

IVAN ALMES

CORRESPONDING THE “AGENDA” OF ZAMOŚĆ COUNCIL
(1715–1720):
APOSTOLIC NUNCIO, CATHOLIC CLERICS,
AND UNIATE HIERARCHS*

INTRODUCTION

After the Tridentine Council 1545–1563, See of Rome centralized religious life all over its parts that also concerned the Kyivan Uniate Metropolitanate founded in 1596 after Brest Union. But only in 1720 Zamość council (for Ruthenian Uniate church elite) and synod (for Roman Curia)¹ codify the tradition of Eastern Catholics of this part in the so-called Tridentine style and was one of the so-called

Dr. IVAN ALMES – Associate Professor at the Department of History and Director of Ihor Skochylas Center for Religious Culture at the Ukrainian Catholic University [Український католицький університет]; email: ivanalmes@ucu.edu.ua; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9252-225X>.

Prof. IVAN ALMES – starszy wykładowca (profesor) na Wydziale Historycznym Ukraińskiego Uniwersytetu Katolickiego we Lwowie; email: ivanalmes@ucu.edu.ua; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9252-225X>.

* The research was supported by a grant from the Research Fund of the Ukrainian Catholic University, 2020–2021, and by the fellowship of Gerda Henkel Stiftung.

¹ See the newest editions with commentaries of the Zamość Council Acts: Rostyslav Paran'ko, Ihor Skochylas and Iryna Skochylas, eds., *Zamoys'kyu provintsynyy sobor Rus'koyi Uniyoi Tserkvy 1720 roku*, book 1: *Diyannya ta postanovy* (seriya “Kyuyiv's'ke khrystyianstvo”, vol. 23) (L'viv: Ukrayins'kyu katolyts'kyu universytet, 2021) [Ростислав Паранько, Ігор Сkochиляс and Ирина Сkochиляс, eds., *Замойський провінційний собор Руської Унійної Церкви 1720 року*, book 1: *Діяння та постанови* (series “Київське християнство”, vol. 23) (Львів: Український католицький університет, 2021)]; Przemysław Nowakowski, ed., *Statuty Synodu Zamojskiego 1720 roku. Nowe polskie tłumaczenie z komentarzami* (Krakow: Avalon, 2020); and see the bibliography on the topic of Zamość Council 1720: Przemysław Nowakowski, ed., *Dziedzictwo Synodu Zamojskiego 1720–2020. Wyzwania i perspektywy* (Krakow: Avalon, 2021), 321–327.

Artykuły są objęte licencją Creative Commons Uznanie autorstwa-Użycie niekomercyjne-Bez utworów zależnych 4.0 Międzynarodowe (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0)

post-Tridentine synods.² The correspondence from the papal archives of the Kyivan metropolitan Lev Kyshka, apostolic nuncio Girolamo Grimaldi, Latin bishops and clerics of *Propaganda Fide*, and Uniate hierarchs allows one to reconstruct the history of the preparations, primarily to trace the process of forming the “agenda” of the council.³ Research on corresponding raises also the question of tensions between Latin and Uniates hierarchs in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth on the eve of the council and in which way these debates were “moderated” from Rome by the apostolic nuncio. Firstly, the paper concentrates on the so-called *Memorial* of Apostolic Nuncio Girolamo Grimaldi prepared already in 1716. After that research analyzed a “campaign” in May-June 1720 organized by Apostolic Nuncio to gather information about the affairs of the Ruthenian Uniates, in particular to update the council’s agenda. The group of informants included the rector of Armenian and Ruthenian Papal College in Lviv, Stefano Trombetti, and Latin Archbishop of Lviv Jan Skarbek. Girolamo Grimaldi sent letters also to the Uniate bishops, in particular to Yosyf Levytskyi and Atanasiy Sheptytskyi. Each of the mentioned hierarchs responded to the apostolic nuncio, sharing their propositions regarding the agenda of the planned council of the Kyivan Uniate Metropolitanate.

MEMORIAL
OF APOSTOLIC NUNCIO GIROLAMO GRIMALDI OF 1716

Girolamo Grimaldi (1674–1733) played one of the key roles at the Council who was a papal diplomat and Italian who at 46 headed the provincial Council of Zamość. It was he who informed Rome about the preparations for the council and took active part in those preparations, for he was apostolic nuncio in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth from 1712 to 1721. He studied at Avignon University and there, in 1705, defended a doctorate in two laws (canon and civil).

² Birgit Emich. “Uniformity and Polycentricity. The Early Modern Papacy between Promoting Unity and Handling Diversity,” in *Pathways through Early Modern Christianities*, edited by Andreea Badea, Bruno Boute and Birgit Emich (Kulturen des Christentums/Cultures of Christianity, vol. 1) (Köln: Böhlau, 2023), 33–53.

³ More about correspondence on the eve of the Zamość Council see: Ivan Al’mes, Dar’ya Syroid and Taras Shman’ko, eds., *Zamoys’kyu provintsynnyu sobor Rus’koyi Uniyanoi Tserkvy 1720 roku*, book 2: *Dokumenty i materialy* (seriya “Kyuyivs’ke khrystyanstvo”, vol. 35) (L’viv: Ukrayins’kyu katolyts’kyu universytet, 2024) [Іван Альмес, Дарія Сироїд and Тарас Шманько, eds., *Замойський провінційний собор Руської Унійної Церкви 1720 року*, book 2: *Документи і матеріали* (series “Київське християнство”, vol. 35) (Львів: Український католицький університет, 2024)] (forthcoming).

