

**National Research University Higher School of Economics**

as a manuscript

**Anna Rodionova**

**TECHNICAL IMAGINATION  
IN RUSSIAN-LANGUAGE UNOFFICIAL POETRY  
IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE XX CENTURY**

Dissertation Summary

for the purpose of obtaining

academic degree Doctor of Philosophy in Philology and Linguistics

Academic Supervisor:

M.G. Pavlovets,

Doctor of Sciences, Assistant professor

Moscow 2024

**General description of the work.** The topic of our research combines two large and seemingly unrelated areas: technology and poetry. Without resorting to the common point of such works — the connection between poetry and techne, which has been pondered upon by ancient Greek philosophers and remains relevant today — it is worth noting that studying various types of interaction between technology and literature holds significant philological value.

Firstly, technology is a crucial part of culture, especially in the contemporary era of the 20th and 21st centuries, and literature does not exist in isolation from cultural processes. Being a part of these processes, literature is inseparable from their changes. Secondly, analyzing the plots and motifs in which technology was involved during different periods of the 20th century in various literary strata opens up new perspectives on the aesthetic development of literature.

Russian literature throughout the 20th century has undergone numerous transformations. One of the most notable changes is associated with the emergence of a specific subfield of unofficial literature. While official or official literature adhered to the aesthetic restrictions of the Soviet era and was allowed for publication, unofficial literature (underground, self-published, sam- and tamizdat literature) existed outside of the normative publishing instances.

The reception of technology in official Soviet literature played a significant role in shaping its aesthetic system, partly associated with the ideology of scientific and technological progress. However, little research has been done on how unofficial literature dealt with scientific and technological issues (particularly in conjunction with official literature), although it could provide additional insights into the interaction between these mentioned literary strata of the past century.

Based on the above, the **relevance** of our research can be summarized as follows:

1. The poetics of unofficial Russian literature was formed through complex interactions with official Soviet literature, for which technology was an ideologically significant cultural area. However, the relationship between these two types of literary reception (official and unofficial) has not been sufficiently explored, despite the necessity of comparing them being identified by Victor Krivulin in his 1979 work “Twenty Years of Modern Russian Poetry” [Kalomirov (Krivulin) 1979]. Official literature provided a limited and somewhat distorted range of possible interpretations of technology and its role in human life and society. Moreover, the aforementioned issues involved completely different perspectives, as evidenced by the multitude of concepts for understanding them formed in world literature of the 20th century. Therefore, when discussing the Russian literary tradition, it is essential to consider alternative views on the problem of technology and progress, which are not restricted by Soviet norms and can be found in unofficial texts, as it is in these texts that the meanings that remained unexpressed in official culture or were suppressed by state ideology were articulated.

2. The results of this research will help discover the specifics of the interaction between official and unofficial Russian poetry of the past century, which is a relevant area for contemporary literary studies. Without understanding the principles of this connection, it is impossible to hope for an objective and comprehensive picture of Russian literature of the 20th century, its connection with previous periods, and the global literary context.

Unofficial poetry here refers to a collection of texts whose authors went beyond the boundaries of the system of Soviet aesthetics and thereby beyond the limits of what was permissible in the Soviet press. In developing this concept, we follow

Ilya Kukulin [Kukulin 2019], who defined it in the programmatic article “Two Births of Unofficial Poetry in the USSR”. In addition, in our research we focus on the research of Stanislav Savitsky, who devoted a significant part of his book “Underground: the history and myths of Leningrad unofficial literature” to the study and differentiation of various concepts related to associations of authors who did not want to be guided by Soviet thematic restrictions and/or aesthetic requirements [Savitsky 2002].

The term unofficial poetry (“nepodtsenzurnaya poeziya”) in the context of our research refers to a collection of works that were not intended for publication in Soviet literature and whose main goal is not social-ideological adaptation but the representation of personal and/or collective experience [Kukulin 2019]. This term encompasses both literary-sociological and purely aesthetic aspects. However, it is not objective to reduce the diversity of associations, practices, and methods to a uniform model of “nepodtsenzurnaya” (unofficial) literature: unofficial literature is heterogeneous, just like official literature. Therefore, in our discussion of unofficial literature, we consciously try to maintain this indefiniteness of definition. On the one hand, we don’t want to terminologically limit its forms of existence, which were diverse (for example, unofficial literature is broader than samizdat), and on the other hand, we want to show the significance of the connection (albeit often negative) with official literature.

