



REV. JAROSŁAW R. MARCZEWSKI* – LUBLIN

ORDOS AND DIRECTORIES OF THE DIOCESE OF LUBLIN IN THE ERA OF THE PARTITIONS OF POLAND

Abstract

The Diocese of Lublin was established in 1805 by a papal bull, the announcement of which was, however, postponed until 1807 for political reasons. As a consequence, it was only from 1808 that ordos and directories of the Diocese of Lublin began to appear. In their external features and content layout, they resembled earlier prints issued in the Dioceses of Chełm. In the years 1808–1918, that is in the period of the partitions of Poland, 111 ordos and 105 directories of the Diocese of Lublin were published. All of them were found, due to intensive research, in the archival and library institutions of Lublin. Ordos and directories of the Diocese of Lublin were published both in Warsaw and Lublin. They were written in Latin, Polish and Russian. The ordos included liturgical calendar, followed by pastoral and liturgical announcements important from the point of view of the Diocese's life and the ministry of the priests. The directories included information about the entire Church hierarchy under Russian rule, and about the clergy and institutions of the Diocese of Lublin. All the mentioned data have become a valuable source for research into the Church's past.

Keywords: ordo; directory; clergy; the Diocese of Lublin

Many dioceses of the Polish Church, both historical and contemporary, have had (more or less extensive) research devoted to them focusing on their ordos and directories.¹ This is because the subject remains intriguing both on the level

* Rev. Jarosław R. Marczewski – Ph.D. (dr hab.) in theology specializing in the history of the Church, Institute of Theological Sciences, John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin

e-mail: jaroslaw.marczewski@kul.pl

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7021-6806>

¹ B. Kumor, *Schematyzmy diecezji tarnowskiej z XIX wieku jako źródło demograficzne*, „Przeżycie Demograficzne Polski”, 1 (1967) pp. 67–87; T. Krahel, *Schematyzmy diecezji wileńskiej jako źródło historyczne*, „Archiwa, Biblioteki i Muzea Kościelne”, 38 (1979) pp. 109–149; 39 (1979)

of the library or archival search itself, as well as in the strict aspect of substance. Finding the collection of the aforementioned prints and estimating their informative value also contributes to making available these interesting source materials that can locally serve the study of the Church's institutional, social and cultural past. In the case of the Diocese of Lublin, there has been no such study so far. This article, therefore, aims to fill this gap at least to some chronological extent. The historical framework of the subject is consciously limited to the era of the partitions, beginning with the real existence of the Diocese of Lublin, as a product of the historical circumstances of the functioning of the Church in the Polish lands changed by the partitions, until the end of the national enslavement and the regaining of freedom also in the area of religious life.

pp. 191–235; H. Kramarz, *Schematyzmy galicyjskie jako źródło historyczne*, „Studia Historyczne”, 25 (1982) issue 1, pp. 27–48; W. Kowalski, *Schematyzm diecezji krakowskiej z tzw. kopiarza wiślickiego*, „Archiwa, Biblioteki i Muzea Kościelne”, 81 (2004) pp. 101–138; G. Zamoyski, *Schematyzmy diecezji przemyskiej ob. łac. jako źródło statystyczno-kartograficzne*, „Rocznik Przemyski”, 41 (2005) issue 4, pp. 127–142; H. Kramarz, „*Schematyzmy galicyjskie (1776–1914) jako c.k. rocznik sprawozdawczy dotyczący obsady kadrowej władz, urzędów, towarzystw i instytucji*”, „Rocznik Historii Prasy Polskiej”, 10 (2007) issue 1, pp. 5–29; J. Kopiec, *Schematyzmy diecezji opolskiej z lat 1947–1974*, „Archiwa, Biblioteki i Muzea Kościelne”, 61 (1992) pp. 167–216; A. Kwaśniewski, *Rubrycele i schematyzmy diecezji kieleckiej (1808–1818)*, „Z Dziejów Regionu i Miasta. Rocznik Oddziału Polskiego Towarzystwa Historycznego w Skarżysku-Kamiennej”, 4 (2013) pp. 57–77; A. Kwaśniewski, *Rubrycele i elenchusy diecezji krakowskiej z lat 1801–1848*, „Świętokrzyskie Studia Archiwalno-Historyczne”, (2014) pp. 205–245; P. Górecki, *Opolskie roczniki diecezjalne 1947–2010*, „Studia Teologiczno-Historyczne Śląska Opolskiego”, 34 (2014) pp. 207–230; P. Kardyś, *Rubrycele i schematyzmy diecezji żmudzkiej z lat 1853–1914 zachowane w Archiwum Diecezjalnym w Kielcach*, „Nasza Przeszłość”, 126 (2016) pp. 291–319; S. Bylina, *Schematyzm Diecezji Siedleckiej czyli Podlaskiej w latach 1945–1992*, „Rocznik Białkopodlaski”, 24 (2016) pp. 293–316; Ł. Krucki, *Rubrycele i schematyzmy archidiecezji gnieźnieńskiej. Katalog druków przechowywanych w Archiwum Archidiecezjalnym w Gnieźnie*, Gniezno 2016; M. Hałaburda, *Katalog rubrycel diecezji pińskiej 1926–1939 znajdujących się w księgozbiore Archiwum Diecezjalnego w Drohiczynie*, „Studia Teologiczne. Białystok, Drohiczyn, Łomża”, 35 (2017) pp. 241–260; S. Konarska-Zimnicka, *Ze zbiorów Archiwum Diecezjalnego w Kielcach: rubrycele i schematyzmy diecezji tyraspolskiej 1858–1913*, „Archeion”, 118 (2017) pp. 341–364; M. Różański, *Schematyzmy diecezji łódzkiej w okresie II Rzeczypospolitej (1922–1939) jako źródło do poznania jej struktury organizacyjnej*, „Archiwa, Biblioteki i Muzea Kościelne”, 110 (2018), pp. 311–326; T. Moskal, *Rubrycele i schematyzmy diecezji sandomierskiej (1818–1992)*, „Roczniki Teologiczne”, 65 (2018) issue 4 pp. 39–50; J.R. Marczewski, *Rubrycele i schematyzmy diecezji chełmsko-lubelskiej*, „Roczniki Teologiczne”, 65 (2018) issue 4, pp. 51–71; M. Hałaburda, *Schematyzmy diecezji pińskiej (1926–1939)*, „Archiwa, Biblioteki i Muzea Kościelne”, 112 (2019) pp. 151–166; J.R. Marczewski, *Rubrycele i schematyzmy łacińskiej diecezji chełmskiej*, „Roczniki Teologiczne”, 66 (2019) issue 4, pp. 21–39; Ł. Krucki, *Rubrycele i schematyzmy archidiecezji gnieźnieńskiej (1532–2019)*, „Roczniki Teologiczne”, 67 (2020) issue 4, pp. 5–39; J. Szczepaniak, *Rubrycele diecezji krakowskiej z lat 1735–1811 przechowywane w księgozbiore podręcznym Archiwum Kurii Metropolitalnej w Krakowie*, „Archiwa, Biblioteki i Muzea Kościelne”, 114 (2020) pp. 353–370; idem, *Zawartość i katalog rubrycel diecezji krakowskiej z lat 1735–1811 znajdujących się w księgozbiore podręcznym Archiwum Kurii Metropolitalnej w Krakowie*, „Archiwa, Biblioteki i Muzea Kościelne”, 115 (2021) pp. 471–502.

