

19. Wood, G. S. *The Idea of America: Reflections on the Birth of the United States* / G.S. Wood. – New York: Penguin Press, 2011. – 335 p.

20. Wright, L. B. *Thomas Jefferson and the Classics* / L.B. Wright // *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*. – 1943. – Vol. 87, No. 3. – Pp. 223-233.

References:

1. DZHEFFERSON, T. (1990). *Avtobiografiya. Zapiski o shtate Virdzhiniya*. [Autobiography. Notes on the State of Virginia]. Leningrad: Nauka. [In Russian].

2. BERNSTEIN, R. B. (2004). *Thomas Jefferson: The Revolution of Ideas*. New York: Oxford University Press.

3. BOWERS, C. G. (1945). *The Young Jefferson, 1743-1789*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

4. CARPENTER, J. (2013). Thomas Jefferson and the Ideology of Democratic Schooling. [Online]. *Democracy & Education*, 21(2), 1–11. Retrieved from <https://democracyeducationjournal.org/home/vol21/iss2/5/>.

5. CATLET, L. B. (2004). *Thomas Jefferson: A Free Mind*. Victoria: Trafford Publishing.

6. GROSSBERG, M. & TOMLINS, C. (Eds). (2008). *The Cambridge History of Law in America. Vol. 1: Early America (1580-1815)*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

7. HOLOWCHAK, M. A. (2017). *Thomas Jefferson, Moralist*. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland.

8. LEHMANN, K. (1947). *Thomas Jefferson, American Humanist*. New York: The Macmillan Company.

9. MECKLER, M. (2006). *Classical Antiquity and the Politics of America: From George Washington to George W. Bush*. Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press.

10. ONUF, P. S. (2007). *The Mind of Thomas Jefferson*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

11. PETERSON, M. D. (1998). *The Jefferson Image in the American Mind*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

12. RICHARD, C. J. (2009). *Why We're All Romans. The Roman Contribution to the Western World*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

13. RICHEY, T. L. (2009). An Historical Inquiry into Thomas Jefferson's Influence on the American Educational System. *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 909. Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.du.edu/etd/909>.

14. SELLERS, M. N. S. (1994). *American Republicanism. Roman Ideology in the United States Constitution*. New York: New York University Press.

15. SHALEV, E. (2003). Ancient Masks, American Fathers: Classical Pseudonyms during the American Revolution and Early Republic. *Journal of the Early Republic*, 23(2), 151–172.

16. SULLIVAN, L. H. (1924). *The Autobiography of an Idea*. New York: Press of the American Institute of Architects.

17. WOOD, G. S. (1990). Classical Republicanism and the American Revolution. *Chicago-Kent Law Review*, 66(1), 13–38.

18. WOOD, G. S. (2009). *Empire of Liberty. A History of the Early Republic (1789-1815)*. New York: Oxford University Press.

19. WOOD, G. S. (2011). *The Idea of America: Reflections on the Birth of the United States*. New York: Penguin Press.

20. WRIGHT, L.B. (1943). *Thomas Jefferson and the Classics. Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 87(3), 223–233.

Надійшла до редколегії 20.11.18

M. Bazaieva, Student

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine

THE INFLUENCE OF ANTIQUITY ON THE VIEWS FORMATION AND ACTIVITY OF THOMAS JEFFERSON

The article is dedicated to the influence of antiquity on the formation of Thomas Jefferson's system of philosophical, political, scientific and artistic views. Specificity of philosophical and cultural space of Europe and North America is considered, as well as conditions of education and personal development of Thomas Jefferson. Thomas Jefferson's works are analyzed, direct citations and references to antique philosophers and writers are noted, likewise political ideas of Thomas Jefferson, that are grounded on antique history. Tendency to identification antique history, philosophy and literature as sample and guidance in publicistic and literary works of Thomas Jefferson is pointed out. In the article are revised influences of antiquity on the following spheres of Thomas Jefferson's activity: organization of education, law, governance, architecture. In the educational development Thomas Jefferson propagated broad studying of antique history and classical languages that might be the basis for education and personality development. Antique examples were the foundation of Thomas Jefferson's ideas about citizenship, nation and slavery, principles of the classical republicanism and organization of public administration are grounded on the same samples. Thomas Jefferson's personal ambivalence in the questions of patriotism as dualism in relations "citizen of the state – citizen of the USA" is noted. Some attention is paid to the architectural works of Thomas Jefferson. He followed the best antique masterpieces in his own architectural projects and laid the foundation of American classicism in the architecture of 19th century.

Key words: antiquity, Thomas Jefferson, Roman republic, classical republicanism, education, citizenship, slavery, American classicism.

УДК 97(477):94(439)

<https://doi.org/10.17721/1728-2640.2018.139.02>

B. Varga, Dr. Habil. (History), Associate Professor
University of Szeged, Szeged, Hungary

ROLE OF HAJDUKS AND COSSACKS IN THE 16TH AND 17TH CENTURY HUNGARIAN AND UKRAINIAN SOCIETY

The intent of the research is to determine viewpoints for the comparative analysis of the Hungarian Hajduks and the Ukrainian Cossacks. During the period spanning from the end of the 15th century up to the 1570's, Cossacks, similarly to Hajduks, began to take shape as a new social phenomenon, yet legally they still did not exist. Registered Cossacks and royal Hajduks as such were legally recognised, thus they gained a distinguished position in contemporary society despite the fact that hard as they tried, the title of nobility was yet unavailable to them. After comparing the position of Ukrainian Cossacks and Hungarian Hajduks in society, it can be stated that they constituted an "intermediate" social category between nobility and villeins, and they became a mass phenomenon in society only at the end of the 16th century.

Keywords: Hungarian Hajduks, Ukrainian Cossacks, historical parallels, intermediate social category, Royal Hungary, Transylvania, Rzeczpospolita.