“Technical imagination” (“tekhnicheskoye voobrazheniye”), another concept highlighted in our research, refers to a historically and culturally specific way of formulating thoughts about technology in literature, while also displaying specific relationships with the environment (both perceptual and socio-cultural) in the literary texts. “The complexity of the structure is directly proportional to the complexity of the information being transmitted. The complication of the nature of information inevitably leads to the complication of the semiotic system

used to convey it” [Lotman 2018: 18], therefore, technical and information transformations in society inevitably affect the ways of organizing a literary text.

The perceptual aspect of technical imagination is related to our sensory experience, which is shaped by new technologies [McLuhan 2003] [Kittler 2009], and in turn, influences the reading of the text. The cultural aspect of technical imagination is associated with the concrete historical reality, which is usually in complex relationships with the literary work but inevitably manifests itself in its motivational and imagery structure. Technical imagination engages both the lexical-semantic level of the text and the phonological and rhythmic aspects [Lotman 2018: 124-251]. In addition to the imagery of technical devices, motifs associated with them, and the theme of progress, technical imagination can also be expressed through language usage. Neologisms, which activate the phonological level, can covertly refer to concepts of progress in the historical avant-garde and be criticized, subverted, or appropriated by poets of the second half of the 20th century.

**Degree of development of the research topic.** Among the philological works on Russian literature, there is a significant number of studies closely related to the topic of this dissertation, which indicates the interest in this field in contemporary philology.

In working on our dissertation, we relied on existing studies of several directions. Firstly, these are the works of Stanislav Savitsky and Ilya Kukulin mentioned earlier, which discuss unofficial literature as a subfield or separate literary stratum. In addition, we value books and articles dedicated to various groups, personalities, and problems associated with unofficial literature. These include works by Yulia Valieva, Dmitry Golyenko-Volfson, Danila Davydov, Alexander Zhitenyov, Alexey Konakov, Ilya Kukuy, Ilya Kukulin, Denis Larionov, Mark Lipovetsky, Alexey Masalov, Ensley Morse, Yuri Orlytsky, Mikhail Pavlovets,

Stephanie Sandler, Olga Severskaya, Alexander Skidan, Klavdia Smola, Daria Sukhovei, Pavel Uspensky, and others.

It was also important for our research to get acquainted with these two books: the first — about the unofficial culture of the USSR, “The Oxford Handbook of Soviet Underground Culture”, edited by Mark Lipovetsky, and the second is about an alternative view of the poetic canon in Russian-language poetry of the 20th century — “Twentieth-Century Russian Poetry: Reinventing the Canon”, edited by Katharine Hodgson.

Moreover, our research is contextually rooted in the linguistic works of Natalya Fateeva (particularly relevant for our dissertation is her approach to metalinguistic poetics), linguistic-poetic and linguistic-pragmatic works by Olga Sokolova and Vladimir Feshchenko.

Individual works on the contexts of the Soviet era associated with scientific and technological progress and the surrounding unofficial poetry of interest to us also proved significant. These works include historical studies by Natalya Lebina, the book “Industrial Whistle: Proletkult Poetry” by philologist Maria Levchenko, the articles from the collection “Socialist Realist Canon” (edited by Hans Gunter) that shed light on socialist realism from different angles, the book “Material Life” by Alexey Golubev, which is devoted to the anthropology of things (including technology) in late socialism, books by Slava Gerovich on various aspects of technical knowledge and discourse in the Soviet era, and works by Anindita Banerjee on Russian-language science fiction and its role in shaping the Soviet modern subject, the subject of modernity.

Another important group of research works for us are the texts that address the connection between technology and literature. We referred to a number of studies that analyze authors of the second half of the 20th century. These include the overview collection of articles edited by Robert Crawford, “Contemporary Poetry

and Contemporary Science”, literary-sociological articles by Ilya Kukulín, and media-cognitive works by Evgenia Samostienko (Suslova), where the term “technological imaginary” is particularly important to us. In many ways, it is close to our concept of technical imagination. However, while technological imaginary focuses more on the cognitive aspects of the connection between technology and language, employing cognitive metaphor theory, technical imagination speaks about the external dimension — about the perceptual contact with the environment and the cultural-historical realities filtered through the poetic text.

