

Mykhailo Pylynskyi,

Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University (Kyiv, Ukraine)

ORCID ID 0000-0002-4771-1294

e-mail: m.pylynskyi@kubg.edu.ua

ORDERED LIBERTY IN BORYS HUMENIUK'S TEXTS

This paper is concerned with the notion of ordered liberty and whether Borys Humeniuk promotes it in his texts. In order to determine it several issues are examined. First, the author establishes reasons for discussing this writer by describing Humeniuk's personal and professional life; while also connecting the fact that Humeniuk acknowledges the importance of literature for shaping a society. Further, the author establishes the framework of the paper, as he discusses what freedom is in the philosophical tradition of the West and elaborates on the key idea of the paper — what the ordered liberty is and its origin. After an introduction of specific literary texts for the paper, the author moves to their discussion. This research includes a description of tiers of the society that is discerned in connection with personal responsibility and selflessness. Those tiers would be, firstly — members of the military who are ready to die for their country; secondly — everybody who in some way helps the military; thirdly — draft dodgers; and lastly — government officials, who are despised for being corrupt. This breakdown helps understand Humeniuk's perception of ordered liberty, as it gives better understanding of his value system. Then using previous findings the author analyses three types of freedom found in Humeniuk's texts. The first is freedom from life, as from war and suffering. Second, freedom that manifests in a public setting. It surfaces in a sentiment that everyone should work for the cause of defending the country. Third, deeply personal freedom, which can be seen in behavior when people tend only to their business; furthermore, they are rather cynical of all institutions and their ability to improve. Lastly, author makes a connection between Humeniuk's sentiment about artists' great impact on society and his emphasis on the latter type of freedom, showing the disconnection between the two ideas. The novelty of such research lies in bridging Ukrainian literature and the Western philosophic tradition, specifically on freedom and its facets. The further development of this research is analysis of Ukrainian literature through this lens as it helps to establish the attitude of Ukrainians towards freedom and if applied properly, helps to encompass policy makers in their work for the prosperity of Ukraine.

Key words: freedom, liberty, responsibility, wartime literature, war, novella, free verse.

This paper is concerned with a question whether Borys Humeniuk (1956–) promotes ordered liberty in his texts. To answer this question, we shall also examine what ordered liberty is, and what types of freedom Humeniuk has in his works.

Borys Humeniuk's texts for this paper have been selected out of the array of writers because first of all, he is an accomplished writer. He works both with poetry and prose, but mostly novellas. As soon as the war broke in 2014, Borys Humeniuk became one of the most prominent voices in the genre of Ukrainian wartime literature. If we look closer at his course of life, we will quickly understand how he was and is able to compete with other professional writers like Serhiy Zhadan, Liubov Yakymchuk, Dmytro Lazutkin and others. Moreover, Humeniuk was an active member of the patriotic movement during the Revolution of Dignity and enlisted into the army almost immediately after the Russian Federation invaded Ukraine in 2014. The fact that he is both a writer and an active longstanding

member of the Ukrainian army had a significant impact on the decision to choose his works as a fair pertinent representation of war-related literature. The reason for that is Humeniuk has seen both peace and war with his own eyes as well as has acclaimed creative skills. Also, because Humeniuk in his novellas acknowledges the impact of writers and poets on the society. He asserts that they mold people's souls, thus their actions might be even more consequential and even dangerous than those soldiers that are trying to invade Ukraine and kill its population. So, if Humeniuk is aware of potential significant educational effect of his writing it seems reasonable to try to establish which sentiments he conveys to the public. We shall discuss this point in more detail later as we delve deeper into his texts.