Hungarian historians [7, p. 16-21; 11, p. 153-180; 17, p. 193; 18, p. 22; 20, p. 42; 24, p. 38; 25, p. 16-19; 31, p. 31-47; 36, p. 174-180] repeatedly voiced special concern for the fact that, similarly to the Hajduks, bonnet-laird communities fulfilling military service were formed in the Polish-Lithuanian state, too, known as the Cossacks, who took up arms against either internal feudal oppression or external enemies, primarily the Turks [25, p. 196]. The Cossacks of Ukraine, as a new social and political factor, had evolved in the second half of the 15th century [16, p. 191; 26, p. 108-109; 38, p. 251; 43, p. 303; 44, p. 183;

45, p. 20; 46, p. 33; 48, p. 19; 56, p. 36; 57, p. 178-179], which period coincides with the emergence of the Hungarian Hajduks. It unequivocally turns out from previous sources that Hajduks in large numbers had already been members of György Dózsa's army in 1514. Social identification of Cossacks can be considered as a heterogeneous composition, as in addition to runaway villeins settled at the southern border of the Polish-Lithuanian state, the so-called "no-man's-land", impoverished city-dwellers and outcast gentry were present in their ranks, who recognised the king of Poland as their

only lord. Hungarian historiography has still not reached a unanimous consent regarding the exact proportion of various social strata constituting the ranks of Hajduks [18, p. 19; 25, p. 23-24]. However, comparing the origins of Hajduks and Cossacks doing military service, it can be stated that they can by no means be considered as a homogeneous formation in society, yet from the beginning they came into being as a differentiated social category. Moreover, although they had been able to gain members from diverse social classes, the majority of them were still villeins.

Initially, Hajduks did not form a separate social category as a detached body. It was only at the end of the 15th century that they began to take shape [8, p. 7], and after 1526 they were obviously considered as not only raiding troops, but armed groups who, yet disorganised at the time, principally fought to protect their home country [6, p. 25], and from 1552 onwards they already established an independent military group which aimed to conduct systematic struggle against the Turks to replace occasional raids [2, p. 106].

In the meantime, Polish monarchs, similarly to Hungarian authorities, attempted to hold the restless Cossacks off by issuing a series of threatening decrees [35, p. 4, 12, 28, 33, 44, 84, 130, 190, 200, 253], yet with little success, since they mostly did not possess the necessary power to have the decrees enforced. The denomination of Cossack at the time was used for groups difficult to control and living on the southern border of the Polish-Lithuanian state. Non-privileged Cossacks resettled to the waterfalls of the Dnieper ("za porogi") [15, p. 70-71], which area, due to its excellent geographical features, with its thick forests, swamps and islands, offered sound protection as a natural boundary against intrusions by Turks or Tartars. Also, their "combat state", the Zaporozhian Sich was "established" here in the 1540's. Also, these people had built up a social and political organisation of military nature in the Zaporozhian Sich independent from the Polish-Lithuanian administration, and eventually effectively integrated into the protection of the southern borders.

It was only after the second half of the 1590's that the Hajduks developed to become a genuine military factor, which was due to the fact that the Fifteen Years' War resulted in an increase in their numbers and importance. Following this, Stephen Bocskai compressed part of the Hajduks into such organised troops that were acknowledged countrywide as independent and privileged corps [9, p.317; 22, p. 333; 23, p. 11], since the 1608 assembly of Bratislava ratified Bocskai's decrees [30, p. 15] by enacting the points of the Treaty of Vienna. Half of the estimated 30,000 Hajduks living in Trans-Tisza and the Partium were relocated, thus eventually Hajduk soldiers became integrated into the anti-Ottoman defense line. Nevertheless, while the privileges of the seven Hajduk cities in Szabolcs (Nánás, Böszörmény, Szoboszló, Vámpércs, Polgár, Hadház, Dorog) county were solidified by 1632 [10, p. 317] for good, the "Little Hajdu cities" [21, p. 248-248] of Bihar country came under county authority and tax obligations were imposed on them from 1634 onwards.

The Polish influence on pre-1648 Ukrainian nobility had born its stamp on it, as by the turn of the 16th and 17th centuries only few Ukrainian noblemen remained who had been unaffected by the Polonisation process. This caused Ukrainians to "lose" the majority of their political and social elite, therefore Cossacks took over to "lead" and represent the interests of the Ukrainian society. In 1572, Sigismund II Augustus of the Polish-Lithuanian state succeeded in passing the introduction of Cossacks as an institution registered in the Sejm [16, p. 196; 57, p. 263; 42, p. 81; 33,

p. 176; 39, p. 185]. As the King of Poland, between 1576 and 1586 Stephen Báthory experimented with several methods to regulate unregistered "free" Cossacks, using intimidation [1, p. 32; 3, p. 69] and executions to restrain Cossacks. Also, he hired some of them for serving the state. Although 300 "free" Cossacks had already sworn to be loyal to the last Jagiellonian monarch previously, in fact it was Stephen Báthory who, in accordance with his statute of September 1578 titled "Agreement with Sich Cossacks" [1, p. 337] created the institute of registered Cossacks. This act of Báthory's basically meant providing to initially 500, then in 1583 to 600 state-registered Cossacks [51, p. 92-93] tax exemption, exemption from church and landlord taxes. In addition, they gained independence from the scope of authority of local Polish authorities, which is they acquired the right to act as a local government [56, p. 9]. However, formally the Polish-Lithuanian government acknowledged privileges of only registered Cossacks in state service [41, p. 57-64] and officially Sich Cossacks were regarded to be outlaws. Still, despite this, the Zaporozhian Sich actually functioned as a "state within the state" in the framework of the Rzeczpospolita. The central power reluctantly tolerated its existence due to its determining role in defending the borders; however, no official recognition came along. Eventually, registered Cossacks fulfilled the hopes placed in them by the Polish monarch; moreover, they actively participated in the Livonian war against Russia, along Stephen Báthory [4, p. 102-103; 27, p. 73-74]. The concept of registered Cossacks as such practically legalized the opportunity to escape from the dependence on landlords, and endowed registered Cossacks significant privileges [57, p. 263]; nevertheless, in fact they were merely treated as supporting troops in the military system of the Polish-Lithuanian state [16, p. 196]. It was this being pushed to the background in the first place that resulted that they had begun to serve outlandish monarchs as mercenaries. The Fifteen Years' War was the first occasion when the Habsburgs employed the Cossacks as mercenaries, moreover, later several times they were hired for military services, eg. during the Thirty Years' War.