Organization of the Diocese of Lublin during the partition period

The context for the issuance of ordos and directories of each diocese was the local shape of religious life. Thus, the local ecclesiastical tradition, the extent of the borders and the internal structure of dioceses, including the Diocese of Lublin, were directly reflected in the specific external form, layout and content of the prints in question.

Even before the final collapse of Polish statehood, there was a project at the Great Sejm to establish a diocese combining Chełm and Lublin. The idea was that the Diocese of Chełm of the Latin Rite, which had been crippled in terms of its territory and income as a result of the first partition, would gain renewed organizational and pastoral stability. As a result, by virtue of parliamentary decisions issued on 11 June 1790, the fragment of the Chełm Diocese that had remained under Polish rule was enlarged to include a wider area derived mainly from the Lublin archdeaconsy of the Kraków Diocese. The bishop was consequently expected to bear the title of Bishop of Lublin and Chełm. The Holy See approved the circumscription changes on 20 July 1790, retaining the existing Chełm Bishop's title.² Nevertheless, in the practice of ecclesiastical and state life, a new, informal name began to solidify: the Diocese of Chełm-Lublin.³

After the third partition, as a result of the efforts of the partitioning authorities, the Holy See established the Diocese of Lublin, encompassing part of the so-called Chełm-Lublin Diocese that remained under Austrian rule, as well as the incorporated parts of the Lutsk, Płock and Poznań dioceses. The *Quemadmodum Romanorum Pontificum* foundation bull was issued by Pius VII on 23 September 1805. In reality, however, due to the complicated political situation of the Austrian Empire, which at the time included the territories covered by the borders of the newly established Diocese of Lublin, the execution of the papal decisions did not take place until more than two years later – on 19 October 1807.⁴

The Diocese of Lublin inherited the tradition of the Chełm Diocese, which was said to be reflected in the translocation of the cathedral from Krasnystaw to Lublin, the renaming of the Chełm chapter to the Lublin chapter and the appointment of Wojciech Skarszewski, the last bishop of Chełm, as the first bishop of Lublin. On the other hand, it was the heritage of Lublin, not Chełm that constituted the main territorial and demographic component of the new diocese.

The changes taking place on the political map in the era of the Napoleonic wars had serious consequences for the early history of the Lublin Diocese. First, in the light of the creation of the Duchy of Warsaw, the Bishop of Lublin was given jurisdiction over the Zamość territories taken from Austria in 1811. Under the already changed, i.e. Russian, partition, within the Congress Kingdom of Poland, on 30 June 1818, the *Ex imposita nobis* bull, issued by Pius VII, established the shape of the diocese, stripped of the Podlasie territories, but with the annexed

² B. Kumor, *Granice metropolii i diecezji polskich (966–1939)*, „Archiwa, Biblioteki i Muzea Kościelne”, 20 (1970) pp. 322–325.

³ Marczewski, *Rubrycele i schematyzmy diecezji chełmsko-lubelskiej*, pp. 52–53.

⁴ Kumor, *Granice metropolii i diecezji*, pp. 325–328.

Vistula territories, taken from the abolished Diocese of Kielce.⁵ The Diocese of Lublin, hitherto dependent on the Metropolis of Lviv, became part of the Warsaw ecclesiastical province.⁶

The shape of the diocese outlined after the Congress of Vienna lasted almost half a century. It was only by a decision of the Russian partitioning authorities on 20 May 1867, that the territories of the abolished Diocese of Podlasie were annexed to the Diocese of Lublin, as a result of tsarist repression after the January Uprising. Despite the inclusion of the territory into administration by the Lublin bishops, full papal approval for the enforced state of affairs did not come until 30 December 1889. Less than three decades later, i.e. on 24 September 1918, the Diocese of Podlasie was restored under the conditions of the reborn Polish state.⁷

Collection of prints

Ordos, being by their nature strictly utilitarian prints, intended for a specific liturgical year and therefore subject to obsolescence, did not claim to be long-term valuable publications in the eyes of their contemporaries. Likewise, with the constant change of positions and functions of the clergy and the admittedly rarer but ongoing changes in the field of ecclesiastical structures, the directories, which contain information on the organizational and personnel shape of a given diocese, were superseded by new prints that were constantly being supplemented. It was only in retrospect of history that it became apparent how interesting and at the same time systematic news from many areas of church life was available to those who had insight into the range of publications discussed. Under these circumstances, compiling the full collection of ordos and directories published for a given diocese throughout its existence becomes a serious, but also a fundamental challenge in the course of a research. In the case of the Diocese of Lublin, the central archives and libraries of Lublin, both ecclesiastical and state, are by nature the relevant institutional circle for ongoing study.

The Lublin ordos and directories⁸ of the partition era were found in five local institutions. These include: The State Archive in Lublin, the Hieronim Łopaciński Provincial Public Library in Lublin, the Lublin Archdiocesan Archives, and the University Library of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin and the Library of the Metropolitan Seminary in Lublin. Unfortunately, the prints in question do not appear as complete in any of the above-mentioned institutions. The full collection of ordos should consist of 111 prints. Directories, on the other hand, unlike ordos, did not have to be published for all years. This is not only the conclusion based on library searches and comparative activities alone, but also on a casual marginal note preserved in an ordo for the year 1866, kept in the Lublin Archdiocesan Archives,

⁵ Kumor, *Granice metropolii i diecezji*, pp. 329–330.

⁶ B. Kumor, *Ustrój i organizacja Kościoła polskiego w okresie niewoli narodowej (1772–1918)*, Kraków 1980, pp. 40–45.

⁷ Kumor, *Granice metropolii i diecezji*, p. 331.

⁸ The article refrains from including detailed bibliographic information in footnotes about the ordos and directories that are sufficiently clearly indicated in the main text by the year for which the publication was intended.

stating: 'This year's clergy catalogue was not compiled.' Seemingly, directories were not prepared for the years 1810–1811 and 1866–1869. The full set of these publications should therefore include 105 copies.

The largest collection of ordos is kept in the Library of the Metropolitan Seminary in Lublin. Of the 111 prints for the years 1808–1918, 100 publications are stored there. As for directories, out of 105 items, 95 prints can be found in the institution. The Lublin Archdiocesan Archives includes 95 ordos and 92 directories. The University Library of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin stores 66 ordos and 66 directories. It is worth noting that the prints held by the university library have been digitized and are available for general online access.⁹ The State Archive in Lublin contains 48 ordos and 48 directories. The least number of the prints in question is kept by the Hieronim Łopaciński Provincial Public Library in Lublin, counting only 34 ordos and equal number of directories. Summing up the resources of Lublin archival and library institutions, among the expected 111 ordos and presumably 105 directories, all necessary publications are available to compile a list of prints for the years 1808–1918. It is worth noting that Karol Estreicher's *Bibliografia* mentions only some of them.¹⁰ For a complete summary of the currently preserved collection of ordos and directories, see the table below.