In 1706, at 32, he began the career of a papal diplomat. First, until 1712, he was internuncio (that is, the head of a diplomat representation of the Vatican) in Brussels. An internuncio ranked below a nuncio, and internuncios were appointed in those places which, from a diplomatic point of view, were not of special importance. On 30 December 1712, he was appointed nuncio to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Two months after the ending of the Council of Zamość, on 22 November 1720, Girolamo Grimaldi was promoted, becoming nuncio of the Holy Roman Empire in Vienna; its representation coordinated, in particular, affairs with the Ottoman Empire. It was one of the four largest nunciatures in Europe at the time (together with Paris, Madrid, and Lisbon).⁴ He was then nuncio in Vienna for more than 10 years, until 1731. The crowning of Girolamo Grimaldi's ecclesiastical career was the granting to him of the title of cardinal in 1730.⁵

In a letter of 12 March 1716, the secretary of the congregation informed the head of the Secretariat of Apostolic Breve, Cardinal Fabio Olivieri, of the need for a papal breve to be sent from Rome giving Apostolic Nuncio Girolamo Grimaldi the right to head a provincial council of the Kyivan Uniate Metropolitanate.⁶ Why did Grimaldi head the Council but not Kyivan metropolitan Lev Kyshka? Grimaldi was appointed head, most likely, because of a conflict at that time between the metropolitan of Kyiv and part of the Ruthenian episcopate, which had continued up to 1715 and about which Rome was well informed. Also, the apostolic nuncio, presiding, would be a neutral person, as opposed to the metropolitan, a direct party in the conflict.⁷ Lev Kyshka was not satisfied with the matter, but, as can be seen in the metropolitan's letters regarding the summoning of the council, it was the “neutral” presiding by the nuncio that allowed that all be summoned to the council, in particular the metropolitan's opponents, for example, Basilian Yoan-Khryzostom Radzymynskyi-Frantskevych.

After his appointment as the head of the planned synod Grimaldi was responsible for shaping the meeting's agenda. A number of the apostolic nuncio's letters to Rome directly involved questions of the program which they planned to discuss at the council. Propositions for the *curriculum* of the council which the apostolic nuncio had formulated for the Ruthenian episcopate are dated already on

⁴ Alexander Koller, “Grimaldi Girolamo,” in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, edited by Mario Caravale, vol. 59 (Roma: Istituto Della Enciclopedia Italiana, 2002), 539–543; Wojciech Kęder, “Przydatność akt nuncjatury papieskiej jako źródła historycznego,” *Textus et Studia*, No 2/6 (2016): 63.

⁵ *Zamoys'kyu provintsynyy sobor* [Замойський провінційний собор], book 1, 107–108.

⁶ Archivio Storico SCPF, Litterae S. Congregationes et Secretarii, vol. 105, fol. 196 v.

⁷ For a detailed history of this conflict, see: Ihor Skochylyas, “Dekrety Zamoys'koho soboru,” in *Zamoys'kyu provintsynyy sobor* [Ігор Сконіляс, “Декрети Замойського собору,” in *Замойський провінційний собор*], book 1, 430–437.

11 November 1716. This document, the Memorial of Girolamo Grimaldi, is composed of 12 sections.⁸ It is worthwhile at once to emphasize that, for the majority of questions which Grimaldi in 1716 proposed for discussion, there are responses in the official Roman publication of the decrees of the Council of Zamość (1724).⁹ It is understood that the Memorial of Grimaldi was composed not by the nuncio himself; this was a document “of collective authorship,” which demonstrates a knowledge of details of the Byzantine rite, for example, regarding baptismal formulas, the Eucharist, “Greek” antimensions, etc. But it is still interesting to compare at least some of the propositions with those decrees which were finally approved, and also with the metropolitan’s initial intentions, which led to the beginning of the procedure of calling the provincial council.

Above all, it emphasized the need to unify ritual practices connected with the sacrament of baptism, in particular regarding giving the Eucharist to children under two kinds, the practice of a few godparents, the absence of metrical books at parishes, and midwives’ ignorance of baptismal formulas. If one compares this with the decrees of the Council of Zamość, the first section – regarding baptism – is much wider than the propositions of the nuncio, composed in 1716. Finally, in the summary decrees of the Council of Zamość there is a provision consonant with four points of the Memorial of Grimaldi: about forbidding Communion to infants and children; about one pair of godparents; about the baptismal formula; about the obligation of introducing metrical books.¹⁰ Later in the Memorial, it mentions the disorganized procedure for preserving chrism and the church tax. Ihor Skochylyas in detail analyzed the discussion of these questions before and after the council, and also decisions regarding them.¹¹

The Memorial turns attention to a detailed description of abuses in the Kyivan Metropolitanate, which demonstrates a good level of information about the situation in church life. For example, among the questions which it is worthwhile to consider at the council regarding the sacrament of confession, carefully described are problems of the “unfinished” reading of prayers over the penitent and incomprehensible prayers over children before allowing them to Communion.¹² And it is still worthwhile to recall ending the practice of payment for confession, which is emphasized in the *Memorial*. Though the fifth section on confession does not contain this point, still, the question about the unacceptability

⁸ Archivio Storico SCPF, Scritture, riferite nei Congregazioni Generali, vol. 611, fol. 153–154 v.

⁹ *Zamoys'kyi provintsynny sobor* [Замойський провінційний собор], book 1, 257–315.

¹⁰ *Zamoys'kyi provintsynny sobor* [Замойський провінційний собор], book 1, 325–329, 334.

¹¹ Skochylyas, “Dekrety Zamoys'koho soboru” [Скочилияс, “Декрети Замойського собору”], 430–437.