The research on Borys Humeniuk is quite modest and only tangentially touches upon our topic of concern. Whereas Nina Golovchenko has been so far mostly concerned with his influence on modern Ukrainian free verse, Svitlana Bybyk has

studied stylistic functions and semantic properties of his texts. Besides, there are articles which provide general reviews of his texts without getting into fine details of specific themes or issues, for example articles by Oleg Kotsarev or Zhanna Kuiava, or Taras Pastukh. Nevertheless, the scholarly and artistic community hold Borys Humeniuk and his texts in high regard. Evidence of that would be a bevy of various accolades and praise he got over the years of his career and continues to do so up until recently. Humeniuk is revered by the public as well, which can be measured by high level of engagement with his public activity on the social media outlets. Another fact that helps us understand his poetic reach is that his texts have been translated to several languages, including Crimean Tatar and Polish.

The closest to our point of interest is the paper penned by Svitlana Bybyk, "*Chroniclers will not Harm for Us Epithets with a Tint of Red*" (*Epithetics "Poems from the War" by Borys Humeniuk*). In her paper, she deals a fair bit with issues of personal relation to various objects and the war in particular. Since this paper is going to wrestle with issue of liberty (and thus of personal responsibility) in Borys Humeniuk's texts, the fact that this issue has been already touched upon gives this paper a solid footing.

Svitlana Bybyk acknowledges this deep-seated personal attachment to the war, and surrounding issues as well as objects. Humeniuk, according to Bybyk, keeps referring to the war and everything war related as something *my/mine/personal* or even *my personal*. Although, these signifiers of a close relationship with the war coexist with a neutral one also — *this war*. Bybyk's assessment of these signifiers and their use is that through them the author subjectivizes the war, making it understandable that the hero takes it more personally. Through words, "On a second day of the second month of my own personal war" the reader has a feeling of the high importance of the events to the hero. Arguably, it would have been a major tonal shift if it had not been for this feeling of strong attachment to the events and objects around. If soldiers do not care about the land they defend, they are hardly motivated enough to effectively protect it, sacrificing their lives.

What is also important to mention is that these indications of deep personal attachment are not scarce and not limited to first person pronouns. Such words (pronouns/definitive articles) as *ours*, *someone's*, *we*, *his*, *theirs* permeate the book. For instance, "entering somebody else's yard", "opening doors of someone's house", "our genuine rear", "we have a battlefield here/we have a post here", "this precious Ukrainian soil", "forgive me

for myself and for my crazy planet", "his enemy", "your country", and so on. Adding to Bybyk's words, through this approach Humeniuk emotionally brings the war closer to the reader, making it more relatable. While also it might be showing the hero's feeling of personal responsibility during the war. Bybyk's insights to the epithets of Humeniuk's poetical world indicate that personalised language plays a significant role in Humeniuk's texts. This theme is quite important not just in a context of Bybyk's paper on epithets in Humeniuk's texts, but it also matters for the topic of this paper — of ordered liberty and how it is represented through personal responsibility, among other components.

But before we engage with Humeniuk's texts we need to establish and lay out the analytical grid. This paper is going to look at Humeniuk's texts through the lens of ordered liberty. Under this philosophical idea is understood that personal freedom is not absolute and is checked by demand of order in society. The phrase itself establishes itself firmly in 1937 in the United States after it was used in the Supreme Court case *Palko v. Connecticut*. However, the idea that freedom is not just the ability to act as you please, is well established in the Western philosophical tradition. We start seeing assertions that freedom stems from order and restraint in the philosophy of Stoicism. Then we can see these connections made in *Summa Theologica* (1485) by St. Thomas Aquinas. John Lock in *The Second Treatise of Government* (1689) also talks about limitations of freedom inside of the society as well as in accordance with the Natural Law. In modern times the idea that a person's freedom is limited by interactions with other people and groups of people is thoroughly explored by John Stuart Mill in his essay *On Freedom* (1859). Since then there has not been any fundamental changes to the idea, although various thinkers from different fields of study have never stopped researching it, for instance, economists Friedrich von Heiek and Milton Friedman, philosophers like Adam Mikhnik and Raymon Aron, historians Myroslav Popovych and Stephen Kotkin, to name just a few.

As we have established now, liberty in terms of this paper will be discussed in terms of order, responsibility, and a civic society. The poetic construct of freedom will be used to signify the ability and desire to act as one pleases. Keeping it in mind we shall analyse the selected texts by Humeniuk.