For the contextualization of the topic we are addressing in a cross-cultural perspective, we have turned to the research of foreign (primarily English-speaking) authors on non-Russian material. Although these works are not directly related to the texts we are examining, they allow us to clarify various theoretical aspects of the connection between literature (particularly poetry) and the technosphere. These include the works of Katherine Hayles and Marjorie Perloff, contemporary theoretical articles on the role of perception in literature and eco-poetics, and the forms of interaction between the environment, including technological elements, and the text. Other significant texts for our work are books and articles on philosophy that develop various aspects of the concept of technology, particularly those related to critical posthumanities, which problematizes many of the dichotomies of the modern era, such as the dichotomy between nature and civilization. Accordingly, the problem of progress, extremely important for the literature we are considering, can be studied in more detail and contextually, in close connection with modern trends in the humanities. This includes the works of Donna Haraway, Karen Barad, and Rosi Braidotti, as well as anthropological and STS research by Bruno Latour, Lucy Suchman, and Harris Thompson. Additionally, the study would not be complete without drawing on media theory, both from the classics of the discipline (Friedrich Kittler, Marshall

McLuhan) and the latest concepts presented, for example, in the works of Alexander Galloway.

Despite the diversity of methods and approaches used by different authors when writing about poetry, 20th-century literature, and technology (together or separately), the issue of technical imagination, which implies an expanded examination of the representation of technology in Russian unofficial poetry in dialogue with literary tradition and cultural processes of the 20th century, has not been sufficiently studied. Currently, there are no research works that specifically focus on this aspect using unofficial poetry material. Usually, this issue appears in researchers' works as part of a larger context and is never the main focus. Despite the obvious importance of the concept of technology for the entire 20th century and Russian literature of the period, there has not been enough attention given to the technical imagination in unofficial poetry. For this reason, we can speak of the scientific novelty of the proposed approach.

Considering all the above, **the object** of this research is the poetic texts of unofficial poets from the second half of the 20th century (groups and associations known as the “Lianozovo School”, the “Philological School”, and Metarealism), specifically Henry Sapgir, Igor Kholin, Mikhail Eremin, Alexander Kondratov, and Alexey Parshchikov. We consciously did not refer to authors who were more closely associated with the Soviet press, such as Viktor Sosnora, or authors whose works did not prominently feature technical motifs, such as representatives of the Moscow Conceptualist movement. **The subject** of the research is the manifestation of technical imagination in the poetic texts of these authors and the relationship between their strategies and the information situation of the specified period, as well as each group's place in the history of literature in the second half of the 20th century.



**The goal** of this research is to identify and interpret the characteristics of the manifestation of technical imagination in the works of unofficial Russian-language poetry in the second half of the 20th century. The set goal involves solving **the following tasks**:

1. To study the experience of comprehending technology in the humanities of the 20th century in order to contextualize the representation of technology in poetry.
2. To describe the specifics of the relationship to technology in Soviet culture in the second half of the 20th century.
3. To explore the problem of the relationship between technology and literature as a theoretical issue, examining various approaches to this problem in critical, metapoetic, and theoretical texts of the 20th century.
4. To define the concept of technical imagination and its possible implications.
5. To systematically present the various strategies for the manifestation of technical imagination in the poetic texts of unofficial Russian-language poetry of the 20th century, primarily in the works of representatives of the “Lianozovo School”, the “Philological School”, and Metarealism, where such manifestations are most distinct.
6. To identify the specifics of such implementations of technical imagination in the context of the legacy of the historical avant-garde and the ideology of scientific and technological progress. The main materials for the study were the poetic texts of the aforementioned authors (Sapgir, Kholin, Eremin, Kondratov, Parshchikov) from the 1950s to the 1980s. In addition, texts on the theory of literature from these periods were studied to provide context for the work (works by representatives of OPOYAZ, the Moscow-Tartu Semiotic School), as well as a number of manifestos, declarations, essays, letters, interviews, and other

metapoetic statements belonging to the poets and theorists associated with the aforementioned movements.