¹² Archivio Storico SCPF, Scritture, riferite nei Congregazioni Generali, vol. 611, fol. 153v.

of taking payment for sacraments is mixed in separately in decrees of the council on simony.¹³ Another example of the good level of information regarding details of the situation involves questions of the Eucharist. The Memorial says: “When it has happened on a holy day that there was no wine, sometimes they have consecrated beer, saying it is better to consecrate beer than to miss the priestly acts on a holy day.”¹⁴ Finally, the decrees detail and emphasize the condition of the eucharistic wine: it should be “pressed from grapes, not sour, not spoiled and not mixed with other liquids.”¹⁵

Reflections in the Memorial on the practice of the minimal age of candidates for ordination in the Ruthenian Church attract attention. At first it speaks of the Greek tradition with clear requirements: 20, 25, 30, and 35 years to ordain a subdeacon, deacon, priest, and bishop. Then it gives concrete examples when such ecclesiastical rules were not observed: “Some were ordained to the priesthood at 20, such as the current All-Enlightened Metropolitan Lev Kyshka, and at 22 to the episcopate, such as the All-Enlightened Yosyf Shumlyanskyi, deceased bishop of Lviv.”¹⁶ Kyshka studied in Rome and lodged at the Greek college, so it was expected that they knew there about such details from the metropolitan’s biography. In fact, at a very young age (according to some data, at 15 years old in 1683) he joined the Basilian Order,¹⁷ though exactly how old he was when he became a priest is unknown for sure. It is most likely that he was a little more than 20.¹⁸ Is such a mention about the early age of ordination of the current metropolitan worth treating as a personal reproach to Lev Kyshka for not maintaining church regulations? Possibly, but this sooner looks like an illustration of the level at which church rules were not observed. For, if the current leader of the Church began his ecclesiastical ministry with such canonical violations, then this signals a large-scale problem. Finally, in the decrees of the council there are no explicit instructions as to age, though it is stated about priests “not to lay on hands too hastily” and not to allow the ordination of “those who

¹³ *Zamoys'kyi provintsynny sobor* [Замойський провінційний собор], book 1, 343–346.

¹⁴ Archivio Storico SCPF, Scritture, riferite nei Congregazioni Generali, vol. 611, fol. 153r.

¹⁵ *Zamoys'kyi provintsynny sobor* [Замойський провінційний собор], book 1, 332. For more details about the liturgical decrees of the Council of Zamość, in particular the use of zeon, see: Daniel Galadza, “Zjednotenie, Prijmanie a Premenie. Tristo rokov po miestnej synode w Zamošči,” in *Zamošćská synoda*, edited by D. Černý (Bratislava–Roma, 2021), 134–155.

¹⁶ Archivio Storico SCPF, Scritture, riferite nei Congregazioni Generali, vol. 611, fol. 153v.

¹⁷ Aleksander Codello, “Kiszka Łukasz,” in *Polski słownik biograficzny*, edited by Władysław Konopczyński et al., vol. 12 (Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1966–1967), 511–512.

¹⁸ Dmytro Blažejovskij, *Byzantine Kyivan Rite Students in Pontifical Colleges, and in Seminaries, Universities and Institutes of Central and Western Europe (1576–1983)* (Rome, 1984), 121.

have not reached the age which the Council of Trent prescribes.” And as for bishops, it emphasized that age which “the prescriptions of the holy canons require of future bishops.”¹⁹

Such a not excessively precise formulation regarding age in the decrees and, at first glance, a failure to respond to Rome’s remarks of 1716 does not look strange, for a number of persons from the Ruthenian episcopate who were at the Council of Zamość received episcopal ordination before they were 35.²⁰ So, to pass a decree which they themselves did not adhere to, and which would have been almost impossible to enforce, looks not entirely acceptable.

Already in 1716, Grimaldi, together with papal clerics, formulated all main points to discuss in the planned synod of the Ruthenian Uniates. But during the next four years he coordinated the so-called “campaign” to improve “agenda” on the eve of the synod that engaged a few Catholic Clerics in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, primarily in Lviv, and of course the Ruthenian Uniate hierarchs.

THE ROLE OF STEFANO TROMBETTI, PREFECT OF THE LVIV COLLEGE

Primarily the council was to be held in Lviv (later because of plague it held in Zamość), in Rome they planned to resolve still more questions in Lviv, taking advantage of the fact that the apostolic nuncio was there. One of the most important questions, of which many had accumulated, was resolving the conflict between the Kyivan Uniate metropolitan Lev Kyshka and the prefect of the Armenian and Ruthenian Papal College in Lviv, Stefano Trombetti.

Stefano Trombetti headed the college in Lviv from 1706 to 1723 and was a person trusted by the Congregation *Propaganda Fide* regarding Ruthenian matters in Lviv, and not only. For example, in June 1720 it was through Trombetti that reports reached Rome about a conflict with Basilian Maksymilian Vitrynskyi. This is not strange, because the Lviv college answered to the Congregation for the *Propaganda Fide*, so its prefect, obviously, was a person trusted by functionaries in Rome.²¹ Stefano Trombetti was well acquainted with details of the conflict in the

¹⁹ *Zamoys'kyi provintsynny sobor* [Замойський провінційний собор], book 1, 350, 353, 358.

²⁰ See the biographies of the council’s participants: *Zamoys'kyi provintsynny sobor* [Замойський провінційний собор], book 1, 350, 353.

²¹ About the papal college of the Theatines in Lviv, see: Yaroslav Dashkevych, “L’vivs’ka virmens’ka kolehiya,” in *Yaroslav Dashkevych. Ukraina na perekhrestі svitiv: relihiyevnavchi y sotsiokul’turni studiyi*, edited by Liliya Moravs’ka and Iryna Skochulyas (L’viv, 2016) [Ярослав Дашкевич, “Львівська вірменська колегія,” in *Ярослав Дашкевич. Україна на перехресті світів: релігієзнавчі й соціокультурні студії*, edited by Лілія Моравська and Ірина Скочильяс (Львів, 2016)], 487.

Peremyshl eparchy, sending reports to Rome about an abuse of the metropolitan in the matter of the church tax, et al.²² Trombetti’s direct interest during the Council of Zamość was in the matter of “forwarding” donations for the Peremyshl eparchy to the Lviv college, which he headed. In a word, Trombetti was interested in resolving to his advantage a number of questions which did not entirely correlate with the interests of Metropolitan of Kyiv Lev Kyshka, and so misunderstandings arose.