The corpus of texts that this paper is going to be concerned with consists of prose and poetry. To be more specific, prose is represented by short novellas of a semi-biographic genre while poetry is represented mostly by free verse poems (*vers libre*). These pieces will be drawn from two major

books by Borys Humeniuk — *Block Post* (2016), which includes almost all of his poetry; and *100 Novellas about the War* (2018), which consists almost entirely out of his novellas with a few poems enwoven inside of them.

In the aforementioned books Borys Humeniuk displays a certain hierarchy of values in terms of liberty. Firstly, the highest regard from the author goes to the characters of soldiers who serve their country. This is mostly the case because they are those who are willing to risk their life and ultimately to die for it. Humeniuk acknowledges that those now soldiers could have been not the most upstanding and law-abiding citizens beforehand (however only petty criminals), but it does not matter now. They all serve their country, meaning fulfilling their duty as men, as all men should. This ultimate risk that they are now taking voluntarily means that all the previous transgressions have been atoned for. Special recognition gets air assault forces for their valiant service in most dangerous situations. They are also regarded as the last line of defense (Humeniuk, 2018, p. 75). Voluntarily enlisted into the army also take place in this group. They are regarded high on par with the drafted military because it was their personal choice to enlist to the army although they were not obligated to do so. There are several stories in Humeniuk's poems and prose about young men, some of them even husbands and fathers already, who could not sit and just watch the war unraveling on their TV screens. They kissed their wives and children and headed to the place where their sense of honour and duty commanded them to go.

A bit lower on this tier list lies the second category of characters — volunteers. They are civilians who have helped the army in any way possible. Whether collecting money and straight transferring them to bank accounts of the military forces or buying various required goods for the military ranging from medical supplies, provisions, and technical gear to ammunition. Of course, a significant number of volunteers have been donating their own money. Moreover, Humeniuk is amazed that people have been donating even their retirement money (Humeniuk, 2018, p. 188), taking out mortgages for houses and donating that as well. He praises those people by saying that it is the highest form of sacrifice for a civilian (Humeniuk, 2018, p. 152).

The third category of characters are draft dodgers. They are highly despised and berated by the hero of Humeniuk's texts. They have abdicated their duties as men and as citizens of their country and thus deemed despicable (Humeniuk, 2018, p. 178). A point worth noting is that although he has nothing but contempt for such people there

are no threats of violence toward them as opposed to the last category in this list.

The fourth and the last tier on the list is populated by the characters of government officials. In the view of the texts' hero, those are horrible people. It is repeatedly stated throughout Humeniuk's texts that they should be slaughtered (Humeniuk, 2018, p. 131). Different characters express this idea in a variety of ways. Some of them pose it in a joking manner of gloomy humour. Other characters express the sentiment unapologetically being dead serious.

This breakdown of the society into tiers helps us understand Humeniuk's perception of ordered liberty laid out in his texts, as we now have a better understanding of his value system. As was mentioned above, the author (as well as the main character) seems to significantly value freedom of action in accordance with certain duties to their own country, people, and family. The highest regard goes to the characters who have or currently sacrifice the most in order to fulfill their duties in the times of war — protect the land and the people of Ukraine on the battlefield. The argument is that those characters, at least on some level, understand that independence of the country relies upon the sacrifice of their own interest for the sake of the interest of the state.

What we can see is that basically, the proximity to the battlefield and size of a sacrifice determines how highly you should be regarded in the times of war. Therefore, air assault forces for their hardest tasks are on the top of the list and government officials are at the bottom. Oftentimes politicians are as far from the action as possible. So far, actually, that they do not even care about what is going on or the outcome at all. However, the sentiment about politicians will be discussed further on into the article.

Now we shall look at types of freedom that can be discerned in Humeniuk's texts. The first and foremost one is a metaphorical view of freedom. Death for a soldier is being portrayed by the author several times as the ultimate freedom — war is a prison and by dying you are being set free. This take is a rather explicit one, as the author plainly writes about it (*Here and further the translation is mine — M. P.*) (Humeniuk, 2018, p. 16).