Therefore, the major problem posed to the Polish administration in handling the Cossack-issue was that it had been unable to hire for state service all Cossacks desiring to get registered, for this endeavour had been hindered by either the lack of financial resources or the hostile attitude of Polish nobility towards Cossacks. The Polish Szlachta had a good reason to hamper the growth of registered Cossacks. On the one hand, they were afraid to lose their labour supply if too many of the villeins attempted to make it to the ranks of the privileged registered Cossacks, and, on the other hand, they recognised that a ready and sizeable army built on Cossacks in the hands of the "elected" Polish monarchs may very well be dangerous to their own privileges, too. By all accounts, Stephen Báthory played a decisive role in the history of relations between Hajduks and Cossacks, as he, the ruler of Transylvania [19, p. 18], and then king of Poland [27, p. 73; 54, p. 72] was the first to realise the real combat value of Ukrainian Cossacks. As monarch of the Rzeczpospolita, from 1576 onwards Báthory had both Hajduks [28, p. 93-108; 29, p. 2] and Cossacks [52, p. 77-78] fighting in his army, which was a rare occasion since normally in most of the armed conflicts these two groups fought each other as enemies.

A significant change in the position of Cossacks took place as a result of the Kurukovo Agreement of 1625 [35, p. 284-292], signed between the Polish government and the state Cossacks. As its consequence, Cossacks emerged as an organised military formation, and thus

registered Cossacks became a public institute that provided them with a livelihood including a combination of legally obtained takings and military pay. The officially registered six regiments of Cossacks were allowed to apply privileges separately supported to them by the monarchs of Poland. At the same time, the Agreement of Kurukovo plunged the Rzeczpospolita into an inevitable social disaster, for the gradual expansion of registered Cossacks did not even alleviate, but instead further increased social tensions [11, p. 158].

By the 1630's, the registered Cossacks had become a regular army with an ever-increasing involvement in politics, all this in spite of the fact that apart from the "noble uprising", only supporting troops were trained within the military of the Polish state. This marginalization also explains that more and more of them began to sympathize with the revolts of free Cossacks, which ultimately meant that part of the registered Cossacks' joining the 1637 Cossack uprising in fact served as a pretext for the Szejm, controlled by Polish nobility, to issue a decree of 1638 named "Ordination of the Zaporozhian Cossack Army" [37(1), p. 255-256]. According to this, Cossacks as a whole had lost all their previously obtained rights and privileges, and henceforward became equal with villeins. Even though the number of registered ones still remained to be 6.000, they were not allowed to have their own, elected leaders, but instead they were put under the direct authority of a supervisor (commissar) of Polish origin, appointed by the monarch. Under the Ordination, from then on Cossacks differed from villeins in that they owed not agricultural, but military service to the Polish-Lithuanian state. Thus, owing to the reforms of 1638, registered Cossacks lost their personal alliance character based on extensive self-government, and transformed into state-controlled and organised complex military unit furnished with an institutionalised leadership.

Up until the middle of the 17th century, Cossacks could not be regarded as a sovereign social class, but only an "intermediate" category, as the population of Ukraine was characterized by a relatively amorph social system at the time. The population of Ukraine is called a "society set for self-defense" [14, p. 61-63] in the literature of history, moreover, Cossacks are evaluated as a phenomenon connected and conditioned to, and intertwined with the economical and social development of the Ukrainian border area. The "great revolution" [53, p. 81] of 1648-1654, led by Bohdan Khmelnytsky brought significant changes and transformation in the composition of social stratification in Ukraine. The crucial change was apparent in the act of the Cossack elite (starshina) seizing governance, and in the Hetmanate society within the Russian bond a relatively free opportunity of moving up in society emerged. As a consequence, villeins were allowed to become common Cossacks by undertaking military service, while the latter could rise to cement themselves in "Cossack aristocracy". Following the outbreak of the Khmelnytsky movement, the Polish and pro-Polish Ukrainian szlachta fled the so-called "Cossack Ukraine" leaving their lands behind. The chief achievement of the movement was the 1649 Treaty of Zboriv, which stated that the Polish government declared "Cossack-Ukraine" containing the voivodes of Kiev, Bratslav and Chernihiv to be an autonomy. A Tschirin-based Hetmanate administrative organisation vested with self-government was built up as a result, headed by Bohdan Khmelnytsky [37(II), p. 299-306]. Then, in the age of Hetmanate (1654-1764), after the union with Russia the Cossack elite and common Cossacks started to become distinct from each other. While the starshina assumed control of Ukraine, accumulating offices and lands, at the

same time common Cossacks became gradually impoverished and tried to avoid the more and more costly military conscription. Due to the Khmelnytsky movement, the Hetmanate presented the image of a "simplified society" as two of its major elements were provided by Cossacks and "non-Cossacks", between whom no sharp borderline existed. Since the previous meaning of nobility disappeared, they did not possess economical and political privileges over other social strata. During the time of the Bogdan Khmelnytsky movement, the existence of nobility as a distinct economical and political controlling class was definitely questioned, and thus stratification of orders gradually vanished within the networks of society. Also, the Polish type of Ukrainian szlachta assimilated into the ranks of Cossacks, therefore nobility as a privileged group of society basically disappeared from Ukraine.

However, in the second half of the 17th century, the so-called "social regression" could be observed in Ukraine, for the Cossack elite firmly voiced its demands to officially adjust to a noble way of life. This endeavour again appreciated the noble title within Ukrainian society. However, we must note here that for the majority of the Cossack starshina the political structure of the Polish "noble republic" was considered to be an ideal type of state until the 1780's, and penetrating the ranks of the privileged shlachta seemed definitely more appealing than obtaining a Russian noble title.

In the official position of the Tsarist Government, no formal nobility existed in the territory of the Hetmanate [50, p. 340-356], so high-ranking Cossack officials, more or less emerging from the ranks of common Cossacks progressively obtained noble rights, as they owned lands, were exempt from payment of taxes and all other payment obligations to the state. By the end of the 17th century, members of the Cossack starshina turned into genuine landlords, yet they could not call themselves either shlachta or dvorjan [49, p. 465]. By the 1720's and 1730's the Cossack elite became entirely detached, and presented the image of a privileged social class even based on the lands they owned and the relations they had with their villeins. Still, the Tsarist government recognised Cossack as nobles only if they 1) were awarded nobility from the Tsar 2) performed services in either the permanent Tsarist army 3) or performed a state service in offices that go with an inheritable noble title. Ukrainian "aristocracy", however, considered itself to be a genuine and legal nobility (=shlachta) despite the fact that most of them did not possess any documents certifying nobility whatsoever. All they could claim was the very fact that as members of the government apparatus in the Hetmanate they gained a privileged position and in practice owned noble privileges.