Table 1. Ordos (R) and directories (S) of the Diocese of Lublin for the years 1808–1918 held at the Lublin Archdiocesan Archives (AAL), the State Archive in Lublin (APL), the University Library of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin (BUKUL), the Library of the Metropolitan Seminary in Lublin (BMSDL) and the Hieronim Łopaciński Provincial Public Library in Lublin (WBPŁL)

| Year | AAL | APL | BUKUL | BMSDL | WBPŁL |
|------|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 1808 | R | | | R | |
| | S | | | S | |
| 1809 | R | | | | |
| | S | | | | |
| 1810 | R | | | R | |
| | | | | | |
| 1811 | | R | | | |
| | | | | | |

⁹ Biblioteka Uniwersytecka KUL, *Consignatio Cleri Saecularis ac Regularis Dioecesis Lublinensis pro Anno Domini [...] Confecta*, <https://dlibra.kul.pl/dlibra/publication/14618> (accessed on: 15.03.2020); *ibidem*, *Ordo Officii Divini ad Usus Dioecesis Lublinensis pro Anno Domini...*, <https://dlibra.kul.pl/dlibra/publication/14476> (accessed on: 15.03.2020).

¹⁰ K. Estreicher, *Bibliografia polska XIX wieku*, part I, vol. 3, Kraków 1962, p. 36; part I, vol. 4, Kraków 1963, pp. 70, 146–148.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 1812 | | R | | | |
| | | S | | | |
| 1813 | | R | | | |
| | | S | | | |
| 1814 | | R | | R | |
| | | S | | S | |
| 1815 | | R | | R | |
| | | S | | S | |
| 1816 | R | | | | |
| | S | | | | |
| 1817 | R | | | | |
| | S | | | | |
| 1818 | | | | R | |
| | S | | | S | |
| 1819 | R | | | R | |
| | S | | | S | |
| 1820 | R | R | | | |
| | S | S | | | |
| 1821 | | R | | R | |
| | | S | | S | |
| 1822 | | R | | R | |
| | | S | | S | |
| 1823 | | R | | R | |
| | | S | | S | |
| 1824 | | R | | R | |
| | | S | | S | |
| 1825 | | R | | R | |
| | | S | | S | |
| 1826 | R | | | R | |
| | S | | | S | |
| 1827 | R | | | R | |
| | S | | | S | |
| 1828 | R | | | R | |
| | S | | | S | |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1829 | R | | | R | |
| | S | | | S | |
| 1830 | R | R | | | |
| | S | S | | | |
| 1831 | R | | | R | |
| | S | | | S | |
| 1832 | R | | | R | R |
| | S | | | S | S |
| 1833 | R | | | R | |
| | S | | | S | |
| 1834 | R | | | R | |
| | S | | | S | |
| 1835 | R | | | R | |
| | S | | | S | |
| 1836 | R | | | R | |
| | S | | | S | |
| 1837 | R | | | R | |
| | S | | | S | |
| 1838 | R | | | R | |
| | | | | S | |
| 1839 | | R | | R | |
| | | S | | S | |
| 1840 | R | | R | R | |
| | S | | S | S | |
| 1841 | R | R | R | R | |
| | S | S | S | S | |
| 1842 | | R | | R | |
| | | S | | S | |
| 1843 | R | R | R | R | R |
| | S | S | S | S | S |
| 1844 | R | R | R | R | |
| | S | S | S | S | |
| 1845 | | R | R | R | R |
| | S | S | S | S | S |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 1846 | R | | R | R | |
| | S | | S | S | |
| 1847 | R | | | | |
| | S | | | | |
| 1848 | R | | R | R | |
| | S | | S | S | |
| 1849 | R | | R | R | |
| | S | | S | S | |
| 1850 | R | | R | R | |
| | S | | S | S | |
| 1851 | R | R | R | R | |
| | S | S | S | S | |
| 1852 | | R | R | R | |
| | | S | S | S | |
| 1853 | R | R | R | R | |
| | S | S | S | S | |
| 1854 | R | R | R | R | R |
| | S | S | S | S | S |
| 1855 | R | R | R | R | R |
| | S | S | S | S | S |
| 1856 | R | R | R | R | |
| | S | S | S | S | |
| 1857 | R | R | R | R | R |
| | S | S | S | S | S |
| 1858 | R | | | R | |
| | S | | | S | |
| 1859 | R | | R | R | R |
| | S | | S | S | S |
| 1860 | R | | | R | R |
| | S | S | | S | S |
| 1861 | R | | | R | |
| | S | | | S | |
| 1862 | R | | R | R | R |
| | S | | S | S | S |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 1863 | R | R | R | | R |
| | S | S | S | | S |
| 1864 | R | | R | R | R |
| | S | | S | S | S |
| 1865 | R | | R | R | R |
| | S | | S | | S |
| 1866 | R | | | R | R |
| | | | | | |
| 1867 | R | | | R | R |
| | | | | | |
| 1868 | R | | | R | |
| | | | | | |
| 1869 | R | | | R | R |
| | | | | | |
| 1870 | R | R | | R | R |
| | S | S | S | S | |
| 1871 | R | R | R | R | |
| | S | S | S | S | |
| 1872 | R | R | | R | R |
| | S | | | S | |
| 1873 | R | R | R | R | R |
| | S | S | S | S | |
| 1874 | R | | R | R | R |
| | S | S | S | S | S |
| 1875 | R | | R | R | R |
| | S | | S | S | S |
| 1876 | | R | | | |
| | S | S | S | S | S |
| 1877 | R | R | R | R | |
| | S | S | S | S | |
| 1878 | R | R | R | R | |
| | S | S | S | S | |
| 1879 | R | R | R | R | R |
| | S | S | S | S | S |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 1880 | R | R | R | R | |
| | S | S | S | S | |
| 1881 | R | R | R | R | |
| | S | S | S | S | |
| 1882 | R | | R | R | R |
| | S | | S | S | S |
| 1883 | R | R | R | R | |
| | S | S | S | S | |
| 1884 | R | R | R | R | |
| | S | S | S | S | |
| 1885 | R | | R | R | R |
| | S | | S | S | S |
| 1886 | R | R | R | R | R |
| | S | S | S | S | S |
| 1887 | R | R | R | R | |
| | S | S | S | S | |
| 1888 | R | | R | R | |
| | S | | S | S | |
| 1889 | R | R | R | R | |
| | S | S | S | S | |
| 1890 | R | R | R | R | R |
| | S | S | S | S | S |
| 1891 | R | R | R | R | |
| | S | S | S | S | |
| 1892 | R | | R | R | |
| | S | | | S | |
| 1893 | R | R | R | R | R |
| | S | S | S | S | S |
| 1894 | R | R | R | R | |
| | S | S | S | S | S |
| 1895 | R | R | R | R | |
| | S | S | S | S | |
| 1896 | R | R | R | R | R |
| | S | S | S | S | S |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 1897 | R | R | R | R | |
| | S | S | S | S | |
| 1898 | R | | R | R | |
| | S | | S | S | |
| 1899 | R | R | R | R | R |
| | S | S | S | S | S |
| 1900 | R | R | | R | R |
| | S | S | | S | S |
| 1901 | R | R | R | R | |
| | S | S | S | S | |
| 1902 | R | R | R | R | R |
| | S | S | S | S | S |
| 1903 | R | R | R | R | |
| | S | S | S | S | |
| 1904 | R | R | R | R | R |
| | S | S | S | S | S |
| 1905 | R | R | R | R | |
| | S | S | S | S | |
| 1906 | R | | R | R | |
| | S | | S | S | |
| 1907 | R | | R | R | |
| | S | | S | S | |
| 1908 | R | R | R | R | R |
| | S | S | S | S | S |
| 1909 | R | | R | R | |
| | S | | S | S | S |
| 1910 | R | R | R | R | R |
| | S | S | S | S | S |
| 1911 | R | R | R | R | R |
| | S | S | S | S | S |
| 1912 | R | | R | R | |
| | S | S | S | S | |
| 1913 | R | R | R | R | |
| | S | S | S | S | |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1914 | R | R | R | R | |
| | S | S | S | S | |
| 1915 | R | | R | R | |
| | S | | S | S | |
| 1916 | R | | R | R | |
| | S | | S | S | S |
| 1917 | R | R | R | R | |
| | S | S | S | S | S |
| 1918 | R | | R | R | |
| | S | | | S | S |