The methodology of our research combines different approaches. Philological methods were used for interpreting the texts. We relied on the work of representatives of the Moscow-Tartu Semiotic School. In the framework of motif analysis, we relied on the combination of elements of intertextual approach [Gasparov 1993] and narratological-semiotic approach [Silantyev 2004]. The concept of imagination in our research combines both a proper philological interpretation [Starobinsky 2002] and a sociological one [Dubin 2017]: the imagination as a category related to text production is here combined with the concept of imagination directed towards the analysis of various structures (social, epistemological, aesthetic), which can be expressed in the poetics of the text.

Finally, to analyze the forms of cultural existence of technology and progress concepts, we turned to the methods of intellectual history/history of ideas [Whatmore 2023], sometimes also using a Foucauldian perspective, particularly in aspects related to discourses [Foucault 1969]. In addition, interdisciplinary works of contemporary theorists writing about literature and text in the context of modern critical posthumanities [Braidotti 2018] [Barad 2018] [Hayles 2012, 2017] [Boyle 2016] [Nolan 2017] [Lattig 2020] were used to clarify various aspects of technical imagination.

From the specific goals and tasks of our research, the following propositions emerge, which are put forward for defense:

1. Throughout the 20th century, technology has inspired people to engage in aesthetic explorations. Literary researchers and theorists turn to it to describe literature more relevantly, and poets seek the foundations of their method in the principles of technological work. Statements by poets and literary scholars from different periods of the past century about how they perceive the problems of

poetry and its connection with technology show that private reader perception in poetic texts is tuned and guided by something similar to how social perception is guided by technology. In the most recent period of the history of Russian-language poetry, technological motifs and other metapoetic indications of technomediareality become a way to reflect on the poetic processes themselves. References to technology in theoretical statements and individual programmatic poems show that these images and motifs often act as markers of awareness of the poetic possibilities in working with perception.

2. To demonstrate this specific interdependence between poetry, its cultural context, and the technosphere, it is necessary to speak of technical imagination as a form of connecting a text to the interplay of cultural and perceptual experience.

3. In unofficial culture, the work of technical imagination highlights the mutual permeation of official culture as an inevitable background and a wider variety of problems characteristic of the 20th century as a whole (e.g., the problem of the relationship between progress and power, technology and perception, existential and environmental aspects of technological progress, etc.).

4. In addition, technical imagination allows for contextualizing specific unofficial poetic practices in the light of literary and cultural processes of the first two decades of the 20th century. It is possible to argue that in the second half of the century, the idea of progress significantly changes compared to that in the historical avant-garde. For example, the dichotomies of nature and civilization are not always maintained in the same way. This is particularly true for unofficial literature. At the same time, some unofficial poets continue certain tendencies of the historical avant-garde. In this case, it is possible to speak of subverting their socio-utopian aspect expressed in technical imagination.

5. Technical imagination manifests itself differently in the discussed texts of unofficial poetry. For example, in the poetry of authors Genrikh Sapgir and Igor

Kholin, members of the “Lianozovo School”, the fusion of body and discourse as conduits and mediating instances of technical imagination became the result of attempts to uncover the possibilities of poetic speech in the conditions of disillusionment both in lyrical pathos, dominated by the rhetoric of the Thaw and “the loud lyricism”, and in progress, which in the 1950s-1960s once again became one of the most important elements of official discourse. The work of Sapgir and Kholin with technical imagination is manifested through the adjustment of the relationship between linguistic abstraction and concreteness (both of language and what can be found outside of it). Their poems remove the mythos of industrial heroism through everyday details and critique of discourse.

6. For Mikhail Eremin and Alexander Kondratov, authors of the “Philological School”, a projective attitude towards creativity is characteristic, within which sufficiently contradictory tendencies can coexist. Eremin reinterprets the avant-garde linguistic experiment, indicating the transformation of the modern model of rationality. The special terminology, in his case, demonstrates shifted referential relationships, where the term becomes “self-sufficient” like a word in the Futurists' sense, but no longer in the purely avant-garde meaning. On the other hand, for Kondratov, the generative potential (both of the poetic thinking of the author himself and the work of computers) is used in an attempt to close the project of the historical avant-garde, having exhausted its formal peculiarities. It can be said that in the poetry of at least these two authors of the “Philological School”, the transition period of the 1960s-1970s is manifested.