From 1762 onwards, the fate of the Ukrainian elite was in the hands of Catherine II, who from the very beginning found it difficult to tolerate the privileged status of the Zaporozhian Army and the Ukrainian elite within the empire. In 1764, the Empress terminated the Hetmanate and introduced by regulation the Russian administration in the Eastern Ukraine [33, p. 173-176]. The rapid and successful integration of Ukrainian territories primarily depended on the cooperation of the Cossack starshina, so on account of Catherine II's Charter of Nobility in 1785 [50, p. 238-266] the Ukrainian elite was conferred on nobility and self-governance. However, a difficulty arose as privileges still applied to members of the starshina who were able to prove their right to the noble title by presenting authentic and valid deed of gift from the Tsar or the King of Poland [47, p. 1-2]. For this reason, the Ukrainian elite excluded from privileges launched an ideological struggle for the full recognition of Ukrainian ranks. Their topmost

success turned out to be the Tsar's decree in 1835, in which the Tsar's government automatically recognised all military and civil Ukrainian ranks, and regarded them as hereditary ones within the Russian Empire.

Summary. After comparing the position of Ukrainian Cossacks and Hungarian Hajduks in society, it can be stated that they constituted an "intermediate" category between nobility and villeins, and they became a mass phenomenon in society only at the end of the 16th century. Initially, denominations of Hajduks and Cossacks were both applied to not an exact ethnic minority, but for the designation of a specific profession and lifestyle, moreover, considering their position, they established themselves as formations differentiated and heterogeneous at the same time. During the period spanning the end of the 15th century and the 1570's, Cossacks, similarly to Hajduks, began to take shape as a new social phenomenon, yet legally they still did not exist. On the analogy of contemporary Hajduks' social status, being a Cossack had not yet been accompanied by any advantages whatsoever, be it either rights or privileges, instead, it was considered as a special occupation, not a distinct social category.

Registered Cossacks and royal Hajduks as such were legally recognised, thus they gained a distinguished position in contemporary society despite the fact that hard as they tried, and the title of nobility was yet unavailable to them. Finally, Cossacks managed to reach higher levels of organisation and self-determination within the Russian coexistence after 1654, which they succeeded in preserving for a longer period with the ongoing Turkish threat.

Occurrences analogous with the privilegedness of Hajduks could be observed in the history of Cossacks living under Polish authority, too, yet on account of the 16th and 17th century internal and foreign policies of the Rzeczpospolita these led to outcomes of different quality. Solution to the Hajduk question causing social tension was more or less successfully achieved, however, disorder in the situation of Ukraine's Cossacks resulted in intensified social conflicts. The greatest failure of the Polish-Lithuanian administration's Cossack-policy was expressed in the exclusion of Cossacks from the "noble nation" [13, p. 383]. Back in the Polish-Lithuanian period, Cossacks found themselves in between nobility and villeins at the social ladder. Owing military service to the state, they were free as individuals, but they were not allowed to hold villeins, thus their appreciation in society was practically dependent on the contemporary political situation. From 1648, nonetheless, Cossacks started to possess a decisive influence in the control of Ukraine, and therefore replaced their "intermediate" social category by elevating to occupy separate social strata.

While Hajduks were effectively integrated into the anti-Ottoman defense system in the 16th and 17th centuries, non-registered Cossacks "voluntarily" undertook to protect the Southern borders, at the same time, for both cases we can declare that the societies of these regions had become basically militarised. [5, p. 121].

Список використаних джерел:

- Acta historica res gestas Poloniae illustrantia ab anno 1507 usque ad annum 1795: Sprawy wojenne króla Stefana Batorego. T. 11 / Zebrał i wydal X. Ignacy Polkowski. – Krakow: X. Ignacy Polkowski, 1887. – 485 p.
- Acsády, I. Magyarországi Budavár visszafoglalása korában / I. Acsády. – Budapest: Méhner V., 1886. – 334 p.
- Báthory István erdélyi fejedelem és lengyel király levelezése, II. 1576-1586 / red. Veress E. – Kolozsvár: Gróf Teleki Pál Tudományos Intézet, 1944. – 386 p.
- Besala, J. Stefan Batory / J. Besala. – Warszawa: PIW, 1992. – 550 p.
- Czigány, I. Hajdútelepítések és a militarizált társadalom megerősödése a Tiszántúlon a 17. század első felében / I. Czigány // Studia Caroliensia. – 2006. – Pp. 105-124.
- Császár, E. A hajdúság kialakulása és fejlődése / E. Császár // Studium. – Debrecen, 1935. – 68 p.

7. Dankó, I. A hajdúság eredete / I. Dankó // A hajdúk a magyar történelemben. – 1969. – 10. – Pp. 3-12.

8. Dudás, Gy. A szabad hajdúk története a XVI. és XVII. században / Gy. Dudás. – Szeged: Engel Adolf, 1887. – 115 p.

9. Erdélyi Országgyűlési Emlékek. (EOE) – Monumenta Hungariae Historica – Magyar Történelmi Emlékek VI. (1608-1614) / red. Szilágyi S. – Buda-Pest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1880. – 560 p.

10. Erdélyi Országgyűlési Emlékek. (EOE) – Monumenta Hungariae Historica – Magyar Történelmi Emlékek VIII. (1629-1658) / red. Szilágyi S. – Buda-Pest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1882. – 485 p.

11. Gebei, S. Hajdú kiváltságolás – kozák kiváltságolás / S. Gebei // red. K. Papp – A. Jeney-Tóth. – Frigy és békeesség legyen... – A bécsi és a zsitvatoroki béke. – Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem Történelmi Intézet – Hajdú-Bihar – Megyei Önkormányzat, Debrecen, 2006. – Pp. 153-180.

12. Gebei, S. Bethlen Gábor viszonya a Rzeczpospolitához / S. Gebei // Bethlen Gábor képmása / red. K. Papp. – Debrecen: Speculum Historiae Debreceniense, 2013. – Pp. 93-116.

13. Kopyts, T. A hajdú- és a kozák kérdés a 16–17. századi lengyel nemesi köztársaságban és Magyarországon / T. Kopyts // red. K. Papp – A. Jeney-Tóth – A. Ulrich – Báthory Gábor és kora. – Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem Történelmi Intézet – Erdély-történelmi Alapítvány, 2009. – Pp. 375-383.

14. Kumke, C. Führer und Geführte bei den Zaporoger Kosaken Wiesbaden. Struktur und Geschichte kosakischer Verbände im polnisch-litauischen Grenzland (1550–1648) / C. Kumke. – Berlin, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1993. – 551 p.