Finally, not only was Fr. Trombetti present at the Council of Zamość, but he actively took part in conciliar matters on the “team” of the apostolic nuncio, which is witnessed by diary entries of Basilian Protoarchimandrite Antoni Zavadskyi. Among other things, Trombetti figured in the list of persons in whose presence and with whose signatures the Ruthenian hierarchs composed the Confession of Faith.²³

Stefano Trombetti took part in forming the agenda of the Council of Zamość, and also – with the mediation of Fr. Sciara – accused Metropolitan Kyshka of delaying the conduct of the provincial assembly of Ruthenian clergy. It was the procurator of the Theatine Fathers, Fr. Sciara, who gave the congregation a report which he “received from Fr. Trombetti, the prefect of two papal colleges in Lviv, a brief report about matters which should be proposed to monsignor nuncio at the synod of those Uniate Greek bishops, which should be convened as soon as possible.”²⁴ Finally, the secretary of the congregation, Niccolo Spinola, in January 1718 repeated the formula that, namely, the “agenda” which Trombetti handed on “contains everything that should be proposed to monsignor nuncio in Poland at the synod of bishops for Uniate Ruthenians.”²⁵

“DEMANDS” OF LATIN ARCHBISHOP JAN SKARBEK

At the request of the apostolic nuncio from 23 May 1720, the Latin archbishop of Lviv, Jan Skarbek (1713–1733), replied with a letter of 11 June with his propositions – or perhaps “demands” – regarding the agenda of the council of the Ruthenians.²⁶ At the start of the letter, the hierarch expressed his fear that “in some way preference might be given to the mentioned rite in what relates to all social classes of the kingdom.” That is, right at the beginning, he

²² Skochylyas, “Dekrety Zamoys’koho soboru” [Скочилия, “Декрети Замойського собору”], 436.

²³ *Zamoys’kyi provintsynny sobor* [Замойський провінційний собор], book 1, 63, 72, 185.

²⁴ Archivio Storico SCPF, Acta S. C. de Propaganda Fide, vol. 85, fol. 309–311.

²⁵ Archivio Storico SCPF, Acta S. C. de Propaganda Fide, vol. 88, fol. 43 v.–46.

²⁶ Archivio Storico SCPF, Scritture riferite nei Congregazioni Particolari, vol. 64, fol. 226–228 v.

accented preserving the privileges of the Latins in the context of “preferences” for Ruthenians of the Eastern rite. Certainly, with such a beginning in a letter regarding defending one’s own interests, he indicated the character of further propositions for the council in relation to the Latins and their interests. The first remark concerned the interference of the Uniates, precisely that “Ruthenian-Greek” pastors provided sacraments for Latins, in such a way “pulling” them “to their rite” – also, in this way the archbishop expressed his care for his flock. The second remark was about reforming the administrative structure, precisely, about increasing the number of priests to improve the quality of oversight of the faithful, for the latter allegedly resorted to fortune-telling. The next proposition regarded the disciplining of Uniate priests who, in the opinion of Archbishop Skarbek, “come to church uncombed,” church vessels are “greatly unclean,” etc. Also, groundless doubts were expressed about the correctness of many priests celebrating Liturgy together at the same time. He also emphasized the need to reform the church tax.

The next “demand” of Archbishop Skarbek was the following: “To establish it so that no Uniates should interfere with a cross being carried in front of them.”²⁷ This involved the exclusive right of the Latins to carry a cross during public church ceremonies for, he wrote, “in this province the Latin rite stands above others.” For the grounds of such a statement, the hierarch gave an example of the ordination in Lviv of a bishop – this was about Atanasiy Sheptytskyi – and this was done precisely with the way of the cross of Uniates “with raised cross.” Later an even more exclusivist demand was made: that “in each city, town, and village where there is a Latin church, its high status be maintained: when the bells of the Latin church are silent, then theirs must be silent, even when they have a ceremonial holy day.”²⁸ Finally, yet another demand of Skarbek was to pass a decree which would have allowed Uniates to transfer to the Latin rite, though in this same letter it mentions the bull of Pope Urban VIII, which forbade such “conversions.”

On 25 June 1720, Archbishop Skarbek sent Grimaldi a second letter – with five propositions. And, as was understood from this letter, the Latin archbishop received a response from the apostolic nuncio which Skarbek, in the second letter, clarified and commented on.²⁹ In particular, the archbishop of the Lviv diocese detailed problems with a number of priests at one parish, giving concrete

²⁷ Archivio Storico SCPF, Scritture riferite nei Congregazioni Particolari, vol. 64, fol. 227r.

²⁸ Archivio Storico SCPF, Scritture riferite nei Congregazioni Particolari, vol. 64, fol. 227v.

²⁹ Archivio Storico SCPF, Scritture riferite nei Congressi: Moscovia, Polonia, Ruteni, vol. 4, fol. 110–112.

examples: he mentioned 5 to 6 thousand churches in the Lviv and Peremyshl eparchies and the practice of sons "inheriting" parishes from their fathers, which should be set right. And yet again, he emphasized the problems of insufficient financing of parishes and monasteries and dependence "on patrons." Later, he clarified a point about Uniates providing sacraments to Latins which, in Skarbek's opinion, needed to be corrected.

The final point again emphasized the superiority of Latin clergy over Uniates, which should not only be guaranteed *de jure* but carried out *de facto*. However, in the analyzed letter, Skarbek moderately described the superiority of the Latins: "The Ruthenian bishops, though they have a lower prerogative, thanks to income from their clergy, have more power [...] the prerogative of our all-enlightened bishops is higher, but the rent from their estates is not equal to it."³⁰

Finally, instead of – at the request of the congregation – writing "that it seems useful and necessary for the Ruthenian synod," Archbishop Jan Skarbek at the start sent a list of "demands," not propositions, moreover from the superior position of the Latins and their exclusivism, which did not so much involve Ruthenian "brothers in faith" as much as a strengthening of their own interests. That is, such "demands" looked mostly harmful for the council of the Uniate Church which, finally, confirmed decrees which did not take these demands into account. However, after correspondence with the apostolic nuncio, repeated remarks of the archbishop of the Lviv diocese became more reasonable and detailed.