7. For the authors of metarealism (especially Alexey Parshchikov), technology serves as a means of mediating the perception. Its elements, permeating most of the images, indicate a new significance of technological motifs in the literature of the late Soviet era. Being markers of scientific and technological progress, discredited in the realm of official poetics and ideology, they become sources of new individual optics. In the poetics of the text, this characteristic is resolved

through complex metaphor, shifting points of view (in the “inside-out” concept according to Kedrov), and parataxis in syntax. The metarealist interpretation of technology coincides with the complexity of the representation of machines in the culture of the last third of the 20th century: it is conceived not in conflict with the surrounding environment, but rather as a part of it and is connected not so much with production as with the recoding of perception.

8. The dividing line between unofficial and official poetry cannot be drawn only by their attitude to technical progress, since in both we can find techno-pessimism and techno-optimism. However, the preservation of the dichotomy between nature and civilization is more typical for official authors. Unofficial poets could speak with greater freedom about the problematic aspects of technological progress, but they could with the same freedom refuse an ethical assessment of technological advance, while among the mainstream Soviet authors we examined, criticism of progress required an inversion. At the same time, the dichotomous view of technology and nature remained: “All progress is reactionary if man collapses” [Voznesensky 2012: 166]. As a result, in the practice of unofficial authors, the boundary between man and the environment (containing both the geological environment in general and the technosphere as part of it) is a little more often blurred, which may also be relevant for the latest Russian-language literature, in which the techno-ecological approach to poetry is quite influential.

**Structure and main content of the work.** The work consists of an introduction, three chapters, and a conclusion. Each chapter contains two to three paragraphs. The **introduction** presents the relevance of the dissertation topic, identifies the object and subject of the research, defines its goals and objectives, and analyzes the degree of scientific development of the problem while describing the methodological basis.

**The first chapter, “Technology in the 20th Century”,** has a theoretical character, methodologically approaching the history of ideas. The chapter provides an overview of various approaches to understanding technology that emerged throughout the 20th century. **The first paragraph of the chapter, “Technology in 20th Century Culture: Three Approaches”,** presents an overview of the peculiarities of comprehending and representing technology during that period. A thorough exploration of the diverse interpretations of technology and progress in the 20th century would require a level of detail far exceeding the scope of this work. However, our aim was to highlight the main relevant tendencies for further analysis. In this paragraph, we identify three perspectives on technology in culture: the first perspective relates to technology primarily associated with industrial labor and production, the second perspective portrays technology in relation to communication and information, and the third perspective presents technology as an environment where multiple culturally significant processes occur while simultaneously being a natural and malleable part of the surrounding space. We also draw a conclusion about the tendency towards expansion and abstraction of cultural representations of technology.

**The second paragraph of this chapter, “Technology in Soviet Culture in the Second Half of the 20th Century”,** narrows down the examination of the role of technology in the 20th century to its specific characteristics in Soviet culture during the second half of the 20th century. This chronological period is selected not only because it corresponds to the time when the studied authors were active but also because significant changes occurred in the concepts of technology and progress during this period. These transformations were influenced both by practical factors (such as a new wave of industrialization, the space race, and the spread of cybernetics) and ideological factors (including the rhetoric of the Thaw, the rhetoric of stagnation, and the transitional situation of the 1980s, which offered their own perspectives on the key principles of the Soviet system and

consequently on the issue of progress). Additionally, there were aesthetic considerations (an example of this is the “physicists versus lyricists” discussion, in which the technical aspect became a significant key to reinterpreting the parameters of literature and art in the thawing society).

**In the third paragraph of this chapter, “The Notion of Technical Imagination”**, building on the regularities identified in the previous paragraphs, we explore the theoretical connection between technology and literary text. In this paragraph, technical imagination is defined as a historically and culturally specific way of formulating thoughts about technology in literature, while expressing specific relationships with the environment (both perceptual and cultural-historical) within the text.

**The second chapter** of our dissertation is called **“Literary Thinking about Scientific and Technological Progress: Testing Technique with Poetry”**. In this chapter, we examine the relationship between poetry and technology both theoretically and practically.