15. Le Vasseur, G. A Description of Ukraine (1660) / G. Le Vasseur. – Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991. – 356 p.

16. Magocsi P.-R. A History of Ukraine – The Land and Its Peoples / P.R. Magocsi. – Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010. – 896 p.

17. Nagy, L. Magyar hadsereg és hadművészet a harmincéves háborúban / L. Nagy. – Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1972. – 220 p.

18. Nagy, L. A hajdúvitézek / L. Nagy. – Budapest: Kossuth Kiadó, 1986. – 320 p.

19. Nagy, L., Nyakas, M. Hajdútestesség tüköre / L. Nagy, M. Nyakas. – Hajdúböszörmény: Hajdúsági Múzeum, 2001. – 339 p.

20. Nyakas, M. A bihari kishajdú városok története / M. Nyakas. – Debrecen: A Hajdú-Bihar Megyei Önkormányzat Hajdú-Bihar Megyei Múzeumok Igazgatósága Kiadványa, 2005. – 369 p.

21. Nyakas, M. Bocskai szabadságharcának kezdetei és a bihari várak / M. Nyakas // Magyarország védelme- Európa védelme. – Eger: Studia Agriensa 24. 2006. – Pp. 247-264.

22. Nyakas, M. A második hajdúfelkelés (1607-1608) / M. Nyakas // red. K. Papp – A. Jeney-Tóth – A. Ulrich – Báthory Gábor és kora. – Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem Történelmi Intézet – Erdély-történelmi Alapítvány, 2009. – Pp. 327-336.

23. Nyakas, M. Nagy András Hajdúgenerális / M. Nyakas. – Biharnagybajom: Hajdú-Bihar megyei Önkormányzat, 2012. – 26 p.

24. Perjés, G. A hajdú kutatás jelentősége / G. Perjés // A hajdúk a magyar történelemben. – Debrecen: Hajdú-Bihar Megyei Múzeumok Közleményei. – 1966. – 10. – Pp. 38-46.

25. Rácz, I. A hajdúk a XVII. században / I. Rácz. – Debrecen: KLTE, 1969. – 240 p.

26. Subtelny, O. Ukraine – A History / O. Subtelny. – Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000. – 736 p.

27. Szabó, B. Báthory István erdélyi fejedelem és lengyel király katonai és katonapolitikai tevékenysége / B. Szabó. – PhD-értekezés, Budapest: 2009. – 161 p.

28. Szabó, B. Báthory István erdélyi fejedelem és lengyel király magyar katonái / B. Szabó // red. Szabó S. Örökös háború két világ határán: Katonák, fegyverek és hadviselés a törökök elleni küzdelemben. – Nyírbátor: Báthory István Múzeum, 2011. – Pp. 93-108.

29. Szádeczky-Kardoss, L. Báthory István lengyel király magyar katonái az 1580-iki muszka háborúban / L. Szádeczky-Kardoss // Hadtörténelmi Közlemények. – 1931. – XXXII. évf. II. – Pp. 1-30.

30. Szendrey, I. Hajdúszabadságlevelek / I. Szendrey. – Debrecen: Alföldi Nyomda, 1971. – 335 p.

31. Varga, B. A magyarországi hajdúság és az ukrán kozákság történelmi párhuzamai / B. Varga // Acta Historica. – 2005. – CXX. – Pp. 31-47.

32. Акты, относящиеся к истории Юго-Западной России (1599-1637) Т. 2. – Санкт-Петербург: Тип. В.В. Праutz, 1865. – 301 с.

33. Акты, относящиеся к истории Юго-Западной России (1665-1668) Т. 6. – Санкт-Петербург: Тип. В.В. Праutz, 1869. – 279 с.

34. Антонович В. Про козацькі часи на Україні / В. Антонович. – Київ: Дніпро, 1991. – 238 с.

35. Архив Юго-Западной России, издаваемый временной комиссией для разбора древних актов. Ч. 3, Т. 1: Акты о козаках (1500-1648). – Киев: Унив. тип., 1863. – 433 с.

36. Варга Б. Історичні паралелі гайдукив Угорщини та козаків України за період XVI-XVII століть / Б. Варга // Четвертий Міжнародний Конгрес Україністів. Історія. Ч. 1. – Одеса, 1999. – С. 174-180.

37. Воссоединение Украины с Россией. Документы и материалы в трёх томах. Т. 1-3. – Москва: АН СССР, 1954. – 588 с., 558 с., 646 с.

38. Голобуцкий В.А. Запорожское козачество / В.А. Голобуцкий. – Киев: Госполитиздат УССР, 1957. – 461 с.

39. Грушевский М.С. История украинского казачества до соединения с Московским государством. Т. 1 / М.С. Грушевский. – Киев: Типография 1-й Киевской Артели Печ. Дела. Трехсвятительская 5, 1913. – 408 с.

