

National Research University Higher School of Economics

As a manuscript

Pavlovets Mikhail Georgievich

**NEO-AVANT-GARDE IN THE RUSSIAN-LANGUAGE POETRY
OF THE SECOND HALF OF THE XX – THE BEGINNING XXI CENTURY**

Summary of the dissertation

for the purpose of obtaining the academic degree

Doctor of Science in Philology and Linguistics

Moscow 2023

General description

The study presents the results of the research of the oeuvre of a number of authors of the uncensored literature of the 2nd half of XX – XXI century and justifies introducing the term “Russian-language poetic neo-avant-garde” into scholarly discourse.

Neo-avant-garde (neo-avant-gardism) is a late, post-war avant-garde that emerged almost simultaneously in the 1940s – 1950s first in the West and then in the USSR – in the underground environment developing in the post-war period – as an attempt to continue the line of the so-called “historical avant-garde” of the previous pre-war period. The main aim of the neo-avant-garde authors was to renew the language of contemporary poetry of that time. The renewal they sought for was based on the experience of the “historical avant-garde”, which they were carefully collecting, researching, and mastering, and the connection with which they felt as artificially interrupted and therefore requiring re-creation and the experience itself – as requiring to be continued. The prefix “neo-” is necessary to distinguish this new generation of artists not only from their predecessors – representatives of the avant-garde of the 1900s – 1930s (Futurists, Dadaists, Oberiuts, etc.) but also from their contemporaries who were sometimes ready to recognize the heuristic nature of avant-garde discoveries, but for whom this heuristicity was rather laboratory, experimental, existing supposedly for art makers and researchers, but not for consumers of art.

The scientific relevance and novelty

The scientific relevance of the study of this layer of Russian uncensored literature lies primarily in the fact that underground literature, including its avant-garde experimental component, is an integral part of our national culture and is associated with the history and culture of our country, refracting them in itself. Moreover, unofficial literature stands at the origins of a significant part of the

phenomena of the contemporary literary process: a number of its current participants either began their artistic endeavor in the cultural underground, or were guided in their work by the traditions set (preserved and developed) in the uncensored environment. However, the ideologization of Soviet literary criticism excluded it from the field of legal scientific consideration, so for many years it was within the sphere of scientific interest only of foreign Slavists or those researchers who themselves belonged to it. Only in the post-Soviet period, a significant part of the underground literature was returned to the reader, and at the same time a wide interest in its description and study arose. However, the most radical, avant-garde forms of this literature remained in the shadow of the more traditional segment of uncensored literature, while it was exactly where the majority of authors whose creative practices were of an exploratory, experimental nature were forced out to by the aesthetic prohibitions of the Soviet era. At the same time, the lack of a strict terminological framework and relevant research optics was blurring the idea of the place of a number of neo-avant-garde authors significant for Russian literature of the 2nd half of the XX century in the literary process of that time, not allowing to realize the significance of their contribution and the reason for skepticism in relation to some of them not only on the part of censored literature and literary science but also representatives of other poetic movements of uncensored literature.

Without studying this layer of uncensored literature – archival and search work, describing, commenting and interpretation, publication and popularization – one cannot count on obtaining an objective picture of Russian literature of the XX century in its connection with previous periods and the world literary context, as well as in all three of its components – censored, uncensored and immigrant (especially given the blurred boundaries between them and the presence of strong lines of interaction and mutual influence).

The scientific novelty of the study lies in the fact that for the first time the works of Alexander Kondratov, “transfurist” poets, and Konstantin Kuzminsky are

considered in the general cultural-historical and literary context, an important neo-avant-garde substrate is found in works of the poets of the “Lianozovo school” Genrikh Sapgir and Vsevolod Nekrasov, the reasons for the existence of the contemporary neo-avant-garde are explained and some of its features are characterized on the example of Sergey Birjukov’s and German Lukomnikov’s works. This study significantly changes former ideas about the structure of the post-war literary field – primarily in the uncensored environment – and about the connections between uncensored poetry and a number of its contemporary movements, about the significance of a particular figure among the poets of the 2nd half of the XX – early XXI century.