*He is through with this war
And this pain
Soul soars from the body to the sky
There — to freedom*

Existence of this understanding of freedom as death and presumably nothingness is not strictly a part of our analysis, however it helps us in a twofold

manner. First, it shows that the explicit (gut level) idea of freedom exists in Humeniuk's texts while, secondly, helps us juxtapose ordered liberty with it. We shall be able to see how more complex constructive liberty is and that it has another (if not more) set of implications.

Second take on freedom is political. It is political in the sense that it manifests in a public setting and affects other people. It surfaces in a sentiment that everyone should work for the cause of defending the country, even with their lives. The general idea is that we should envy the dead as they have fulfilled their ultimate duty before posterity (Humeniuk, 2018, p. 173). These actions will lead to freedom of the country and not something else. This idea is tightly intertwined with the idea that in particular it is a man's duty to fight for his country.

In the poem *This Verse Started as Blank* (2014), there is a situation where a man tells his "mortified" wife that he has to go to war, kisses his three small children goodbye and leaves the next morning (Humeniuk, 2016, p. 134). He explains to her that he cannot just sit in front of the TV and watch how things unfold while other people are dying. In another text "*Kid*" to "*Karmeliuk*" (2018), husband comes home with mild injuries and bandages to take care of his health, however the very next day he is resolute to go back fighting (Humeniuk, 2016, pp. 148–149). This sentiment is reinforced by another one from a novella where a character expresses an idea that you can return home only if you have won the war (Humeniuk, 2018, p. 86). Ultimately, for the author it is about voluntary sacrifice alongside the feeling that it is the only way to live, "What is worth selling your soul for, pay this impossible price? Only for the right to choose. Only for liberty." (Humeniuk, 2018, p. 30). The author explicitly ties liberty to sacrifice, ability to choose, living in accordance with your duties.

Alas, this sense of personal responsibility lives only at war. It evaporates immediately as the events relocate outside of the warzone and into peaceful circumstances/time. It brings us to the third understanding of freedom in Humeniuk's texts — deeply personal freedom. This view of freedom is rather shortsighted and careless. It is succinctly put in the Ukrainian folk piece of wisdom, «Моя хата скраю, нічого не знаю», which can be best translated into English as, "Not my circus, not my monkeys". The idea being here is, "I tend only to my business and do not really care about things that do not affect me directly". In other words, you are too concerned with day-to-day things and just do not have neither time nor energy to think past that. In Humeniuk's texts it manifests itself in a way that his characters do not attend to politics and statecraft because they are attending to their house and land.

They see interest and participation in statecraft as something secondary, meaning that they might start thinking about their country, if they are done with their mundane tasks for the day. There is a clear sentiment about not really wanting to be involved in the government during peacetime (Humeniuk, 2018, p. 83).

This idea can be illustrated by the juxtaposition of two situations, one of which takes place in quiet times and the other one — in the trenches. Both situations are being described in one novella just a couple of paragraphs apart. In the first one a man meditates on what true happiness is. According to him, it is scenic pastoral nature — the whole planet should look like plain fields, forests, farming land, white house with a porch, garden right outside, Carpathian Mountains on the horizon, and river Cheremosh somewhere close by. "What else does a man need for true happiness?", asks this character and the company of friends wholeheartedly agree (Humeniuk, 2018, p. 33). In other words, they do not need anything — there are no other people or worries in this picture, no governments to worry about, no neighbors to deal with, no responsibilities or duties. And the second situation, which takes place in the trenches, has a drastically different view of life. Under those circumstances there is no place for happiness or pleasure, there is only duty. The same character softly mutters to himself that it is Sunday, God's Day but they cannot go to church. But then adds without the shadow of regret that they must stay here and fight because it is their job, and no one will come and do it for them. They are doing it to make the world a better place (Humeniuk, 2018, p. 34). These two situations placed within the same novella illustrate quite well how priorities change during the war and peaceful times. How self-interest is replaced by the interest of the state.