40. Гурбик А.О. Виникнення Запорозької Січі (хронологічний та територіальний аспекти проблеми) / А.О. Гурбик // Український Історичний Журнал. – 1999. – №6. – С. 3-17.
41. Жерела до історії України-Руси – Матеріали до історії української козащини. Том 8 / під ред. М. Грушевського. – Львів, 1908. – 485 с.
42. Каманин І.М. К вопросу о козачестве до Богдана Хмельницького / И.М. Каманин. – Киев: Тип. Г.Т. Корчак-Новицкого, 1894. – 94 с.
43. Костомаров Н.И. Богдан Хмельницкий. Историческая монография / Н.И. Костомаров. – Санкт-Петербург: Тип. М.М. Стасюлевича, 1884. – 378 с.
44. Кулиш П.А. Отпадение Малороссии от Польши. Т. 1 / П.А. Кулиш. – Москва: Унив. тип., 1888. – 282 с.
45. Летопись Григория Грабянки / Киев: Унив. тип. 1854. – 445 с.
46. Летопись Самовидца по новооткрытым спискам. – Киев: Тип. К.Н. Милевского, 1878. – 584 с.
47. Миллер Д. Очерки из истории и юридического быта старой Малороссии: превращение козацкой старшины в дворянство / Д. Миллер. – Киев: Тип. Императ. Ун-та Св. Владимира Н.Т. Корчак-Новицкого, 1897. – 133 с.
48. Осипов К. Богдан Хмельницкий / К. Осипов. – Москва: Молодая гвардия, 1948. – 480 с.
49. Путро А.И. Левобережная Украина в составе Российского государства во второй половине XVIII века / А.И. Путро. – Киев: Головное издательство издательского объединения "Вища школа", 1988. – 142 с.
50. Сборник Императорского Русского исторического Общества. Т. 7 / Санкт-Петербург:ИРИО, 1871. – 417 с.
51. Сборник летописей, относящихся к истории Южной и Западной России / Ред. Д. Антонович. – Киев: Тип. Г.Т. Корчак-Новицкого, 1888. – 322 с.
52. Сили Ш. Венгерские воины на службе московскому государству в конце XVI и XVII вв. / Ш. Сили // Вестник Волгоградского Государственного Университета. – 2003. – 8. – С. 77-81.
53. Смолий В., Степанков В. Українська державна ідея XVII-XVIII століть: проблеми формування, еволюції, реалізації / В. Смолий, В. Степанков. – Київ: Альтернативи, 1997. – 368 с.
54. Сторожко А.В. Стефан Баторий и днепровские казаки / А.В. Сторожко. – Киев: Типография Г.Л. Фронцкевича, 1904. – 327 с.
55. Щербак В.О. Українське козацтво: формування соціального стану: друга половина XV – середина XVII ст. / В.О. Щербак. – Київ: KM Academia, 2000. – 300 с.
56. Щербак В.О. Запровадження козацьких реєстрів / В.О. Щербак // Магістеріум. – 2010. – 41. – С. 6-11.
57. Яковенко Н. Нарис історії середньовічної та ранньомодерної України / Н. Яковенко. – Київ: Критика, 2009. – 380 с.

References:

1. POLKOWSKI, I. (Ed.). (1887). *Acta historica res gestas Poloniae illustrantia ab anno 1507 usque ad annum 1795: Sprawy wojenne króla Stefana Batorego*. T. 11. Krakow: X. Ignacy Polkowski.
2. ACSÁDY, I. (1886). *Magyarországi Budavár visszafoglalása korában*. Budapest: Méhner V.
3. VERESS, E. (Ed.). (1944). *Báthory István erdélyi fejedelem és lengyel király levelezése, II. 1576-1586*. Kolozsvár: Gróf Teleki Pál Tudományos Intézet.
4. BESALA, J. (1992). *Stefan Batory*. Warszawa: PIW.
5. CZIGÁNY, I. (2006). Hajdútelepítések és a militarizált társadalom megerősödése a Tiszántúlon a 17. század első felében. *Studia Carolinensia*. Pp. 105–124.
6. CSÁSZÁR, E. (1935). A hajdúság kialakulása és fejlődése. *Studium*. Debrecen: [s.n.]. 68 p.
7. DANKÓ, I. (1969). A hajdúság eredete. *A hajdúk a magyar történelemben*, 10, 3–12.
8. DUDÁS, GY. (1887). *A szabad hajdúk története a XVI. és XVII. században*. Szeged: Engel Adolf.
9. SZILÁGYI, S. (Ed.). (1880). *Erdélyi Országgyűlési Emlékek. Monumenta Hungariae Historica: Magyar Történelmi Emlékek. Vol.: VI (1608-1614)*. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.
10. SZILÁGYI, S. (Ed.). (1882). *Erdélyi Országgyűlési Emlékek. Monumenta Hungariae Historica: Magyar Történelmi Emlékek. Vol.: VIII. (1629-1658)*. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.
11. GEBEL, S. (2006). Hajdú kiváltságolás – kozák kiváltságolás. In: K. Papp, A. Jeney-Tóth, eds., *"Frigy és békeesség legyen... A bécsi és a zsitvatoroki béke"*. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem Történelmi Intézet – Hajdú-Bihar – Megyei Önkormányzat. Pp. 153–180.
12. GEBEL, S. (2013). Bethlen Gábor viszonya a Rzeczpospolitához. In: K. Papp, ed., *Bethlen Gábor képmása*. Debrecen: Speculum Historiae Debreceniense. Pp. 93–116.
13. KOPYTS, T. (2009). A hajdú- és a kozák kérdés a 16-17. századi lengyel nemesi köztársaságban és Magyarországon. In: K. Papp, A. Jeney-Tóth, A. Ulrich, eds., *Báthory Gábor és kora*. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem Történelmi Intézet – Erdély-történelmi Alapítvány. Pp. 375–383.
14. KUMKE, C. (1993). *Führer und Geführte bei den Zaporoger Kosaken Wiesbaden. Struktur und Geschichte kosakischer Verbände im polnisch-litauischen Grenzland (1550–1648)*. Berlin, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
15. LE VASSEUR, G. (1991). *A Description of Ukraine (1660)*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
16. MAGOCSI P.-R. (2010). *A History of Ukraine – The Land and Its Peoples*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