Source: own research

Typology of prints

Ordos and directories of the Lublin Diocese were referred to by various titles. In each case, however, the nomenclature indicated the same type of publication content. In 1808–1809, 1843–1845 and 1862–1918, the publications came out under the title *Directorium*. In 1810–1842 and 1846–1861 the prints were named *Ordo*. The former name was therefore used 62 times, while the latter occurred 49 times. The relatively small disparity does not showcase either form as particularly preferred. Furthermore, the fact that for the people of the time these terms meant the same thing is evidenced by the fact that the ordos for 1862–1869 were provided with the name *Ordo* on the bastard title, while the name *Directorium* appeared on the title page. It is worth mentioning that after the issuance of the tolerance decree and the abolition of preventive censorship in 1907 attempts were made to reminisce, in the titles of the ordos, that they were intended for the Diocese of Lublin and the Diocese of Podlasie. This was all the more interesting because at that time the fact that the Tsar had abolished the Diocese of Podlasie was already formally accepted by the Holy See.

The titles of the directories also varied. The term *Catalogus* was used in 1808–1809, 1812–1836, 1842, 1857–1865 and 1870–1918. The name *Consignatio* functioned in 1837–1841. The directories of 1843–1856 were referred to as *Elenchus*. The content of the publication made further distinctions in the title, hence the directories titled *cleri saecularis*, or *cleri saecularis et regularis*, or *ecclesiarum et utriusque cleri tam saecularis quam regularis*, or *universi cleri*.

All ordos of the Diocese of Lublin have a 19th-century *sedecimo* library format, within the range of 15–19 cm. The indicated trend of increasing dimensions occurred clearly from the early years of the second half of the 19th century.

The covers of the surviving ordos are varied. The original covers are mainly cardboard-based, from the 1870s onward, sometimes provided with embossed decorations and publication titles. Non-original covers date from both the 19th century – at that time, many ordos were bound together in decorated leather covers;

and the 20th century – at that time, they were bound in grey cloth and cardboard. It should be noted that the covers of the prints were already differing at the publishing stage, and this was even done to the same publication. For example, the information found on prints for 1900 indicates that the co-bound ordos and directories were provided with either decorative or plain cardboard covers or paper covers.¹¹

The Lublin ordos were issued by order of the diocesan administrators. This was reflected in the formula used and posted on the title pages: *sub autoritate, autoritate et mandato*. In most cases, ordos were issued by the power of the authority of the Lublin bishops in office: in 1808–1824 by order of Bishop Wojciech Skarszewski, in 1825–1839 by Bishop Józef Marcełi Dzięcielski, in 1854–1863 by Bishop Wincenty a Paulo Pieńkowski, in 1873–1879 by Bishop Walenty Baranowski, in 1884–1885 by Bishop Kazimierz Wnorowski, and in 1891–1915 by Bishop Franciszek Jaczewski. During the *sede vacante* period, this role fell to diocesan administrators. Consequently, in 1840–1842, the ordos were issued on the orders of Bishop Mateusz Maurycy Wojakowski, in 1864–1869 by Rev. Kazimierz Sosnowski, in 1870–1872 by Bishop Walenty Baranowski, in 1880–1883 by Rev. Szymon Koziejowski, in 1886–1890 by Rev. F. Jaczewski, and in 1916–1918 by Rev. Zenon Kwiek. Only in the years 1843–1853 the ordos did not include information on the person commissioning their publication. We should assume, however, that the principle resulting from the canonical order of ecclesiastical life remained constant. The ordos for 1843–1845 were probably issued under the auspices of diocesan administrator Bishop M. M. Wojakowski, and after his death, the ordos for 1846–1853 were subject to the approval of the next administrator, Rev. Wincenty a Paulo Pieńkowski.

The ordos contain little data on their editors. They presumably came from the chapter or consistory circle, which was characteristic of the time. Confirmation in this case is provided by the information – the only of its kind – contained in the ordos for 1844–1847, which were developed by Rev. Hipolit Stawiński. At the time, he was a clerk at the Lublin consistory with the rank of assistant professor and also vicar of the Lublin cathedral.¹² Other editors from the partition period remain unknown.

The places of publishing ordos and directories of the Lublin Diocese changed throughout history. Publications for 1808–1824 included no information about the printing house. Only as late as 1825, did each print include a message about the place of its publication. Interestingly, until the 1860s, the Lublin rubrics were published

¹¹ The Lublin Archdiocesan Archives (hereafter: AAL), ref. Rep 60 B IIa 112, On ordos and catalogues published in print for 1899–1902, without pagination, Account of funds received for ordos and catalogues for 1900.