Another example that speaks to the point of absence of relatability to your countrymen in the times of peace comes from the novella *First Rotation* (2018). A character meditates on how the war brings people together. That virtually yesterday (right before the war) those voluntarily enlisted men had nothing in common, that nothing tied them together. However, as soon as the war started and they enlisted, it appeared that they share the same country, enemy, and war (Humeniuk, 2018, p. 124). This piece is another demonstration how this idea of togetherness is foreign to the author and arguably to Ukrainians at large. In fact, we all share the same country, government, language, history, culture. On a more local level there will be neighbours, community, public space, local government, and also local history, culture and whatnot. This and other examples throughout

Humeniuk's texts only reinforce the impression that people only want to be left alone in places of and during the times of peace; that they want to be free from the confinements of the society. The only time you intervene in the matters of the country — fighting in a war for it (Humeniuk, 2018, p. 83).

Moreover, this reluctance to take part in the process of state-building is exacerbated by the sentiment that the government and its representatives are all corrupt. As it was previously stated, different characters in different novellas express this thought both jokingly and quite seriously. For example, in one of the scenes during the Revolution on Dignity a nameless crowd talks about lustration of government officials, but they hardly mean just firing them from the job, “We need to immediately start the lustration process, ... prosecutors, judges, officials, special assault forces, members of the parliament and their possessions. We can lustrate them everywhere: in lobbies, their vacation houses, official and private residences, restaurants, garages, day and night. For lustration to be effective, we can use sticks, armature rods, Molotov cocktails, axes, knives, hunting rifles, AK-47s and just bricks. Offices, mansions, vacation homes, cars of the rich are best lustrated by fire, but other ways would work too.” (Humeniuk, 2018, p. 131). It is certainly a call for violence against the government officials. A bit further into the text an old man complains out of desperation that all elected officials are the same and that 2–3 hundreds of them should be executed according to the martial law. He even made an alphabetical list of them with ministers and prosecutors on it (Humeniuk, 2018, pp. 164–165).

The situation evoked by Humeniuk seems desperate as it seems no one can change the corrupt system from within, as it is believed that honest people-soldiers should never be involved with public office, or accept a job offer inside of the government. And if they do, they quickly become corrupt themselves. It inevitably happens even to the best of them (Humeniuk, 2018, p. 167). As one of the characters wonders, “how much should you hate your country to be in the government in your country?” (Humeniuk, 2018, p. 196). Similar level of contempt gets the legacy media with their corrupt political talk shows which help promote a certain narrative (Humeniuk, 2018, p. 217).

So, on the one hand, we see that ordered liberty permeates texts of Borys Humeniuk, however, it is balanced out by this selfish and careless freedom, on the other hand. It is interesting how these two reconcile — die for the country but not being involved in the day-to-day matters, which is considered to be a vice even.

It is reflected in the lives of Ukrainians. When the crisis is upon us, people mobilise and fight. Perfect examples of such behaviour would be the percentage of people who took part in the last election cycle, where about 60 percent of the eligible voters participated (RBC, 2019). Juxtaposing this with massive engagement of the population in pivotal moments of our recent history, such as Revolution on Granite (1990), Orange Revolution (2004–2005), Revolution of Dignity (2013–2014), beginning of the Russian-Ukrainian War (2014–now), and the Grand Russian Invasion of 2022.

Aforementioned take on freedom in connection with sense of duty, honor, and sacrifice (i.e., ordered liberty) loses even more of its weight when we take into account what Humeniuk's heroes think about civilians and returning from the war permanently. One of the characters worries whether there will be a country to return to from the frontline as everyone in his mind is either corrupt (government) or dumb (civilians) (Humeniuk, 2018, p. 219). The situation seems even more desperate as, on the one hand, those soldiers do not want any help or recognition from the government or from the people. Moreover, they explicitly mock psychological therapy offered by the government and various medals and such. On the other hand, those soldiers would berate the government and the people for not caring for them, honoring them, and treating them with respect (Humeniuk, 2018, p. 222). It seems that they contradict themselves and it is just about wanting to despise everything outside of the military sphere.