17. NAGY, L. (1972). *Magyar hadsereg és hadművészet a harmincéves háborúban*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
18. NAGY, L. (1986). *A hajdúvitézek*. Budapest: Kossuth Kiadó.
19. NAGY, L. & NYAKAS, M. (2001). *Hajdútszesség tüköre*. Hajdúböszörmény: Hajdúsági Múzeum.
20. NYAKAS, M. (2005). *A bihari kishajdú városok története*. Debrecen: A Hajdú-Bihar Megyei Önkormányzat Hajdú-Bihar Megyei Igazgatósága Kiadványa.
21. NYAKAS, M. (2006). Bocskai szabadságharcának kezdetei és a bihari várak. *Magyarország védelme – Európa védelme – Studia Agriensa*, 24, 247–264.
22. NYAKAS, M. (2009). A második hajdúfelkelés (1607-1608). In: K. Papp, A. Jeney-Tóth, A. Ulrich, eds., *Báthory Gábor és kora*. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem Történelmi Intézet – Erdély-történelmi Alapítvány. Pp. 327–336.
23. NYAKAS, M. (2012). *Nagy András Hajdúgenerális*. Biharnagybajom: Hajdú-Bihar megyei Önkormányzat.
24. PERJÉS, G. (1966). A hajdú kutatás jelentősége. *A hajdúk a magyar történelemben*, 10, 38–46.
25. RÁCZ, I. (1969). *A hajdúk a XVII. században*. Debrecen: KLTE.
26. SUBTELNY, O. (2000). *Ukraine – A History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
27. SZABÓ, B. (2009). *Báthory István erdélyi fejedelem és lengyel király katonái és katonapolitikai tevékenysége*. PhD-értekezés. Budapest.
28. SZABÓ, B. (2011). Báthory István erdélyi fejedelem és lengyel király magyar katonái. In: Szabó S., ed., *Örökös háború két világ határán: Katonák, fegyverek és hadviselés a törökök elleni küzdelemben*. Nyírbátor: Báthory István Múzeum. Pp. 93–108.
29. SZÁDECZKY-KARDOSS, L. (1931). Báthory István lengyel király magyar katonái az 1580-iki muszka háborúban. *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények*, 32(1-2), 1–30.
30. SZENDREY, I. (1971). *Hajdúszabadságlevelék*. Debrecen: Alföldi Nyomda.
31. VARGA, B. (2005). A magyarországi hajdúság és az ukrániai kozákság történelmi párhuzamai. *Acta Historica*, 120, 31–47.
32. *Akty, odnosyashhiesya k istorii Yugo-Zapadnij Rossii*. [Acts on the History of the Southwest Russia]. (1599-1637). Vol. 2. (1865). Saint Petersburg: Printing house of V.V. Pratic. [In Russian].
33. *Akty, odnosyashhiesya k istorii Yugo-Zapadnij Rossii*. [Acts on the History of the Southwest Russia]. (1665-1668). Vol. 6. (1869). Saint Petersburg: Printing house of V.V. Pratic. [In Russian].
34. ANTONOVYCH, V. (1991). Pro kozatski chasy na Ukraini. [About the Cossacks' Time in Ukraine]. Kyiv: Dnipro. [In Ukrainian].
35. *Arxiv Yugo-Zapadnoj Rossii, izdavaemyj vremennoj komissiej dlya razbora drevnix aktov. Part 3, Vol. 1: Akty o kozakax (1500-1648)*. [The Southwest Russia Archive, Published by the Temporal Commission for the Ancient Acts Parsing]. (1863). Kyiv: University Press. [In Russian].
36. VARHA, B. (1999). Istorichni paraleli hajdukiv Uhorschyny ta kozakiv Ukrainy za period XVI-XVII stolitj. [Historical Parallels of the Hungarian Hajduks and Ukrainian Cossacks of the 16th – 17th Centuries]. *Chetvertij Mizhnarodnyj Konhres Ukrainistiv. Istoriia. Part 1*. Odessa: [s.n.]. Pp. 174–180. [In Ukrainian].
37. *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiej. Dokumenty i Materialy v tryox tomax. Volumes: 1-3*. Moscow: AN SSSR. [In Russian].
38. HOLOBUTSKYI, V. A. (1957). *Zaporozhskoe kozachestvo*. [Zaporozhian Cossacks]. Kyiv: Gospolizdat. [In Russian].
39. HRUSHEVSKYI, M. S. (1913). *Istoriya ukrainskogo kazachestvo do soedineniya s Moscovskim gosudarstvom*. [History of Ukrainian Cossacks before Unification with Moscow State]. Vol. 1. Kyiv: The 1st Kievan Printing Guild Press, Turyusvyatitel'skaya 5. [In Ukrainian].
40. HURBYK, A.O. (1999). Vynykennia Zaporozkoi Sichi (khronolohichniy ta terytorialnyi aspekty problemy). [The Origin of Zaporozhzhia Sich: Chronological and Territorial Aspects]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 6, 3–17. [In Ukrainian].
41. HRUSHEVSKYI, M.S. (Ed.). (1908). *Zherela do istorii Ukrainy-Rusi. Vol. 8: Materialy do istorii ukrainskoi kozachchyny*. [Sources on the History of Ukraine. Vol. 8: Materials on the History of Ukrainian Cossacks]. Lviv: [s.n.]. [In Ukrainian].
42. KAMANIN, I.M. (1894). *K voprosu o kozachestve do Bohdana Xmelnytskoho*. [The Question of the Cossacks before Bohdan Khmelnytsky]. Kyiv: Printing House of G.T. Korchak-Novickij. [In Russian].
43. KOSTOMAROV, N.I. (1884). *Bohdan Khmelnytsky. Istoricheskaya monografiya*. [Bohdan Khmelnytsky. Historical Monograph]. Saint Petersburg: Printing House of M.M. Stasyulevich. [In Russian].
44. KULISH, P.A. (1888). *Otpadenie Malorossii ot Pol'shy. Vol. 1*. [Separation of Little Russia from Poland]. Moscow: University Press. [In Russian].
45. *Letopis' Grigoriya Grabyanki*. [Chronicle of Gregory Hrabianka]. (1854). Kyiv: University Press. [In Russian].
46. *Letopis' Samovidca po novoоткрытым spiskam*. [Chronicle of Samovidets]. (1878). Kyiv: Printing House of K.N. Milevskij. [In Russian].
47. MILLER, D. (1897). *Ocherki iz istorii i yuridicheskogo byta staroj Malorossii: prevrashhenie kozatskoj starshiny v dvoryanstvo*. [Essays on the History and Legal Status of the Old Little Russia: Transformation of Cossacks Starshyna into Nobility]. Kyiv: Emperors Saint Vladimir University Press. [In Russian].
48. OSIPOV, K. (1948). *Bogdan Khmelnytsky*. Moscow: Molodaya gvardiya. [In Russian].

49. PUTRO, A.I. (1988). *Levoberezhnaya Ukraina v sostave Rossijskogo gosudarstva vo vtoroj polovine XVIII veka*. [Left-bank Ukraine in the Structure of Russian State in the Second Half of the 18th Century]. Kyiv: High School. [In Russian].

50. *Sbornik Imperatorskogo Russkogo istoricheskogo Obshhestva*. [Collection of the Imperial Russian Historical Society]. Vol. 7. (1871). Saint Petersburg: IRIO.

51. ANTONOVICH, D. (Ed.). (1888). *Sbornik letopisej, odnosyashhixsya k istorii Yuzhnoj i Zapadnoj Rossii*. [Collection of Chronicles Related to the History of Southern and Western Russia]. Kyiv: Printing House of G.T. Korchak-Novickij. [In Russian].

52. SILI, SH. (2003). *Vengerskie voyny na sluzhbe moskovskomu gosudarstvu v konce XVI i XVII vv.* [Hungarian Soldiers in the Service for the Moscow State at the end of 16th – 17th Centuries]. *Vestnik Volgogradskogo Universiteta*, 8, 77–81. [In Russian].