¹² Hipolit Stawiński (1815–1876) – priest of the Diocese of Lublin, ordained in 1840, prebendary of the Church of the Holy Spirit in Lublin, regens of the Lublin consistory, procurator of the Lublin cathedral chapter, from 1853 parish priest in Parczew, from 1855 incardinated to the Diocese of Podlasie; AAL, ref. Rep 60 A 253, Tabular list of lay clergy for 1839–1846, k. 13v-14r; ref. Rep 60 A 254, Tabular list of lay clergy for 1847–1864, k. 23v, 40v, 47v, 65v-66r; S. Dzyr, *Diecezja podlaska i jej duchowieństwo w latach 1818–1867*, in: *Dzieje diecezji janowskiej czyli podlaskiej w latach 1818–1867*, eds. E. Jarmoch, S. Bylina, R. Wiszniewski, Siedlce 2017, p. 169.

alternately – either in Warsaw or in Lublin. Ordos for the years 1825–1840 were published in Warsaw by the missionary priests at the Holy Cross Church (*Varsaviae ad Sanctam Crucem*). The ordos for 1842 and 1843 included information about the printing in Lublin, although the name of the publishing house was not provided.¹³ In the following years, 1844–1845, the ordos were once again printed in Warsaw, but this time by the publishing outhouse of the Piarist Fathers (*Varsaviae Typis Scholarum Piarum*). Ordos for 1846–1849 were published in Lublin by Szabs Gutfeld (*Lublina Typis S. Gutfeld*), and Ordos for 1850 – once again by the Piarist Fathers. Ordos for the years 1851–1854 were in turn printed in Lublin by Józef Kossakowski (*Lublina Typis Josephus Kossakowski*).¹⁴ Publications for 1855–1862 left the printing house of the missionary priests in Warsaw. The printing of ordos was permanently established in Lublin starting with the publication for 1863, which was printed by Józef Nowaczyński (*Lublina Typis J. Nowaczyński*).¹⁵ The Lublin printers publishing the ordos changed frequently in subsequent years. The publication for 1864 was printed by Władysław Kossakowski (*Lublina Typis Ladislaw Kossakowski*), the ordos for 1865–1868 were again printed by J. Nowaczyński, and for 1869 by the Drukarnia Rządowa printing house (*Lublina Typis Gubernii Lublinensis*). Lasting stability was noted during the following years, as from then on the ordos were printed by the Kossakowskis. Moreover, the Lublin directories, which were co-bound with the ordos, began to be additionally marked with the printer's name. Consequently, ordos and directories for the years 1870–1882 were published under the name of W. Kossakowski, while those for 1883–1918 under the name of Michalina Kossakowska (*Lublina Typis Michaelinae Kossakowska*).¹⁶ Therefore, of the total of 93 rubrics bearing information on the place of publication, 66 were published in Lublin and 27 in Warsaw. Most often, i.e. 54 times, they were printed at the Kossakowskis, and in 25 cases near the Holy Cross Church.

Ordos and directories were issued for the subsequent upcoming years. Therefore, in order not to obstruct the use of their content from the beginning of the

¹³ The following printing houses were operating in Lublin at that time: Kazimierz Szczepański's Printing House, Drukarnia Rządowa Printing House, Szabs Gutfeld' Printing House; P. Gdula, *Drukarstwo lubelskie*, „Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska”, Sectio F. Historia, 8 (1953) p. 70.

¹⁴ The Kossakowskis resumed operations after Jan Karol Pruski, who was active in Lublin in 1813–1823; Gdula, *Drukarstwo lubelskie*, pp. 65–68.

¹⁵ The enterprise, named Zakład Artystyczno-Litograficzny i Drukarnia Józefa Nowaczyńskiego, continued the traditions of Kazimierz Szczepański's Printing House in Lublin; Gdula, *Drukarstwo lubelskie*, pp. 68–69.

¹⁶ The Kossakowskis' Printing House was founded in 1847 by Józef Kossakowski, who ran the institution until his death in 1857. It was then taken over by his son Władysław (d. 1870), his wife Michalina (d. 1894), then their first daughter Pelagia Ostachiewicz (d. 1907) and finally the second daughter Karolina Rogowska, who remained the owner until the end of the partition era. After her, Jadwiga and Tadeusz Wierzbicki took over the institution as of 1918, followed by Jan Józwiakowski in 1939. The company survived until 1949 under the name of Michalina Kossakowska's Printing House; D. Walkowska, *Drukarnia Kossakowskich (1846–1939)*, in: *Studia z dziejów drukarstwa i księgarstwa w Lublinie w XIX i XX wieku*, ed. B. Szyndler, Lublin 1988, pp. 127–128, 130–132, 144–145.

new calendar year, they had to be published in the preceding one. The date of publication was therefore not provided, and the title pages indicated the year for which the column was intended. It is also worth noting that it has not always been possible to prepare ordos well in advance. This can be seen from the dates of issuance of the church *imprimatur* and the approval on the part of state censorship. The government censor's approval to publish a ordo was included for the first time in the latter for 1850. The date of approval was 2 January 1850, subject to submission to the censor's office of the legally prescribed number of printed copies. It seems, therefore, that the ordo appeared only in the earliest days of its liturgical instructions and regulations. Similar incidents occurred later. In 1863 the censor authorized printing on 15 January, while in 1875 the corresponding date was 6 March, and in 1886 – 9 January. The place where state authorities issued permissions to print was the censor's office in Warsaw, except in the year of the January Uprising (1863), when instead of a civilian censor's office, such permission was given in Lublin by a military official assigned to this task. Information about the issuance of the Church *imprimatur* was included in the ordos, starting with 1868. This was usually in Lublin, except in 1872, when Bishop W. Baranowski granted permission while staying in St Petersburg. Church approval usually preceded that of the state censors. Sometimes it was issued very early, such as in 1872, 1873 and 1895, when it was given in July. In 1896, 1897, 1899 and 1914 it was granted in June. In 1898 the permission was issued on 5 May, and in 1915 it the approval was given as early as on 21 April. In each of these cases the approval of state censors in such cases was obviously prior to the Church permission. Eventually permission from state censors was no longer required and marked in the prints, starting with the ordo for 1907.

It is worth noting that, starting with the publication for 1865, the church and state approval also began to be marked in prints for the issuance of diocesan directories. The church approval was abandoned starting from the publication for 1880, and only the approval of government censors remained in the lists of diocesan institutions and clergy, and eventually it was removed, as in the case of ordos, with the 1907 directory.

It should be further noted that different dates of censorship approval were marked for the ordos and the directories for 1865 regarding each print. Was it indicative of their separate publication? Not necessarily, as they were, as a rule, co-bound. In any case, however, it seems that permission to publish them was being handled separately at the time. Nevertheless, starting with the ordo and the catalogue for 1870, the same dates of authorization from the censor's office appeared in the prints.

The pagination of prints began to be permanently applied with the ordo and directory for 1823. The ordo with the smallest volume included 35 pages and was published for 1855. The largest, published for 1913, contained 136 pages. The smallest directory was 24 pages long and was issued for 1865. The largest, with 190 pages, was published for 1874.