Purpose and objectives of the study

The main **goal** of the study is to identify common features of the creative practices within the oeuvre of a number of authors of the second half of the XX – early XXI centuries who continued the most daring experiments of the “historical avant-garde”, which will allow to speak about the existence during this period, primarily in uncensored literature (in the underground and emigration), of such a literary movement as literary neo-avant-garde. This enables us not only to draw parallels between the processes taking place in Western literature of the post-war period and in the USSR but also identify some common patterns of formation and functioning of traditions of the “historical avant-garde” (largely based on declarative negation of traditions and direct inheritance) in fundamentally different sociocultural and political conditions of the post-war world order.

The **tasks** set up to achieve these goals can be formulated as follows:

- considering the main features of the “historical avant-garde” in Russia in the context of the world culture and art and the causes of its crisis in the 1930s – early 1940s;
- determining the reasons for the interest of some post-war authors, primarily uncensored ones, in collecting the avant-garde heritage, in continuing its line and

in reflection on the possibility of its inheritance along the lines of other art systems of modernist literature;

- describing on the basis of specific artistic practices various strategies for building continuity in relation to the heritage of the “historical avant-garde” in the literature of the second half of the XX – early XXI centuries;

- exploring the work of a number of authors who are guided by the continuation of the traditions of the “historical avant-garde” primarily through an appeal to the arsenal of artistic forms and techniques developed by it, with the aim of systematizing and possibly supplementing them within the framework of the neo-avant-garde artistic paradigm;

- analyzing the controversy (both discursive and at the level of creative practices) between the authors under study and contemporary authors – both those who did not share their radical experimental attitudes and those who problematized these attitudes within the framework of the post-avant-garde (primarily conceptualist) artistic system that is being gradually established.

Propositions of the study

1. The traditions of the “historical avant-garde” were perceived by a number of their heirs from the post-war generation of authors (Alexander Kondratov, the “transfurist” poets, Konstantin Kuzminsky, etc.) as artificially cut off, and the avant-garde art system itself was perceived as having not exhausted its transformational potential and, therefore, allowing a possibility of its recreation and continuation under new cultural and historical circumstances.

2. The interest in the “historical avant-garde”, as well as in the tasks of restoring the continuity in relation to it, and also in finding ways to be included in the context of the world neo-avant-garde could not be freely realized within the framework of censored Soviet literature and, therefore, first of all, distinguishes the figures of the literary underground, some of whom retained their commitment to

these tasks, having ended up in emigration.

3. The actual avant-garde (“neo-avant-garde”) line of inheritance in relation to the “historical avant-garde” was chosen by those authors who preferred to evade its ideological (primarily social-utopian) component and focused on the reconstruction and systematization of the arsenal of its artistic forms and techniques, as well as replenishing their number, taking into account emerging new scientific knowledge, technical tools, and creative technologies.

4. The creative practices of the neo-avant-gardists were inseparable not only from their manifesto-critical activity (which was also typical for figures of the “historical avant-garde”) but also involved active archival-collecting, research, publication and popularizing work – initially using the resources of sam- and tamizdat, and then the opportunities that appeared in the post-Soviet period to legalize their diverse activities. One of the goals of such work for neo-avant-garde artists (primarily writers) was to include their own work in the general avant-garde context of the so-called “meta-historical avant-garde” (S. Birjukov).

5. The field of neo-avant-garde searches in Russian poetry of the second half of XX century is located between several contexts: entering into a relationship of inheritance in relation to the “historical avant-garde” of the first half of the XX century, the Russian-language neo-avant-garde is connected by a complex system of mutual typological parallels and genetic links with the world poetic neo-avant-garde, at the same time it conducts polemics both with contemporary non-avant-garde artistic systems and post-avant-garde systems (primarily conceptualism, pop and Sots art), as well as popular culture.