**In the first paragraph** of the chapter, **“Discourse of Technological Progress in Meta-Poetic and Literary Texts of the 20th century”**, we review and analyze conceptualizations of the connection between poetry and technology in Russian-language poetry. We rely on various meta-poetic phenomena (manifestos, self-commentaries, etc.) from symbolism to meta-realism. The theorization of the intersection of poetry and technology is considered in the context of the history of ideas and the transformation of perception, which many of the analyzed documents indicate. Furthermore, we discuss the problematic nature of this connection, which is influenced by the social structure of a given historical period and the role of progressive ideologies in shaping it (e.g., the ideology of scientific and technological progress in the USSR).

**The second paragraph** of this chapter, “**Technology in Official Soviet Literature in the Second Half of the 20th century**”, focuses on specific trends in literature published in official Soviet press. We examine both the general aesthetic principles that influenced the official body of Soviet literary texts and specific movements and genres such as Soviet science fiction, rural prose, “quiet lyricism”, “popular poetry”, etc. We note that it is impossible to attribute solely a progressive inclination to Soviet official literary discourse since it also included critiques of progress. However, both techno-positivism and techno-skepticism in the Soviet context share the preservation of the fundamental dichotomies of the Modern Era, through which technology and civilization, regardless of the worldview, remain at least partially opposed to nature and “naturalness”.

**The third chapter** of our dissertation, “**Critique or Resolution of Contradictions? Technology and unofficial Poetry**”, is devoted to analyzing poetic texts from representatives of three different groups associated with unofficial poetry, known as the “Lianozovo School”, “Philological School”, and metarealism. Specifically, we examine the works of Evgeny Kropivnitsky, Genrikh Sapgir, Igor Kholin, Mikhail Eremin, Alexander Kondratov, and Alexey Parshchikov. We chose these authors' texts because each of them consistently and consciously employed technical motifs in their creative work.

**In the first paragraph** of this chapter, “**“Lianozovo School’: Critique of Industrial Optimism and Technical Imagination in the Barracks**”, we examine the poetic texts of authors from the “Lianozovo School” (Evgeny Kropivnitsky, Igor Kholin, and Genrikh Sapgir), written in the 1950s and early 1960s, in connection with the ideology of scientific and technological progress and its influence on the aesthetic system of Russian literature of the 20th century. The paragraph analyzes how the specific features of early 20th-century literature, which influenced the formation of Soviet official aesthetics, are deconstructed in the poems of Sapgir and Kholin, along with typical speech clichés and ideological



patterns of the second half of the 20th century. By examining how the social and cultural context is reflected in the texts of these two poets, we aim to identify the peculiarities of their work in unofficial literature, including linguistic abstraction, the specificity of everyday life, the literary tradition of modernism, and the mediating role of technical imagination.

**In the second paragraph** of the chapter, “**Philological School and STP: Cybernetic Dialogue with the Historical Avant-Garde**”, we focus on the poetry of two authors from the aforementioned poetic collective: Mikhail Eremin and Alexander Kondratov. By analyzing their texts, we explore how the tendencies of the historical avant-garde associated with the idea of progress are reinterpreted in the practices of these two very different authors, subverting the socio-utopian technocratic aspect in their own ways.

Finally, **the concluding paragraph** of the third chapter, “**Metarealism: Revaluation of Technical Images**”, examines the peculiarities of meta-realism, particularly the poetry of Alexey Parshchikov, whose practice blends the legacy of the avant-garde, both official and unofficial traditions, and where technical motifs become a means of transforming individual perspectives.

**In the conclusion**, we summarize the results of our research, noting the features of the implementation of technical ideas among all the authors under consideration. There we also note the diversity of technical motifs among poets of the second half of the 20th century. We suppose that in the underground poetry the interpretation of scientific and technological progress was limitedly connected with the dichotomies characteristic of modern culture, but these dichotomies were often reproduced in the poetry of official authors (no matter that their views were techno-pessimistic or techno-optimistic). **The bibliography** includes 44 literary/historical sources, 206 scientific and scientific works.