The fact that some ordos are supplied with information on the price of the copy remains interesting. In 1814–1819 it was 2 zlotys 15 groszy, in 1820–1828

it was 3 zlotys, in 1831–1840 it was 3 zlotys 15 groszy, and in 1841 the price was 3 zlotys 23 groszy. The last two pieces of information on the price were included in the ordos for 1866–1867. These were 35 and 40 kopecks, respectively.

Some other ordos included a call to pray for those who funded the publication. Thus, it seems that in those years ordos were distributed free of charge in connection with the purchase of the circulation by the power of a gesture of devotional nature. This kind of information was first included in the ordo for 1842. It did not always provide knowledge on the actual donor (*Ratione obtenti Directorii quilibet sacerdos unam Missam pro animabus Joannis, Rosaliae et consanguineorum absolvere tenetur*). Sometimes, however, the benefactor was mentioned explicitly, such as in the ordo for 1862 (*Pro anima fundatoris huius Directorii p.m. Michaelis Leszczyński¹⁷ et consanguineorum illius quilibet sacerdos saecularis unum Sacrificium Missae absolvere tenetur*). In general, information about the obligation to celebrate Mass according to the intention stated in the ordos received free of charge was included in publications 21 times in the period 1842–1865. It seems that from 1866 onward, the ordos were permanently sold for a charge.

The language of Lublin ordos and directories was initially exclusively Latin. The Polish language appeared for the first time to a greater extent in the ordo for 1851. Mandatory prayers for the tsar's ruling house, intended to be recited during court-related services, were then written in Polish. In 1864–1867 texts Polish in Polish were replaced with their Latin counterparts, in 1868 the texts were in both Polish and Latin, and in 1869–1875 and 1877 only in Polish. In addition, starting in 1871, excerpts from exam announcements began to appear in Polish, and in 1882 the Polish text of the Tridentine Creed was added. The breakthrough came in 1876, when Russian was also used in publications for the first time. Namely, the directory was published simultaneously in Latin and Russian, with the Russian part, which has become a permanent practice, being somewhat less rich in terms of information. Russian directories, in parallel with the Latin ones, were published for the years 1877–1883, 1887, 1890, 1893–1894 and, for the last time, for 1910. Russian also appeared from 1877 in ordos in the form of prayers for the Russian ruling house. Each time, however, it was also accompanied by a Polish text. This was the case up to and including the ordo for 1907. Between 1908 and 1910, the Russian text did not appear, leaving room for the Polish version, only to return between 1911 and 1916. The ordos for 1917–1918 no longer included either Polish or Russian text.

Contents of prints

The content and layout of the ordos of the Lublin Diocese was a continuation of what was in the publications of the Chełm Diocese and later the Chełm-Lublin Diocese.¹⁸ Correspondingly, the ordo for 1808 on the first page includes the title of the print, the name and titles of Bishop W. Skarszewski, as well as his coat of arms

¹⁷ Michał Leszczyński (1761–1848) – priest of the Lublin Diocese, ordained in 1800, canon of the Lublin cathedral chapter since 1830; AAL, ref. Rep 60 A 252, Tabular list of lay clergy 1835–1838, k. 50v–51r; ref. Rep 60 A 254, k. 9v.

¹⁸ Marczewski, *Rubrycele i schematyzmy diecezji chełmsko-lubelskiej*, pp. 54–55.

and the relevant epigram.¹⁹ Page two features information entitled *Revoluciones annuae* and *Festa mobilia*. What followed was a general liturgical calendar, and detailed liturgical information for the Lublin Collegiate Church.

There were minor changes in the ordos in the later period. The coat of arms was generally included, with minor interruptions in the case of diocesan administrators, until the end of Vincent a Paulo Pieńkowski's episcopal ministry, that is, until the ordo for 1863. However, the coat-of-arms poems disappeared after the death of Bishop J. M. Dzięcielski, that is, after 1839.²⁰

Co-bound with 42 leaves of the ordo for 1808, the clergy directory had 14 leaves. It included information on the bishop, lists of prelates and canons of the Lublin cathedral chapter and the Lublin collegiate chapter, a list of local deans, and a list of parish clergy at each post arranged by deanery. The directory then provided a list of the seminary's board of trustees and a list of alumni, a list of competitive examiners for clergy applying for parsonage, a list of examiners for clergy of each deanery applying for confession privileges, and finally a list of priests who died in the previous year. Additional 2 leaves, placed at the end, addressed the phases of the moon and sunrise and sunset and were titled *Lunationes* and *Tabula ortus et occasus solis*, respectively.

This basic arrangement of the contents of ordos and directories appeared in various minor variations over the following decades. Beginning with the directory for 1813, the list of examiners began to be followed by announcements of examination dates for clergy and other news, including liturgical instructions, which were collected under the titles *Notificatio cleri diaecesani*, *Decreta scitu necessaria* and *Annotationes liturgicae*, respectively. Sometimes whole papal documents were also included following the catalogue, such as Benedict XIV's bull on Freemasonry in 1817. Beginning with the publication for 1817, a list of feast days associated with the ruling house began to appear, followed a year later by a description of the manner and the text of the prayer itself to be recited at that time. The ordo for 1818 included liturgical texts for celebrations at the Zamość collegiate church, which had been incorporated into the diocese, and the directory listed the members of the chapter. The directory for 1823 singles out the consistory of Lublin, after the canons of the cathedral chapter. The same publication contained a detailed collection of statistical information on parishes and clergy. Namely: the number of faithful was listed next to each parish, and the year of birth and priestly ordination was listed next to each clergyman. In addition, all the monasteries located in the diocese are presented, along with the monks and nuns. Starting with the directory for 1827, the order of clergy-related information was changed. Afterwards, the news concerning examiners and seminaries was moved ahead of the list of parish clergy, so that henceforth all central diocesan institutions and their staffing were

¹⁹ A. Strycharczuk, J.R. Marczewski, *Apoteoza godła heraldycznego biskupa Wojciecha Skarszewskiego w łacińskich wierszach herbowych w rubrycelach chełmsko-lubelskich i lubelskich*, „Roczniki Humanistyczne”, 63 (2015) issue 3, pp. 149–176.

²⁰ A. Strycharczuk, J.R. Marczewski, *Apoteoza godła heraldycznego biskupa Józefa Marcelego Dzięcielskiego (1768–1839) w łacińskich wierszach herbowych w rubrycelach lubelskich*, „Roczniki Humanistyczne”, 68 (2020) issue 3, pp. 112–128.

included at the beginning of the directory. Beginning with the directory for 1831, all announcements with the exception of information and prayers for the ruling house were moved to the end of the ordo as related to the liturgy. In the directory for 1842, the list of alumni was moved further down in the publication, following the list of priests. The practice was repeated in the directory for the following year with regard to the entire seminary institution. Beginning with the directory for 1843, an index of parishes and clergy began to be included before the information and prayers for the ruling court. In the directory for 1844, the list of the clergy, alumni and deceased priests was followed by a separate list of monasteries and regular clergy, including nuns.

