where the question of property was also debated. Practically, Milíč would certainly get in trouble if he had asked for permission from the church authorities to establish a religious order where lay people and members of religious congregations were living together.

The twelve accusations finally forced Milíč to defend himself at the papal court in Avignon whence he travelled in 1374. He did not return to Prague and his community in the former brothel but, instead, died in Avignon. The community was soon dismantled. The property was given to the Cistercians, who opened a college there. Milíč's project and community were still too young and fresh to survive his death. Nevertheless, Jerusalem had shown Bohemia a new type of religious practice, of which the fruits would be harvested in the following decades.