53. SMOLII, V. & STEPANKOV, V. (1997). *Ukrainska derzhavna ideia XVII-XVIII stolit: problemy formuvannia, evolutsii, realizatsii*. [Ukrainian State

Idea of the 17th – 18th Centuries: Problems of Formation, Evolution, Realization]. Kyiv: Alternatyvy. [In Ukrainian].

54. STOROZHENKO, A. V. (1904). *Stefan Batorij i dneprovskie kazaki*. [Stephen Batory and the Cossacks of the Dnieper]. Kyiv: Printing House of G.L. Fronckevich.

55. SHCHERBAK, V. O. (2000). *Ukrainske kozatstvo: formuvannia sotsialnoho stanu: druha polovyna XV – seredyna XVII st.* [Ukrainian Cossacks: Social Stratum Formation: the Second Half of the 15th Century – in the Middle of the 17th Century]. Kyiv: KM Academia.

56. SHCHERBAK, V.O. (2010). *Zaprovadzhennia kozatskykh reiestriv*. [The Establishment of Cossacks Registers]. *Mahisterium*, 41, 6–11.

57. YAKOVENKO, N. (2009). *Narys istorii serednovichnoi i ranniomodernoï Ukrainy*. [Essay of the Medieval and Early Modern History of Ukraine]. Kyiv: Krytyka.

Надійшла до редколегії 11.11.18

Б. Варга, д-р іст. наук, доц.
Сегедський університет, Сегед, Угорщина

РОЛЬ ГАЙДУКІВ ТА КОЗАКІВ В УГОРСЬКОМУ ТА УКРАЇНСЬКОМУ СУСПІЛЬСТВАХ В XVI–XVII СТОЛІТТЯХ

Представлено можливі міркування для порівняльного аналізу гайдукив Угорщини та козаків України. Екзистенційні можливості обох груп зумовлені владним вакуумом, що виник у другій половині XV ст. в прикордонних районах, а на кінець XVI ст. вони стали визначним оборонним елементом. Основним мотивуючим фактором для розвитку гайдукив і козаків, а також збільшення їхньої чисельності була турецька загроза. Як гайдуки, так і козаки своєю метою вважали військову службу, за рахунок неї мали намір просуватися матеріально та в суспільстві. Стосовно свого становища у суспільстві, то королівське гайдуцтво мало багато спільного з українським реєстровим козацтвом, відчуття згуртованості та розвинене суспільне мислення надавали можливість забезпечувати собі важливе місце у суспільній ієрархії держави. Вони були проміжною категорією суспільства, але тільки на кінець XVI ст. стали масовим соціальним явищем. Їхню соціальну відокремленість, в першу чергу виправдовувала важлива роль у захисті південних прикордонних територій країни. Центральна влада в обох країнах однаково ставилася до козаків і гайдукив, вбачаючи у них потрібну військову силу, але політика уряду щодо козаків і гайдукив фактично змінювалась залежно від актуальної політики держави. Такі ж приклади мають вражаючу подібність в інституціях реєстрових козаків в королівських гайдуцтвах, які були визнані коронною владою і посіли привілейоване місце в суспільстві, але скільки вони не намагались – так і не змогли підняти свій ранг до дворянства.

Ключові слова: угорські гайдуки, українські козаки, історичні паралелі, проміжна соціальна категорія, Королівство Угорщина, Трансільванське князівство, Річ Посполита.

УДК 2-725:272-054.72(=161.2)(71) "1901/1925"
<https://doi.org/10.17721/1728-2640.2018.139.03>

N. Volik, PhD Student
Volodymyr Hnatiuk Ternopil National Pedagogical University, Ternopil, Ukraine

THE UKRAINIAN SISTERS SERVANTS OF MARY IMMACULATE AND BASILIAN FATHERS' ACTIVITY IN CANADA IN 1901-1925

The study focuses on the first half of the 20th century Basilian fathers and Sisters Servants of Mary Immaculate missions in Canada and the people behind those missions. The study explains that despite the zeal, knowledge, and dedication of the missionaries, the Basilian and Sisters Servants of Mary Immaculate missions in Canada were not organized, and were not particularly trained in missions. But their work during 1902–1925 between Ukrainian immigrants from Galicia helped to stop the processes of assimilation and transferring to the Churches that were widespread in Canada.

Key words: Basilians Fathers (OSBM), Sisters Servants of Mary Immaculate (SSMI), priests, immigrants, Roman Catholic Church (RCC), Ukrainian Catholic Church (UCC), Canada.

Introduction. The new world where Ukrainian immigrants arrived was different in all aspects of their life – language, religious expression, social habits, attitudes and political customs. The first wave of Ukrainian immigration to Canada (1891–1914) included deeply religious people and 90% of them belonged to Ukrainian Catholic Church which was popular in their motherland. Once they arrived in Canada, the Ukrainians have left spiritually adrift. The Roman Catholic Church, which had an advantage over other religious organizations in Canada, could not help the immigrants. One of the main problems with Ukrainian religious situation was a desperate shortage of priests familiar with the Slavonic services. Moreover, this shortage of priests was amplified by the insistence of the Latin bishops on only celibate priests (who were in the minority in Galicia) coming to Canada and there was the issue of parish registration. Only the presence of Ukrainian Catholic priests in Canada could solve these problems. After a ten-year stay of Ukrainians in Canada in 1902, the first official mission of the Basilians priests and Sisters Servants of Mary Immaculate were directed there.

Hence, this study aims to assess the missionary activities of the Ukrainian Basilian Fathers and the Sisters Servants of Mary Immaculate between the immigrants from Galicia during 1902–1925 and their impact on the religious development.

This research will address the following questions: 1) What interaction was between Ukrainian Catholic Church and Roman Catholic Church in Canada at the end of 19th century? 2) What is the role of Basilians priests and Sisters Servants of Mary Immaculate in the adaptation of Ukrainian immigrants in Canada during 1901–1925? 3) What authority did Basilians priests and Sisters Servants of Mary Immaculate have among immigrants during the first wave of the Ukrainian immigration?

1. The Interaction between Ukrainian Catholics and Roman Catholic clergies at the end of 19th century.

When Ukrainians began immigration to Canada at the end of the 19th century they immediately came under the jurisdiction of the already established RCC. The evolution of this principle of jurisdiction started from the First Ecumenical Council of Nicea (325) and Fourth Lateran