**Research findings:** Thus, despite the diversity of technical imagination in the practices of unofficial and official authors, several key characteristics can be identified. Firstly, the division between unofficial and official poetry cannot be solely based on their relation to technological progress since both techno-pessimism and techno-optimism can be found among authors from both spheres. However, the preservation of the dichotomy between nature and civilization is more characteristic of official authors. Unofficial authors had greater freedom to address problematic aspects of technological development, but they could also freely abstain from ethical evaluation of technological progress, whereas among the mainstream Soviet authors we examined (Andrey Voznesensky, Nikolay Rubtsov, and some prose writers), criticism of progress required a shift in evaluative polarities, an inversion. Moreover, the dichotomy of views on technology and nature remained: “All progresses are reactionary if humanity is destroyed” [Voznesensky 2012: 166]. As a result, in the practice of unofficial authors, the boundary between humans and the environment (including both the geological environment and the technosphere as its part) is often blurred, which may also be relevant to contemporary Russian literature, where the technoeological approach to poetry is quite influential.

The results of our research were presented and tested at six conferences, both philological and interdisciplinary:

- 1) All-Russian Scientific Conference with International Participation “XVII Sapigir Readings” — “Eight Great Ones” (2020, RGGSU).
- 2) International Scientific Conference “Poet Vacancy-2: Problematization of the ‘poetic’ at the turn of the 20th-21st centuries” (2020, VGU).
- 3) All-Russian Scientific Conference with International Participation “XVIII Sapigir Readings” — “Sapigir and his Circle: Ten More Poets” (2021, RGGSU).

4) All-Russian Scientific Conference “Reading Experiments: Poetry and Verse” (2022, Higher School of Economics).

5) All-Russian Scientific Conference with International Participation “XIX Sapigir Readings” — “Alive! Russian Poets - Sapigir's Younger Contemporaries” (2022, RGGSU).

6) XVII Conference of Students, Graduate Students and Young Researchers “Constructing ‘Soviet’? Regional Diversity and the Search for Identity” (2023, European University).

During our research, the following articles were prepared and published:

1) Rodionova A.A. Assemblages of Alexey Parshchikov between non-censorship and contemporary poetry // In: Figures of Intuition: The Poetics of Alexey Parshchikov. Moscow: Editus, 2022. P. 90-101.

2) Rodionova A.A. “We don't have an automatic station”: Filters of Technical Imagination in the Poetry of Genrikh Sapgir and Igor Kholin // *Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie*. 2022. No. 176. P. 254-269. (Scopus)

3) Rodionova A.A. Connection Established. Intricacies of Poetry, Power, Perception, and Technology // *Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie*. 2023. No. 182. P. 216-229. (Scopus)

4) Rodionova A.A. “Photoforest, Photomeadow, Photosummer”. Techno-ecological Miniatures by Mikhail Yeregin / *Zbornik Matice srpske za slavistiku*, II, 2023. P. 339-351. (Scopus)

The following articles, which are not directly related to the research topic but provided a foundation for it, contextualized our research:

1) Rodionova A.A. Contemporary Poetry as an Informational Practice: On the Texts of Nika Skandiaka // *New Literary Observer*. 2021. No. 167. P. 223-234. (Scopus)

2) Rodionova A.A. The Place of Contemporary Poetry in the Techno-Information Environment as a Theoretical Problem (Using the Example of Articles by A. Skidan and S. Ogurtsov): From Multimedia to Postmediality and Discursive Practices // In: "Poet Vacancy"-2: Materials from Two Conferences / Ed. by M.G. Pavlovets, A.A. Zhitenev. Voronezh: AO "Voronezhskaya Oblastnaya Tipografiya", 2020. P. 269-288.

The dissertation results have both **theoretical and practical significance**. The research expands our understanding of the interaction between unofficial and official literature and places Russian poetry of the 20th century within a broader literary and cultural context. This has implications for the development of courses in literary studies, the history of Russian literature of the 20th century, unofficial Russian literature, and contemporary poetry. The findings can also serve as the basis for educational materials on Russian literature and culture of the 20th century, and the conclusions of this research can be useful for working with library collections and archives.

As for **the prospects of the research**, there are several ways for further exploration. Firstly, the study can extend towards the examination of contemporary Russian poetry that inherits practices and poetics from the unofficial environment. Particularly interesting perspectives arise from the intersection of technology and contemporary poetry, where poets employ digital technologies to create digital and visual forms of poetry or engage in experimental poetic practices. Theoretical and critical approaches rooted in media theory and philosophy of technology are also used to describe processes in contemporary poetry. In the recent period of Russian poetry, technological motifs and meta-

poetic references to the technomedia reality have become a way to reflect on poetic processes. Therefore, the focus of this research can be considered relevant and promising for further investigations in this field.