6. The work of some authors as a whole fits into the neo-avant-garde paradigm (Alexander Kondratov, Ry Nikonova and Serge Segay, Konstantin Kuzminsky), while the work of others includes the practice of entering the field of neo-avant-

garde experiment (Genrikh Sapgir, Vsevolod Nekrasov). Some of the modern authors also allow considering their work in the context of neo-avant-garde (Sergey Birjukov, German Lukomnikov), which indicates the continuing relevance of neo-avant-garde creative attitudes in modern poetry.

The methodological basis of the study

Achieving the research goals and objectives defined in the work required us to study the experience of contemporary avant-garde studies, especially the studies of the Russian-language literary avant-garde in its connections both with the avant-garde in related arts (fine art, theatrical, book art, etc.) and with the global avant-garde context. The work is based on the research and concepts of the “historical avant-garde” of Peter Burger, Igor Vasiliev, Boris Grois, Moimir Grygar, Jean-Philippe Jacquard, Rosalind E. Kraus, Andrey Krusanov, Igor Smirnov and Renata Dühning-Smirnova, Aleksandar Flaker, Aage A. Hansen-Löve, Gerald Janecek and others. Considering avant-garde in the context of the typologies of literary modernism/avant-garde and post-modernism/post-avant-garde required an appeal to the corresponding concepts of Dubravka Oraic-Tolic and Dmitry Golyenko, which determined the theoretical foundations for distinguishing between avant-garde and post-avant-garde. While determining the international artistic context to identify the characteristic features of the subject under study, some works on the Western neo-avant-garde in visual arts drew our attention – Benjamin Buchloh, Hal Foster, in Western literature – Enrique Schmidt, Anna K. Schaffner and others.

We could not but take into account the concept of “neomodernism” in the Russian-language poetry of the XX – early XXI centuries by Alexander Zhitenev; the “neo-futurism” of the 1950s–1980s by Naum Leiderman and Mark Lipovetsky (as well as Kirill Korchagin, who is developing their ideas); the linguopoetic concept of “neo-avant-garde” by Olga Sokolova, the culturological one – “Avant-garde 3” by Igor Smirnov, etc. For the very idea of distinguishing neo- and post-avant-garde in Russian literature of the second half of XX we are much obliged to

Christoph Feldhaus, noting that the idea of the German researcher was not justified in detail, and what's more, in the meaning close to our study, the concept of "neo-avant-garde" is found in the works of Sergey Birjukov, Valeriy Grechko, Ilja Kujuk and others. Our study also considers the author's conceptualizations of the idea of "the second avant-garde" by the artist and poet Michail Grobman, "meta-historical avant-garde" – by the poet Sergei Birjukov, "the third literature" – Ry Nikonova and Serge Segay, etc.

The methodological basis of our study was the works on the analysis of the literary process by the representatives of the Russian formalist school of literary criticism (primarily Yury Tynyanov and Viktor Shklovsky, who were especially sensitive to the contemporary literary process of the time), by the representative of the Leningrad semiological school Igor Smirnov and his concept of literary inheritance and the evolution of artistic systems, we also took into account the developments of the modern followers of the literary-sociological approach of Pierre Bourdieu Evgenia Vorobyeva (Vezhlian) and Ilya Kukulin. We also found the following concepts of utmost importance for our study: the concept of reflective and restorative nostalgia by Svetlana Boym, which allows describing the specifics of the attitude of neo-avant-gardists to the previous tradition; conceptual works dedicated to the "constrained literature" by Tatiana Bonch-Osmolovskaya and Alexander Bubnov; the concept of distinguishing between "semantic" vs. "syntactic" and "pragmatic" lines in neo-avant-garde by Valery Grechko, the concept of heteromorphic and udeteronic forms in poetry by Yuri Orlitsky.