SUPPORT FROM BISHOPS YOSYF LEVYTSKYI AND THE POINTS OF ATHANASIY SHEPTYTSKYI

On 21 June 1720, Bishop of Kholm Yosyf Levytskyi sent a letter to the apostolic nuncio. He supported the program of the agenda for the council which the metropolitan of Kyiv had already formed. Levytskyi also stated that deanery meetings were planned for the Kholm region and that, if other propositions for them should arise, he would report on this.³¹ In this letter, total support was expressed for the metropolitan on the part of the Kholm eparchy and its bishop, Levytskyi, whose signature in the decrees passed by the council was right next

³⁰ Archivio Storico SCPF, Scritture riferite nei Congressi: Moscovia, Polonia, Ruteni, vol. 4, fol. 111v.

³¹ Archivio Storico SCPF, Scritture riferite nei Congressi: Moscovia, Polonia, Ruteni, vol. 4, fol. 118.

to that of the metropolitan. This confirms the law-abiding character of the pastor of Kholm, which is why they wanted to send their propositions to him.

Yet another request of the nuncio regarding propositions for the council was sent to Bishop of Lviv Atanasiy Sheptytskyi, who in response wrote a letter of 23 June 1720, though he was then in Warsaw. Atanasiy Sheptytskyi, just like Yosyf Levytskyi, entirely supported Metropolitan Lev Kyshka, stating: “I consider it necessary in everything to rely on the all-enlightened metropolitan.” What is more, the letter testifies to especially strong support on the part of the bishop of Lviv: “I believe that the all-enlightened metropolitan in view of his hierarchical dignity will submit without any delay [...] the clearest possible report regarding everything in general and each of the points separately.”³²

In six days, on 29 June, Atanasiy Sheptytskyi, now from the Univ archimandrite’s residence, sent Girolamo Grimaldi 10 points-propositions regarding the council’s agenda.³³ Above all, the bishop of Lviv proposed securing the lower clergy from “unjustified burdens,” without, however, providing concrete propositions, which would have been worth doing. This first point intended, most likely, to solve the problem with the church tax, and this very problem is written about even more clearly – referring to the church tax – in the seventh section. The next point proposed closing parishes which did not have financing sufficient for their functioning. The third proposition was to ordain only those priests who would have “provision of food and clothing.” The next recommendation again regarded the parish clergy, namely, not to appoint a number of priests for one parish. And one more proposition regarded parish organizations: regularizing procedures for the granting of donations from patrons, who often in such a way attempted to interfere in church matters. The fifth point regarded the question of setting clear boundaries for eparchies, which was brought about because of the conflict in the Peremyshl region, with which Sheptytskyi was familiar. If Archbishop of Lviv Skarbek “demanded” a review of the question of permitting Uniates to transfer to the Latin rite, then Sheptytskyi in his ninth point, on the contrary, suggesting forbidding such “conversions” – in accord with the decree of Pope Urban VIII. That is, there was a problem with transfers between the Latin and Eastern rites, because the bishops of certain administrative units each supported their own interests. On the other hand, this demonstrates that there were violations in executing the rules of the papal decree. And in the final, tenth point, Sheptytskyi again proposed disciplining the clergy “regarding clothing and cleanliness” and also unifying liturgical practices. That is, Bishop of Lviv

³² Archivio Storico SCPF, Scritture riferite nei Congressi: Moscovia, Polonia, Ruteni, vol. 4, fol. 116 v.

³³ Archivio Storico SCPF, Scritture riferite nei Congressi: Moscovia, Polonia, Ruteni, vol. 4, fol. 146.

Atanasiy Sheptytskyi proposed a program of reforms that involved unifying and disciplining the parish civilization, which he himself implemented in the Lviv eparchy both before and after the provincial Council of Zamość.³⁴

In addition, it is worth mentioning that Sheptytskyi informed Trombetti about the moods of the metropolitan of Kyiv. In particular, in a letter of 17 July, returning from the city of Volodymyr and Kyshka to his seat in Univ, the bishop of Lviv wrote Trombetti that “even regarding the smallest point I have not been able to ascertain his [Kyszka’s] thoughts; but he was clear that he considers this synod necessary in view of various circumstances.”³⁵ But, at the same time, the author of the letter confirmed that the metropolitan was categorically against conducting the council in the chapel of the Theatines in Lviv. Kyshka, finally, personally informed Trombetti about this. They knew in Rome about Atanasiy Sheptytskyi’s reports, because in a letter of 17 August to the nuncio they wrote that they were surprised that Metropolitan Kyshka had not acquainted the bishop of Lviv with the exact points which were to be proposed for the council.³⁶

In this way, the two highest ranking hierarchs (after the metropolitan) of the Kyivan Uniate Metropolitanate before the council in documents of June 1720 demonstrated their support for Metropolitan Lev Kyshka. And this, with the Peremyshl conflict in the background, was a very strong factor in the strengthening of the positions, specifically of the leader of the Uniate Church, and also of the Ruthenian higher clergy in general.

FINAL ROME “AGENDA” AND NICCOLO SPINOLA

On 11 July 1720, a little more than a month before the start of the provincial Council of Zamość, an ordinary session of the Congregation for the *Propaganda Fide* was held in Rome, at which were considered questions about the council of the Ruthenians, and they also made decisions about its agenda.³⁷ At first glance, the number of propositions from Rome in July almost matched the

³⁴ Ihor Skochylyas, *Halyts'ka (L'vivs'ka) yeparkhiya XII–XVIII stolit': orhanizatsiyna struktura ta pravovyy status* (L'viv: Vyd-vo UKU, 2010) [Ігор Скочиляс, *Галицька (Львівська) єпархія XII–XVIII століть: організаційна структура та правовий статус* (Львів: Вид-во УКУ, 2010)], 615–640.

³⁵ Archivio Storico SCPF, Scritture, riferite nei Congressi Moscovia, Polonia e Ruteni, vol. 4, fol. 493.

³⁶ Athanasij G. Welykyj, ed., *Litterae S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide Ecclesiam Catholicam Ucrainae et Bielarusjae spectantes*, vol. 3 (Romae: PP. Basiliani, 1956), 168.