Secondly, the research can be continued through a comparative study of similar processes in foreign poetry of the 20th and 21st centuries. It is evident that such processes occurred, as unofficial authors often engaged in dialogue with representatives of foreign literatures. For example, the “Lianozovo School” interacted with German Concrete Poets, authors of the Metarealist circle had connections with American Language Poets, and so on.

Overall, the research contributes to the theoretical understanding of the interaction between unofficial and official literature, provides practical implications for education and cultural institutions, and opens up avenues for further exploration in the field of contemporary Russian poetry and comparative studies with international counterparts.

## References

1. Barad K. Agential Realism: How Material-Discursive Practices Matter. *Opyty nechelovecheskogo gostepriimstva. Antologiya*. [Experiences of inhuman hospitality. An Anthology]. Moscow, V-A-C press Publ., 2018, pp. 42—121 (in Russian).
2. Braidotti R. The Critical Posthumanities, or is Medianatures To Naturecultures as Zoe is to Bios? *Opyty nechelovecheskogo gostepriimstva. Antologiya*. [Experiences of Inhuman Hospitality. An Anthology]. Moscow, V-A-C press Publ., 2018, pp. 24—41 (in Russian).
3. Voznesensky A. A Complete Collection of Poems in One Book. Moscow, Alfa-kniga Publ., 2012.
4. Gasparov B. Literary Leitmotifs. Essays on Russian Literature of the 20th century. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1993.
5. Dubin B. Imagination — Communication — Modernity. Essays on the Sociology of Culture: Selected works. Moscow, Novoye literaturnoye obozreniye Publ., 2017.
6. Kalomirov A. (Victor Krivulin) Twenty Years of Modern Russian Poetry (Preliminary Notes). *Russkaya virtual'naya biblioteka*. [Russian Virtual Library]. Available at: <https://rvb.ru/np/publication/03misc/kalomirov.htm> (Accessed 24 July 2021).
7. Kittler F. Optical media. Berlin lectures 1999. Moscow, Logos Publ., 2009 (in Russian).
8. Kukulin I. Two Births of Uncensored Poetry in the USSR. *Proryv k nevozmozhnoj svyazi: stat'i o russkoj poezii*. [Breakthrough to an Impossible Connection: Articles on Russian Poetry]. Ekaterinburg, Kabinetny uchenyy Publ., 2019.
9. Lotman Yu. Semiosphere. Saint Petersburg, Iskusstvo-SPb Publ., 2001.
10. Lotman Yu. The Structure of the Literary Text. Analysis of the Poetic Text. Saint Petersburg, Azbuka-Attikus Publ., 2018.
11. McLuhan M. Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man. Moscow, KANON-Press-C Publ., Kuchkovo Pole Publ., 2003 (in Russian).
12. Savitsky S. Underground. History and Myths of Leningrad Unofficial Literature. Moscow, Novoye literaturnoye obozreniye Publ., 2002.
13. Silantiev I. Poetics of Motive. Moscow: Yazyki Slavyanskoy Kultury (YaSK) Publ., 2004.

14. Starobinsky J. Poetry and Knowledge. History of Literature and Culture. Vol. 1. Moscow, Yazyki Slavyanskoy Kultury (YaSK) Publ., 2002.
15. Whatmore R. What is Intellectual History? (2015) Moscow, Novoye literaturnoye obozreniye Publ., 2023.
16. Foucault M. The Archaeology of Knowledge (1969). Moscow, Gumanitarnaya Akademia Publ., 2020 (in Russian).
17. Boyle C. Rhetoric As A Posthuman Practice. Ohio State University Press, 2018.
18. Hayles K. How We Think: Digital Media and Contemporary Technogenesis. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2012.
19. Hayles K. Unthought: The Power of the Cognitive Nonconscious. The University of Chicago Press, 2017.
20. Lattig Sh. Cognitive Eco-poetics: A New Theory of Lyric. L.; N.Y.: Bloomsbury Academic, 2020.
21. Nolan S. Unnatural Eco-poetics: Unlikely Spaces in Contemporary Poetry. University of Nevada Press, 2017.