The sense of despair, and as a result — detachment, is one of the major themes in his texts which also tie into our topic of discussion. One of the characters asserts that for a lot of people there will be no “after the war” because “the Good has a short memory”. And thus, heroes will be forgotten very soon, as well as the enemy. He quickly corrects himself by saying that we have never known our heroes and that we are our worst enemy (Humeniuk, 2018, p. 76). Humeniuk's characters revel in this hopelessness. And pass this feeling on to the reader. Another glaring example is when an old man mocks his grandson for believing that after the Revolution of Dignity life will get better and there will be more justice and order in the society. Almost the whole page is dedicated to this monologue of how prosecutors and judges will be as corrupt as before, that grandson would still have to bribe his way into college, that it would be impossible to do business in Ukraine. Not now, not ever (Humeniuk, 2018, p. 90). It is almost as if Humeniuk cultivates despair and detachment from the public sphere in his audience.

Such sentiments when it comes to civilians and peaceful life are not lifting the spirit, but only discouraging people to do anything, engage with each other. They prompt people to drop their efforts and withdraw into themselves, their own business even more. Instead of cultivating the idea that even if the government is corrupt, we can change it for better, we just must be persistent. Applying the same sense of responsibility, duty, honour, and unbendable faith — the government (local and central) can and will be changed for the better. Soldiers might protect the country from the outside enemy, but with sentiments like this the country will crumble from within. When everyone despises the government, it is only natural that only corrupt people are getting in there. Of course, only people who view elected office as a lucrative place will be drawn to it, as all decent people will view it as a nuisance and a waste of time at best.

Through showing government only in one manner “you need to hate your own country to be in government” (Humeniuk, 2018, p. 196), through comments about that justice will never come, by saying that we [Ukrainians] will not live better because we, as people, do not deserve it, ordered liberty cannot be preserved for long (Humeniuk, 2018, p. 209). Such viewpoints discourage people from participating in the life of the country. Societies cannot survive when the sense of duty and togetherness exists only at the frontline. When there is no belief in our future. And where literature only propagates and entrenches those lines of thinking and behaviour.

Borys Humeniuk acknowledges that we look to the literature to understand the reality around us and that this is one of the reasons why this paper is also concerned about the implications of his texts. Humeniuk posits the idea that “poets are more dangerous than separatists” because poets

want your soul, not just your land (Humeniuk, 2018, p. 155). Humeniuk also laments that our literature lacks heroes to aspire to. That our modern literature is weak and unable to serve our society which is unfortunate as literature — does and should model our social processes. Besides, he acknowledges that literature is of immense importance for the sustainability of our society and thus our independence (Humeniuk, 2018, p. 230). However, he still cultivates mostly despair.

You cannot be responsible only in times of crisis and in the warzone. That is not liberty, that is freedom, a desire to be left alone. Ordered liberty can only be sustained by everyday actions of the society. Modus operandi of a citizen should not be “that is none of my business”. It should be closer to what Marcus Aurelius wrote in his *Meditations* (circa 170 A.D.), “By working to win your freedom. Hour by hour. Through patience, honesty, humility” (Aurelius, 8:51). In other words, ordered liberty is not something spontaneously constructed by the individual or government once and for all, nor its existence only threatened by the external enemy, but it is a long and arduous process of establishing and sustaining, which requires the continuous and relentless engagement of the people. Ordered liberty as an idea must be exercised by the people everywhere and under different circumstances — in their bedrooms, farms, public squares and streets, trenches, battlefields, and voting places, day and night.

Only when a large portion of the population will live by this idea and public figures will be promoting it, Ukraine will become more stable and prosperous. But right now, the existent reverence for virtues are largely overshadowed by the sense of despair and contempt to, and thus detachment from everything related to state crafting.