³⁷ Archivio Storico SCPF, Scritture, riferite nei Congregazioni Particolari, vol. 64, fol. 219–220, 163–167 v.

amount of titles of decrees of the council (18 and 19, respectively). In other words, this leads to a thesis about the program sent from Rome which was to be executed at the council. However, a detailed comparative analysis of the texts of the July propositions and decrees, and also the history of the forming of the agenda, with the participation of both Roman ecclesiastics and the Ruthenian episcopate, witnesses to the fact of conciliar discussions which influenced and modified the texts of the final decrees, regardless of the planned agenda. Finally, the diary of Basilian Archimandrite Antonyi Zavadskyi testifies inarguably to the conciliar discussions.³⁸

The propositions of June 1720 summarize all the described discussions and also the discussion of the agenda which already in 1716 Girolamo Grimaldi had proposed in the circles of the metropolitan of Kyiv and the Ruthenian hierarchs, Jan Skarbek, Stefano Trombetti, and others. First of all, some of the points from Rome in July 1720 regarded the unification and disciplining of the clergy, especially of the newly-joined Lviv, Lutsk, and Peremyshl eparchies. The main reasonable proposition to resolve this problem was to establish new seminaries. Secondly, there was a proposal to discuss questions of the rite, in particular the calendar and fasts. If they discussed fasting for laity in the correspondence, finally, the conciliar decrees weakened the demands regarding fasting practices, and there was no active discussion of the “new” calendar, though the Roman functionaries accented this. Finally, the decrees of the council were not implemented, as was stated in the decisions of the congregation, though the calendar question was discussed at the third, “closed” session of the council at the end of August, which Protoarchimandrite Antonyi Zavadskyi noted in his dairy. Also, a request to introduce the “new calendar” was recorded in the desiderata of the Ruthenian clergy to the Congregation for the *Propaganda Fide* directly during the conclusion of the council.³⁹ A system of church holy days was arranged, among other things, officially introducing the celebration of Corpus Christi.⁴⁰ However, this was not a “new” calendar, by its nature, but only the codification of an existing situation.

³⁸ For details about this, see: Ihor Skochylyas, “Vasylians’ka ‘lehenda’ Zamoys’koho soboru,” in *Zamoys’kyi provintsynny sobor* [Ігор Сkochиляс, “Василіянська ‘легенда’ Замойського собору,” in *Замойський провінційний собор*], book 1, 5–24.

³⁹ *Zamoys’kyi provintsynny sobor* [Замойський провінційний собор], book 1, 52, 518.

⁴⁰ *Zamoys’kyi provintsynny sobor* [Замойський провінційний собор], book 1, 398–401; for details, see: Maria Takala-Roszczenko, *The ‘Latin’ within the ‘Greek’: The Feast of the Holy Eucharist in the Context of Ruthenian Eastern Rite Liturgical Evolution in the 16th–18th Centuries* (Joensuu: Ita-Suomen yliopisto, 2013), 205.

It is important to emphasize that the Roman propositions in a number of points underline the equality between Latins and Uniates, particularly maintaining the papal bull of Urban VIII forbidden transfer between rites. That is, Rome carried out the role of arbiter in disputes between Latins and Uniates in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and this role can be traced very well in the materials of the analyzed propositions, conditioned by the particular interests of the leaders of church administrations in Lviv: Jan Skarbek and Atanasij Sheptytskyi. The question of forbidding transfer from the “Greek” to the Latin rite is again emphasized in the desiderata of the Uniate clergy, which they sent to the Congregation for the *Propaganda Fide* immediately after the conclusion of the council.⁴¹ In separate points, the problem of simony and the urgent need to regulate the church tax were described, which were emphasized by almost all the participants of the preparatory stage of the council, both the Ruthenian hierarchy and also diplomats from Rome.

One more point about which the Roman functionaries wrote draws attention: on the position of the centralization and unification of church life, regardless of difference in rites. It regarded the conduct of visitations by Ruthenian hierarchs, in particular the bishop of Kholm, who, they said, published without Rome’s agreement a book of visitation instructions. The same provision condemned the violation of Latin hierarchs who tried to have their visitations placed above those of Uniate jurisdictions. In other words, the proposition was to norm the procedures for visitations with clear instructions for all church institutions which belonged to the jurisdiction of Uniate hierarchs. Finally, such detailed instructions with concrete questions were prescribed in the final decrees of the Council of Zamość.⁴²

It is worth noting here that Cardinal Niccolo Spinola, even at the start of June 1720, in his letter to Grimaldi wrote about the question of centralization and discipline with the help of the instrument of mandatory visitation by the Ruthenian hierarchs, not the Latins. A former nuncio in Warsaw (1707–1712) who, among other things, took active part in the transfer of the Dormition Brotherhood in Lviv to the Union, he emphasized that it was the Uniate bishops who should conduct visitations of their own jurisdictions, and he expressed the expectation that educational reform, in the form of seminaries, in perspective would allow the disciplining of the Ruthenian clergy. In this same letter, Spinola answered Girolamo Grimaldi’s concrete points regarding the future council.⁴³

⁴¹ *Zamoys’kyi provintsynny sobor* [Замойський провінційний собор], book 1, 524.

⁴² *Zamoys’kyi provintsynny sobor* [Замойський провінційний собор], book 1, 409–420.

⁴³ Archivio Storico SCPF, Scrittura, riferite nei Congressi: Moscovia, Polonia, Ruteni, vol. 4, fol. 10-11 v.

In this way, the former nuncio in Warsaw gave advice to Grimaldi about Ruthenian matters and, it seems, was actively involved in the process of preparing the assembly. From time to time the former nuncio in Warsaw was asked to assess and send his opinions regarding the planned council of the Ruthenians. In particular, in one of his descriptions, Spinola recommended that all participants of the assembly be acquainted with the rules for conducting the councils of Trent or Milan, the latter of which happened under the direction of Carlo Borromeo. In other words, it was recommended that technical questions of organization be borrowed precisely from Latin models. Clearly, Spinola supported propositions to discipline the clergy, admitting the need to oversee the clothing of pastors, check how they provide the sacraments, etc.⁴⁴ In other words, the propositions of Niccolo Spinola were clearly based on a post-Tridentine Catholic vision of the arrangement of church life.