Finally, one of the key research contexts for our work was created by studies of uncensored literature and samizdat of the Soviet era – by Ilya Kukulin, Vladislav Kulakov, Stanislav Savitsky, Josephine von Zitzewitz; studies of the works of specific authors and neo-avant-garde groups by Mikhail Aizenberg, Yulia Valieva, Charlotte Greve, Danila Davydov, Lyudmila Zubova, Galina Zykova, Dennis Ioffe, Pyotr Kazarnovsky, Ilja Kujuk, Tim Klähn, Massimo Maurizio, Ainsley Morse, Yuri Orlitsky, Elena Penskaya, Daria Sukhovey, Pavel Uspensky,

Sabine Hänsgen, Henrike Schmidt and a number of other scholars and literary critics.

The analysis of the works dedicated both to uncensored literature in general and to the traditions of the historical avant-garde in it led us to the conclusion that despite the impressive amount of work already done and planned for the future, in both Russian literary criticism and world Slavic studies there are no detailed monographic studies which would conceptually justify the existence of Russian neo-avant-garde poetry, which would describe both genetic connections and typological convergence of individual poetics of a number of authors who obviously belong to the same artistic system, explaining them by their common historical, cultural and literary prerequisites, by a common field of creative inheritance and context, a common artistic agenda and by awareness of the processes in contemporary world poetry of their time. The absence of a strict research optics and terminological framework was blurring the idea of the place of a number of authors significant for Russian literature of the second half of the XX century in the literary process of that time and did not allow to realize the significance of their contribution and the reasons for skepticism towards some of them from representatives of other poetic movements of uncensored literature.

The scientific and practical impact of the study lies in the fact that its results can be taken into account in the development of modern training courses on the history of Russian literature of XX century, underground literature, avant-garde literature, the modern literary process, etc. Introduction to scientific circulation of the new literary materials and creative concepts of the authors open new ways of research for other scientists. Moreover, the avant-garde forms of literary creativity (which have already been demonstrated by the educational projects of the German “concretists” and the popularity of popular science publications by A. Kondratov, S. Birjukov, A. Bubnov and others) have great potential for their use in the educational process, introducing the younger generation to reading and creative writing.

Approbation

The scientific results obtained during the work on the study were reported at international and domestic Russian philological conferences, such as:

International conference “Nepodtsenzurnaya i “legal’naya” literatura v Rossii XX veka: formy vzaimodejstviya”, Moscow Humanitarian Pedagogical Institute, Moscow, March 17 2012.

International conference “Sapgirovskiye chteniya”, Russian State Humanitarian University, Moscow 2013, 2015, 2017, 2018, 2020, 2022.

XLIII International Philological Conference, Saint-Petersburg State University, Saint-Petersburg, March 11-16, 2014.

International conference “Istoriya russkoy nepodtsenzurnoj literatury: odinochki, soobshchestva, vyrabotka novykh form i kanonov”. Moscow Pedagogical State University, Moscow, March 22, 2014.

International conference “Strategii institutsional’nogo stroitel’sтва v poslestalinskom SSSR. (1953-1968)”, The Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, June 25-27, 2015.

XX all-Russian conference “Fenomen zaglaviya”, Gorky Institute of World Literature, Moscow, April 1-2, 2016.

International conference “Subjekt und Liminalität in der Gegenwartsliteratur (Lyrik, Prosa, Drama)“. Universität Trier, Germany, July 6-10, 2017.

International conference “Russkaya nepodtsenzurnaya literature XX veka: individual’nyye praktiki, soobshchestva, institutsii”. HSE University, Moscow. March 31 – April 1, 2017.

International conference “Kitay v noveyshey poezii (Rossiya, Yevropa, Amerika)”. Russian State Humanitarian University, Gorky Institute of World Literature, December 4-5, 2017.

AATSEEL Annual Conference, Washington, DC., February 1-4, 2018.

International conference “Lyrik und Erkenntnis: Methodische und praktische Überlegungen aus lyrikologischer und philosophischer Sicht“. Universität Trier, Germany. February 2018 – March 3, 2018.