REFERENCES

1. Aquinas, T. (1912). The “Summa Theologica” of St. Thomas Aquinas: Part I. QQ. LXXV. O — CII. Fathers of the English Dominican Province (Ed.), *The “Summa Theologica” of St. Thomas Aquinas*, Vol. 4, pp. 147–155, London: Burns Oates & Washbourne [in English].
2. Aurelius, M. (2002). *The Meditations*. Random House [in English].
3. Bybyk, S. (2020). “Chroniclers will not Harm for Us Epitets with a Tint of Red” (epithetics “Poems from the war” by Borys Humeniuk). *Word Culture*, 92, 22–35 [in Ukrainian].
4. Golovchenko, N. (2016). Verlibr as a Form of Modern Poetry. About “Poems from the War” by Borys Humeniuk (2015). *Education of the Region: Political Science. Psychology. Communication*, 1 (42), 81–91 [in Ukrainian].
5. Humeniuk, B. (2016). Block post: Poems. Novellas. Journalism. Kyiv, PH “Academy” [in Ukrainian].
6. Humeniuk, B. (2018). Poems from the War. Kyiv: DIPA [in Ukrainian].
7. Kotsarev, O. (2014). Poetry of the Front. Poets go to war and post poems on Facebook. [in Ukrainian].
https://texty.org.ua/articles/56130/Pojezija_frontu_Pojety_idut_na_vijnu_i-56130/

8. Kuiava, Zh. (2015). *Poet and Warrior Borys Humeniuk: "Real soldier must be ready to die"*. [in Ukrainian].
<https://oksamyt.org/190120151/>
9. Locke, J. (1823). Two Treatises of Government. *The Works of John Locke*, A New Edition, Corrected, in Ten Volumes, Vol. 5., p. 106, London: Printed for Thomas Tegg; W. Sharpe and Son; G. Offor; G. and J. Robinson; J. Evans and Co.: Also R. Griffin and Co. Glasgow; and J. Gunning, Dublin [in English].
10. Mill, J. S. (2003). *On Liberty*. Edited by David Bromwich and George Kateb; with essays by Jean Bethke Elshtain... [et al.]. Binghamton, New York: Vail-Ballou Press [in English].
11. Palko v. Connecticut, 302 U.S. 319 (1937). [in English].
<https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/302/319/>
12. Pastukh, T. (2015). "Poems have Seen Everything...". [in Ukrainian].
<http://litakcent.com/2015/12/23/virshi-bachyly-vse/>
13. Polishchuk, Ya. (2016). Ars masacrae, or Whether Poetry is at War. *Word and Time*, 7, 3–11 [in Ukrainian].
14. *The Turnout in the Presidential Elections of Ukraine: All details*. (2019). [in Ukrainian].
<https://www.rbc.ua/ukr/news/vka-vyborah-prezidenta-ukrainy-podrobnosti-1553076979.html>