Regarding all 18 points accepted at the session of the Congregation for the Propaganda Fide of 11 July 1720, resolutions were passed, and those responsible for their fulfillment were designated. And here it was expected that the main “controller” of the implementation of the decisions was Apostolic Nuncio Girolamo Grimaldi.

The apostolic nuncio in Warsaw received from the congregation a separate letter, dated 13 July, with detailed instructions regarding the agenda of the planned council. Among other things, Girolamo Grimaldi was obligated to block consideration of the question of the possibility of visitation of church institutions under Uniate jurisdiction by Latin hierarchs.⁴⁵ They also informed the nuncio about the situation with “conversions” from the Uniate to the Latin rite, especially in the “Lithuanian” part of the Kyivan Metropolitanate. At the congregation, they knew about the violation of the papal bull on the part of the Latin hierarchs; also, separate documents of 1717 and 1718 mentioned such abuses.⁴⁶ In this way, they explained to Grimaldi from Rome why this question needed to be removed from the council’s agenda. Grimaldi was also to take care that the problem of public processions of Ruthenian Uniates with the cross in Lviv not be discussed. Not only bishops of both rites in Lviv wrote

⁴⁴ Athanasij G. Welykyj, ed., *Litterae episcoporum historiam Ucrainae illustrantes (1600–1900)*, vol. 5 (Romae: PP. Basiliani, 1981), 1711–1740, 178–180.

⁴⁵ Archivio Storico SCPF, Litterae S. Congregationis et Secretarii, vol. 109, fol. 244–244v.

⁴⁶ Archivio Storico SCPF, Litterae S. Congregationis et Secretarii, vol. 109, fol. 244v.

about this, but it also concerned Metropolitan of Kyiv Lev Kyshka. And if they were insistent about considering this question, it was recommended to the nuncio that the sides directly appeal to the congregation about this.⁴⁷

In the first half of July 1720, papal brevi came from Rome about the designation of the apostolic nuncio as head of the council and about the conduct of the assembly, addressed to the nuncio himself, the metropolitan of Kyiv, and also the Lviv and Peremyshl bishops. In addition, they demanded from the last two mentioned bishops in separate letters that they help conduct the council “in peace,” regardless of present conflicts. Moreover, in a letter of 20 July to the nuncio, they entrusted him with ensuring that at the start of the council, for the verification and canonical proceeding of the conciliar activities, all the documents from Rome be read. The goal of the documents, addressed to various parties, in particular those who were in conflict with each other, was to restrain any passions.⁴⁸

In this way, Grimaldi, led by “practical recommendations” from Rome, had to create favorable conditions and “relieve the tension” that could arise during the council, both between the Latin and Uniate hierarchs and also within the Ruthenian episcopate, which might spill out into various arguments. In order to prevent this, they informed him from Rome about important details, since they had, as they considered, the fullest information about the situation from both sides and from a list of informers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival Sources

Archivio Storico «De Propaganda Fide» – Congregazione per l’Evangelizzazione dei Popoli
[Archivio Storico SCPF]

Acta S. C. de Propaganda Fide, vol. 85, vol. 88.

Litterae S. Congregationes et Secretarii, vol. 105, vol. 109.

Scritture, riferite nei Congregazioni Generali, vol. 611.

Scritture, riferite nei Congregazioni Particolari, vol. 64.

Scritture, riferite nei Congressi Moscovia, Polonia e Ruteni, vol. 4.

Printed Sources

Welykyj, Athanasij G., ed. *Litterae S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide Ecclesiam Catholicam Ucrainae et Bielarusjae spectantes*. Vol. 3. Romae: PP. Basiliani, 1956.

Welykyj, Athanasij G., ed. *Litterae episcoporum historiam Ucrainae illustrantes (1600–1900)*. Vol. 5, 1711–1740. Romae: PP. Basiliani, 1981.

⁴⁷ Archivio Storico SCPF, Litterae S. Congregationis et Secretarii, vol. 109, fol. 245.

⁴⁸ Athanasij G. Welykyj, ed., *Litterae S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide*, vol. 3, 164–165.