This arrangement of ordos and directories was perpetuated for two decades, with the exception that, starting with the directory book for 1855, general diocesan statistics was placed before the index. The days and texts of prayers for the Pope appeared for the first time in the directory for 1864, and were placed before the texts of prayers for the members of the ruling house. Since only the ordos were published for the years 1866–1869, they included the lists and prayers for the Pope and the ruling house, as well as astronomical tables, following the liturgical calendar. This transfer was perpetuated in the following years as well – from then on, the directories ended with indexes. From 1870, the directories changed to distinguish between institutions and clergy in the Lublin and Podlasie governorates. It is worth remembering that the borders of governorates in the Congress Poland coincided with those of the dioceses. In the same year, 1870, information about the seminary's board of trustees and alumni returned to its earlier place in the directory's agenda, i.e. among the central diocesan institutions. Starting with the ordo for 1872, a number of liturgical information and indications of a general nature were placed before the liturgical calendar itself. At the end of the ordo, before the astronomical information, the only remaining information was concerned with examinations for benefices and seminary. Starting with the directory for that year, information about the pope and church superiors in Russia began to be posted in front of the offices and institutions of the Diocese of Lublin. From the ordo for 1873, prayers for the pope and ruling house were also additionally accompanied with the texts for the bishop, while information on examinations was moved to the end of the directory, after the index.

The 1874 directory is of particular interest. On its 30 pages, after the lists of foreign ecclesiastical dignitaries and before the news about local institutions and individuals, an extensive text was printed on Chełm and Kraków traditions and the establishment and organization of the Diocese of Lublin. A complete list of the previous bishops of Chełm and Lublin has also been added. Concurrently, the directory for 1875 included some documents on the origins of the Lublin Diocese. Beginning in 1876, information about the seminary was fragmented so that what pertained to the seminary board was printed next to the central institutions, while the list of alumni followed the list of all diocesan clergy. Concurrently that year, a practise was initiated to print the abbreviated directory in Russian after its Polish counterpart.

From the 1880s onward, there came a stabilization of the layout of the contents of Lublin ordos and directories alike, which lasted basically until the end of the Partition Era. Therefore, it seems worth recalling, for the sake of exemplification, the exact table of contents of one of the prints of the time. The layout and content of the selected publication for 1900 was as follows:

Directorium divini officii

De necessitate, utilitate et modo catechizandi

Revolutiones anni

Festa mobilia

Communio paschalis

Praenotanda

De oratione iussu ordinarii loci dicenda

Tempus lectionis matutini cum laudibus

Announcing the Jubilee Year

Liturgical Calendar

Brevis regula vitae

Dies festivi papales

Dies festivi episcopales

Dies festivi imperialis palatii (also in Russian)

Phases lunae

Tabella ortus et occasus centri solis

Catalogus ecclesiarum et utriusque cleri

Hierarchia Romano-Catholica

Catalogus cleri

Episcopus

Capitulum Cathedrale Lublinense

Capitulum Insignis Collegiatae Zamoscensis

Consistorium Generale

Decani foranei

Seminarium Dioecesis Lublinensis

Preceptores religionis et moralitatis in scholis publicis

Gubernium Lublinense (deaneries, parishes, clergy)

Gubernium Siedlcense (deaneries, parishes, clergy)

Ordinati anno 1899

Presbyteri emeriti

Residentes sine officio

Presbyteri extra dioecesim degentes

Demeriti

Presbyteri in Domino defuncti anno 1899

Seminarium Dioecesanum (alumni)

Hospitalia infirmorum

Diocesan statistics

Alphabetica specificatio ecclesiarum

Alphabetica consignatio universi cleri

Consignatio examinum

The identification of the places of storage and presentation of the complete collection of ordos and directories of the Lublin diocese at the time of the partitions, which has been done under this study, is undoubtedly an important achievement that can facilitate the work of future researchers of the diverse range of issues related to local church life of almost the entire 19th century and the first decades of the 20th century. Due to the specific past of local ecclesiastical structures, once combining within their boundaries several modern ecclesial organisms, the content presented in the article can presumably serve a relatively wide audience.

REFERENCES

Manuscripts

The Lublin Archdiocesan Archives (AAL)

ref. Rep 60 A 252, Tabular list of lay clergy 1835–1838.

ref. Rep 60 A 253, Tabular list of lay clergy 1839–1846.

ref. Rep 60 A 254, Tabular list of lay clergy 1847–1864.

ref. Rep 60 B IIa 112, On ordos and catalogues published in print for 1899–1902.

Printed sources

Directorium (Ordo) officii divini pro dioecesi Lublinensi 1808–1918.

Catalogus (Elenchus, Consignatio) cleri dioecesis Lublinensis 1808–1918.

Studies

Bylina Sławomir, *Schematyzm Diecezji Siedleckiej czyli Podlaskiej w latach 1945–1992*, „Rocznik Białkopodlaski”, 24 (2016), pp. 293–316.

Dzyr Stanisław, *Diecezja podlaska i jej duchowieństwo w latach 1818–1867*, in: *Dzieje diecezji janowskiej czyli podlaskiej w latach 1818–1867*, eds. E. Jarmoch, S. Bylina, R. Wiszniewski, Siedlce 2017, pp. 136–178.

Estreicher Karol, *Bibliografia polska XIX wieku*, part I, vol. 3–4, Kraków 1962–1963.

Gdula Paweł, *Drukarstwo lubelskie*, „Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska”, Sectio F. Historia, 8 (1953) pp. 39–112.

Górecki Piotr, *Opolskie roczniki diecezjalne 1947–2010*, „Studia Teologiczno-Historyczne Śląska Opolskiego”, 34 (2014) pp. 207–230.

Hałaburda Marek, *Katalog rubrycel diecezji pińskiej 1926–1939 znajdujących się w księgozbiornie Archiwum Diecezjalnego w Drohiczynie*, „Studia Teologiczne. Białystok, Drohiczyn, Łomża”, 35 (2017) pp. 241–260.

Hałaburda Marek, *Schematyzmy diecezji pińskiej (1926–1939)*, „Archiwa, Biblioteki i Muzea Kościelne”, 112 (2019) pp. 151–166.

Kardyś Piotr, *Rubrycele i schematyzmy diecezji żmudzkiej z lat 1853–1914 zachowane w Archiwum Diecezjalnym w Kielcach*, „Nasza Przeszłość”, 126 (2016) pp. 291–319.

Konarska-Zimnicka Sylwia, *Ze zbiorów Archiwum Diecezjalnego w Kielcach: rubrycele i schematyzmy diecezji tyraspolskiej 1858–1913*, „Archeion”, 118 (2017) pp. 341–364.