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Palko v. Connecticut, 302 U.S. 319 (1937). Режим доступу: <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/302/319/>. [in English].
2. Aurelius, M. (2002). *The Meditations*. Random House [in English].
3. Aquinas, T. (1912). *The "Summa Theologica" of St. Thomas Aquinas: Part I. QQ. LXXV. O — CII*. Fathers of the English Dominican Province (Ed.), *The "Summa Theologica" of St. Thomas Aquinas*, Vol. 4, pp. 147–155, London: Burns Oates & Washbourne [in English].
4. Бибик С.П. «Літописці не шкодуватимуть для нас епітетів з відтінком червоного» (епітетика «Віршів з війни» Бориса Гуменюка). *Культура слова*. 2020. № 92. С. 22–35.
5. Головченко Н. Верлібр як форма сучасного вірша. Про «Вірші з війни» Бориса Гуменюка. *Освіта регіону: Політологія. Психологія. Комунікації*. 2016. 1 (42). С. 81–91.
6. Гуменюк Б. 100 новел про війну / ДІПА. К., 2018. 272 с.
7. Гуменюк Б. Блокпост: Вірші. Новели. Публіцистика. К.: ВЦ «Академія», 2016. 336 с.
8. Коцарев О. Поезія фронту. Поети ідуть на війну і постять вірші у Фейсбуку. Режим доступу: https://texty.org.ua/articles/56130/Pohezija_frontu_Pojety_idut_na_vijnu_i-56130
9. Куява Ж. Поет і воїн Борис Гуменюк: «Справжній солдат має бути готовим померти». *Оксамит*. Режим доступу: <http://www.oksamyt.org/publik/personali/818-190120151>
10. Локк Дж. Два трактати про державність. *Праці Джона Локка: у 10 т.* Лондон: Віддруковано для Томаса Тегга. Т. 5. С. 106. [Англійською].
11. Міль Дж. Ст. Про свободу / за ред. Девіда Бромвіча та Джорджа Катеба; зі статтями Джин Бетке Ельштайн... [та ін.]. Бінгемтон, Нью-Йорк. Vail-Ballou Press, 2003. [Англійською].
12. Пастух Тарас. «Вірші бачили все...»: рецензія. *Літакцент*. 23 грудня 2015 р. Режим доступу: <http://litakcent.com/2015/12/23/virshi-bachyly-vse/>
13. Поліщук Я. Ars masacrae, або Про те, чи є поезія на війні. *Слово і час*. 2016. № 7. С. 3–11.
14. Явка на виборах президента України: усі подробиці. 2019. Режим доступу: <https://www.rbc.ua/ukr/news/vka-vyborah-prezidenta-ukrainy-podrobnosti-1553076979.html>

Пилинський Михайло,

Київський університет імені Бориса Грінченка (Київ, Україна)

ORCID ID 0000-0002-4771-1294

e-mail: m.pylynskyi@kubg.edu.ua

УПОРЯДКОВАНА СВОБОДА В ТЕКСТАХ БОРИСА ГУМЕНЮКА

У статті досліджується, чи пропагує Борис Гуменюк упорядковану свободу. Для того щоб це з'ясувати, розглядаються також деякі інші питання. По-перше, встановлюються причини дискусії у творах цього автора, описується особисте та професійне життя Гуменюка, який визнає важливість літератури для формування суспільства. Далі встановлюється термі-

нологічний апарат статті, визначається, що таке свобода у філософській традиції Заходу, і розкривається ключова ідея статті — що таке впорядкована свобода та її походження. Після означення конкретних літературних текстів для статті, автор переходить до їх обговорення. Це дослідження включає опис шарів суспільства, які виокремлюються у зв'язку з особистою відповідальністю та безкорисливістю. На першому рівні перебувають військово-вслужбовці, які готові померти за свою країну; на другому — всі, хто так чи інакше допомагає військовим; на третьому — ухильанти; і нарешті — урядовці, яких зневажають за корумпованість. Цей розподіл допомагає зрозуміти сприйняття Гуменюком упорядкованої свободи та його систему цінностей. Використовуючи попередні висновки, автор аналізує три типи свободи, які зустрічаються у текстах Гуменюка. Перший — це воля від життя, як від війни і страждань. Другий — свобода, яка проявляється у публічній сфері, у почутті, що кожен має працювати на захист країни. Третій — глибоко особиста воля, яка простежується у поведінці, коли люди займаються лише своєю справою і, крім того, є досить цинічними щодо всіх інституцій та їх здатності вдосконалюватися. Зрештою автор встановлює зв'язок між почуттям Гуменюка щодо великого впливу митців на суспільство та його наголосом на останньому типі свободи, показуючи незгодженість між двома ідеями. Новизна такого дослідження полягає у поєднанні української літератури та західної філософської традиції, зокрема, щодо визначення свободи та її граней. Подальший розвиток цього дослідження вбачається в аналізі української літератури у зазначеному ключі задля з'ясування ставлення українців до свободи та, якщо його правильно застосувати, допомозі політикам у їхній роботі задля процвітання України.

Ключові слова: воля, свобода, відповідальність, воєнна література, війна, новела, вільний вірш.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 01.08.2022.

Прийнято до друку 11.10.2022.