Literature

- Al'mes, Ivan, Dar'ya Syroid and Taras Shman'ko, eds. *Zamoys'kyu provintsyyny sobor Rus'koyi Uniyanoi Tserkvy 1720 roku*. Book 2: *Dokumenty i materialy*. (Seriya "Kyuyivs'ke khrystyuanstvo", vol. 35). L'viv: Ukrayins'kyu katolyts'kyu universytet, 2024 [Альмес, Іван, Дарія Сироїд and Тарас Шманько, eds. *Замойський провінційний собор Руської Унійної Церкви 1720 року*. Book 2: *Документи і матеріали*. (Series "Київське християнство", vol. 35). Львів: Український католицький університет, 2024] (forthcoming).
- Blažejovskij, Dmytro. *Byzantine Kyivan Rite Students in Pontifical Colleges, and in Seminaries, Universities and Institutes of Central and Western Europe (1576–1983)*. Rome, 1984.
- Codello, Aleksander. „Kiszka Łukasz.” In *Polski słownik biograficzny*, edited by Władysław Konopczyński et al. Vol. 12, 511–512. Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1966–1967.
- Dashkevych, Yaroslav. “L'vivs'ka virmens'ka kolehiya.” In *Yaroslav Dashkevych. Ukrayina na perekhresti svitiv: relihiyeznavchi y sotsiokul'turni studiyi*, edited by Liliya Moravs'ka and Iryna Skochylyas. L'viv, 2016 [Дашкевич, Ярослав. “Львівська вірменська колегія.” In *Ярослав Дашкевич. Україна на перехресті світів: релігієзнавчі й соціокультурні студії*, edited by Лілія Моравська and Ірина Сकोчиляс. Львів, 2016].
- Emich, Birgit. “Uniformity and Polycentricity. The Early Modern Papacy between Promoting Unity and Handling Diversity.” In *Pathways through Early Modern Christianities*, edited by Andreea Badea, Bruno Boute and Birgit Emich, 33–53 (Kulturen des Christentums/Cultures of Christianity, vol. 1). Köln: Böhlau, 2023.
- Galadza, Daniel. “Zjednotenie, Prijímanie a Premenenie. Tristo rokov po miestnej synode w Zamošči.” In *Zamošćská synoda*, edited by D. Černý, 134–155. Bratislava–Roma, 2021.
- Kęder, Wojciech. “Przydatność akt nuncjatury papieskiej jako źródła historycznego.” *Textus et Studia*, No 2(6) (2016): 56–67.
- Koller, Alexander. “Grimaldi Girolamo.” In *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, edited by Mario Caravale. Vol. 59, 539–543. Roma: Istituto Della Enciclopedia Italiana, 2002.
- Nowakowski, Przemysław, ed. *Dziedzictwo Synodu Zamojskiego 1720–2020. Wyzwania i perspektywy*. Krakow: Avalon, 2021.
- Nowakowski, Przemysław, ed. *Statuty Synodu Zamojskiego 1720 roku. Nowe polskie tłumaczenie z komentarzami*. Krakow: Avalon, 2020.
- Takala-Roszchenko, Maria. *The 'Latin' within the 'Greek': The Feast of the Holy Eucharist in the Context of Ruthenian Eastern Rite Liturgical Evolution in the 16th–18th Centuries*. Joensuu: Ita Suomen yliopisto, 2013.
- Paran'ko, Rostyslav, Ihor Skochylyas and Iryna Skochylyas, eds. *Zamoys'kyu provintsyyny sobor Rus'koyi Uniyanoi Tserkvy 1720 roku*. Book 1: *Diyannya ta postanovy*. (Seriya "Kyuyivs'ke khrystyuanstvo", vol. 23). L'viv: Ukrayins'kyu katolyts'kyu universytet, 2021 [Паранько, Ростислав, Ігор Сकोчиляс and Ірина Сकोчиляс, eds. *Замойський провінційний собор Руської Унійної Церкви 1720 року*. Book 1: *Діяння та постанови*. (Series "Київське християнство", vol. 23). Львів: Український католицький університет, 2021].
- Skochylyas, Ihor. *Halys'ka (L'vivs'ka) yeparkhiya XII–XVIII stolit': orhanizatsiyina struktura ta pravovyy status*. L'viv: Vyd-vo UKU, 2010 [Скочиляс, Ігор. *Галицька (Львівська) єпархія XII–XVIII століть: організаційна структура та правовий статус*. Львів: Вид-во УКУ, 2010].

CORRESPONDING THE "AGENDA" OF ZAMOŚĆ COUNCIL (1715–1720):
APOSTOLIC NUNCIO, CATHOLIC CLERICS, AND UNIATE HIERARCHS

Summary

The paper studies the correspondence from the papal archives on the eve of the Zamość Council 1720. Research on corresponding raises the question of tensions between Latin and Uniates hierarchs on the eve of the council and in which way these debates were "moderated" from Rome by the apostolic nuncio. The article concentrates on the so-called *Memorial* of Apostolic Nuncio Girolamo Grimaldi prepared already in 1716. After that research analysed a "campaign" in May-June 1720 organized by Apostolic Nuncio to gather information about the affairs of the Ruthenian Uniates to update the council's agenda. The group of informants included the rector of Papal College in Lviv, Stefano Trombetti, and Latin Archbishop of Lviv Jan Skarbek. Girolamo Grimaldi also sent letters to the Uniate bishops (Yosyf Levytskyi and Atanasiy Sheptytskyi) each of them responded to the apostolic nuncio, sharing their propositions regarding the agenda of the planned council of the Kyivan Uniate Metropolitanate.

Keywords: Zamość Council 1720; correspondence; papal archives; Congregation of Propaganda Fide; Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth; Kyivan Uniate Metropolitanate; Girolamo Grimaldi; Lev Kyshka.

KORESPONDENCJA DOTYCZĄCA "AGENDY" SYNODU ZAMOJSKIEGO (1715–1720):
NUNCJUSZ APOSTOLSKI, KATOLICCY DUCHOWNI I HIERARCHOWIE UNICCY

Streszczenie

W artykule analizie poddano korespondencję pochodzącą z archiwum papieskiego w przededniu synodu zamojskiego w roku 1720. W badaniach nad korespondencją pojawia się kwestia napięć pomiędzy hierarchami Kościoła rzymskokatolickiego i unickiego w okresie poprzedzającym synod oraz sposobu, w jaki te spory były „moderowane” z Rzymu przez nuncjusza apostolskiego. Autor skupia się na tzw. *Memoriale* nuncjusza apostolskiego Girolama Grimaldiego, przygotowanego już w 1716 r. Następnie przeanalizowano „kampanię” zorganizowaną przez nuncjusza w maju i czerwcu 1720 r. celem aktualizacji informacji dotyczących unitów ruskich. Wśród informatorów znalazł się rektor kolegium papieskiego w Lwowie, Stefano Trombetti, i rzymskokatolicki arcybiskup Lwowa Jan Skarbek. Girolamo Grimaldi wysłał listy także do biskupów unickich (Józefa Lewickiego i Atanazego Szeptyckiego), otrzymując od każdego z nich propozycję dotyczącą porządku obrad planowanego synodu unickiej metropolii kijowskiej.

Słowa kluczowe: synod zamojski 1720; korespondencja; archiwa papieskie; Kongregacja ds. Ewangelizacji Narodów; Rzeczpospolita Obojga Narodów; unicka metropolia kijowska; Girolamo Grimaldi; Leon Kiszka.

Translated by Matthew Matuszak