- Kopiec Jan, *Schematyzy diecezji opolskiej z lat 1947–1974*, „Archiwa, Biblioteki i Muzea Kościelne”, 61 (1992) pp. 167–216.
- Kowalski Waldemar, *Schematyzm diecezji krakowskiej z tzw. kopiarza wiślickiego*, „Archiwa, Biblioteki i Muzea Kościelne”, 81 (2004) pp. 101–138.
- Kraheil Tadeusz, *Schematyzy diecezji wileńskiej jako źródło historyczne*, „Archiwa, Biblioteki i Muzea Kościelne”, 38 (1979) pp. 109–149; 39 (1979) pp. 191–235.
- Kramarz Henryka, „*Schematyzy galicyjskie*” (1776–1914) jako c.k. rocznik sprawozdawczy dotyczący obsady kadrowej władz, urzędów, towarzystw i instytucji, „Rocznik Historii Prasy Polskiej”, 10 (2007) issue 1, pp. 5–29.
- Kramarz Henryka, *Schematyzy galicyjskie jako źródło historyczne*, „Studia Historyczne”, 25 (1982) issue 1, pp. 27–48.
- Krucki Łukasz, *Rubrycele i schematyzy archidiecezji gnieźnieńskiej. Katalog druków przechowywanych w Archiwum Archidiecezjalnym w Gnieźnie*, Gniezno 2016.
- Krucki Łukasz, *Rubrycele i schematyzy archidiecezji gnieźnieńskiej (1532–2019)*, „Roczniki Teologiczne”, 67 (2020) issue 4, pp. 5–39.
- Kumor Bolesław, *Granice metropolii i diecezji polskich (966–1939)*, „Archiwa, Biblioteki i Muzea Kościelne”, 20 (1970) pp. 253–374.
- Kumor Bolesław, *Schematyzy diecezji tarnowskiej z XIX wieku jako źródło demograficzne*, „Przeszłość Demograficzna Polski”, 1 (1967) pp. 67–87.
- Kumor Bolesław, *Ustrój i organizacja Kościoła polskiego w okresie niewoli narodowej (1772–1918)*, Kraków 1980.
- Kwaśniewski Andrzej, *Rubrycele i elenchusy diecezji krakowskiej z lat 1801–1848*, „Świętokrzyskie Studia Archiwalno-Historyczne”, (2014) pp. 205–245.
- Kwaśniewski Andrzej, *Rubrycele i schematyzy diecezji kieleckiej (1808–1818)*, „Z Dziejów Regionu i Miasta. Rocznik Oddziału Polskiego Towarzystwa Historycznego w Skarżysku-Kamiennej”, 4 (2013) pp. 57–77.
- Marczewski Jarosław Roman, *Rubrycele i schematyzy łacińskiej diecezji chełmskiej*, „Roczniki Teologiczne”, 66 (2019) issue 4, pp. 21–39.
- Marczewski Jarosław Roman, *Rubrycele i schematyzy diecezji chełmsko-lubelskiej*, „Roczniki Teologiczne”, 65 (2018) issue 4, pp. 51–71.
- Moskal Tomasz, *Rubrycele i schematyzy diecezji sandomierskiej (1818–1992)*, „Roczniki Teologiczne”, 65 (2018) issue 4, pp. 39–50.
- Różański Mieczysław, *Schematyzy diecezji łódzkiej w okresie II Rzeczypospolitej (1922–1939) jako źródło do poznania jej struktury organizacyjnej*, „Archiwa, Biblioteki i Muzea Kościelne”, 110 (2018) pp. 311–326.
- Strycharczuk Agnieszka, Marczewski Jarosław Roman, *Apoteoza godła heraldycznego biskupa Wojciecha Skarszewskiego w łacińskich wierszach herbowych w rubrycelach chełmsko-lubelskich i lubelskich*, „Roczniki Humanistyczne”, 63 (2015) issue 3, pp. 149–176.
- Strycharczuk Agnieszka, Marczewski Jarosław Roman, *Apoteoza godła heraldycznego biskupa Józefa Marcellego Dzięcielskiego (1768–1839) w łacińskich wierszach herbowych w rubrycelach lubelskich*, „Roczniki Humanistyczne”, 68 (2020) issue 3, pp. 111–132.
- Szczepaniak Jan, *Rubrycele diecezji krakowskiej z lat 1735–1811 przechowywane w księgozbiorze podręcznym Archiwum Kurii Metropolitalnej w Krakowie*, „Archiwa, Biblioteki i Muzea Kościelne”, 114 (2020) pp. 353–370.
- Szczepaniak Jan, *Zawartość i katalog rubrycel diecezji krakowskiej z lat 1735–1811 znajdujących się w księgozbiorze podręcznym Archiwum Kurii Metropolitalnej w Krakowie*, „Archiwa, Biblioteki i Muzea Kościelne”, 115 (2021) pp. 471–502.

Walkowska Danuta, *Drukarnia Kossakowskich (1846–1939)*, in: *Studia z dziejów drukarstwa i księgarstwa w Lublinie w XIX i XX wieku*, ed. B. Szyndler, Lublin 1988, pp. 127–153.

Zamoyski Grzegorz, *Schematyzmy diecezji przemyskiej ob. łac. jako źródło statystyczno-kartograficzne*, „Rocznik Przemyski”, 41 (2005) issue 4, pp. 127–142.

Online Sources

KUL University Library, *Consignatio Cleri Saecularis ac Regularis Dioecesis Lublinensis pro Anno Domini [...] Confecta*, <https://dlibra.kul.pl/dlibra/publication/14618> (accessed on: 15.03.2020).

KUL University Library, *Ordo Officii Divini ad Usum Dioecesis Lublinensis pro Anno Domini...*, <https://dlibra.kul.pl/dlibra/publication/14476> (accessed on: 15.03.2020).

RUBRYCELE I SCHEMATYZMY DIECEZJI LUBELSKIEJ W DOBIE ZABORÓW

Abstrakt

Diecezja lubelska została ustanowiona w 1805 roku mocą wydanej wówczas papieskiej bulli. Jej ogłoszenie z przyczyn politycznych zostało odłożone do 1807 roku. W konsekwencji dopiero od 1808 roku zaczęły ukazywać się rubrycele i schematyzmy lubelskie. W swoich cechach zewnętrznych oraz układzie treści przypominały wcześniejsze druki diecezji chełmskiej i chełmsko-lubelskiej. W okresie rozbiorów, w latach 1808–1918, ukazało się 111 rubrycel i 105 schematyzmów. Wszystkie udało się odnaleźć w archiwalnych i bibliotecznych instytucjach Lublina. Rubrycele i schematyzmy lubelskie były wydawane w Warszawie oraz Lublinie. Posługiwano się w nich językiem łacińskim, polskim i rosyjskim. W rubryceli zamieszczano kalendarz liturgiczny, a także ogłoszenia duszpasterskie oraz liturgiczne ważne z punktu widzenia życia diecezji i posługi księdza. W schematyzmach podawano informacje o całej hierarchii kościelnej pod panowaniem rosyjskim oraz o duchowieństwie i instytucjach diecezji lubelskiej. Z perspektywy czasu stały się one cennym źródłem do badań nad kościelną przeszłością.

Słowa kluczowe: rubrycela; schematyzm; duchowieństwo; diecezja lubelska