International MAG Convention „The Image of the Self“. Ukrainian Catholic University, Lviv, June 27-29, 2018.

„Produktion, Dokumentation, Intervention. Bedingungen des Werks in der inoffiziellen sowjetischen Literatur der 1960er-1980er Jahre. / Prigovskie Čtenija/Приговские чтения“. LMU München, Germany November 8-10, 2018.

International conference “Symbolarium kul'tury: simvolicheskiye universalii i ikonicheskiye znaki” RUDN University, Moscow. December 14, 2018.

International conference „Ähnlichkeit als Strukturkategorie der Lyrik. Perspektiven für die interkulturelle und komparatistische Literaturwissenschaft“. Universität Trier, Germany. May 1-5, 2019.

Deutscher Slavistentag Universität Trier, Germany, September 24-26, 2019.

Interuniversity conference “Opyty chteniya – 2019”. HSE University, Nizhny Novgorod. April 26, 2019.

International conference “Poetika I poetologiya yazykovykh poiskov v nepodtsenzurnoy I sovremennoy poezii” HSE University, Moscow. May 17-19, 2019.

International conference “Moskovskiy kontseptualizm”. University of Belgrade, Serbia. October 25-27, 2019.

International conference “Teorii I praktiki literaturnogo masterstva”, HSE University, Moscow, September 18-19, 2020.

International conference “(Counter-)Archive: Memorial Practices of the Soviet Underground” Technische Universität, Dresden, Germany. October 13-16, 2020.

International conference “Substandart v rusском yazyke: kommunikatsiya I literature”, HSE University, Moscow. November 13-14, 2020.

International conference “Vavilonskaya bashnya poezii: Pamyati Konstantina Kuz'minskogo”. Russian State Humanitarian University, Saint-

Petersburg State University, Anna Akhmatova Literary and Memorial Museum, Andrey Bely Center (Saint-Petersburg), November 2-6, 2021.

International conference “Gedonizm v russkoy kul'ture XVIII-XX vv.: pro et contra”. Faculty of Liberal Arts and Sciences of Saint-Petersburg State University. March 5-6, 2022.

International conference “Ot andergraunda do aktsionizma: Russkiy kontekst”. University of Belgrade, Serbia. September 28 – October 2, 2022.

The structure of our study is set in accordance with the task of gradually introducing the reader to the world of the literary neo-avant-garde, separating it along the way from other artistic systems, perhaps better known and even more respectable, both along the line of synchrony and on the diachronic axis.

Content of the study

The **Introduction** formulates the goals and objectives of the study, the provisions submitted for defense, substantiates the relevance of the study and its novelty, theoretical and practical significance, describes the methodological foundations of the study.

The work consists of four chapters, each of which includes in turn into paragraphs.

The first chapter “Avant-garde – Neo-avant-garde – Post-avant-garde” is not only historical and literary but also partly theoretical and literary in nature.

The first paragraph of the first chapter “Uncensored Literature and the Historical Avant-garde” explains why it was in the culture of the underground where a keen interest in the “historical avant-garde” appeared – and how Russian futurism became a precedent for most Russian-speaking authors and literary groups who chose a line of succession in relation to the art of the first third of XX century in its avant-garde component. Special attention is paid here to the so-called

“Grand Style” of Soviet culture – socialist realism: critically examining the well-known concept of the avant-garde’s responsibility for establishing the Grand Style in a number of countries, we do not deny certain links that exist between them, far from being only genetic ones. Thus, the establishment of socialist realism as a unified method of Soviet literature and art in the early 1930s led, on the one hand, to the official curtailment of the avant-garde project (although, as we now understand, it continued in the work of a number of its representatives – mainly in clandestine literature, for example, in the works of OBERIU, and was also attractive to a number of representatives of the younger generation of the late 1930s–1940s – it is enough to mention “nebyvalisty”). But on the other hand, the prohibition of “avant-garde” served as an additional incentive for the revival of the interest in it in the second half of the XX century. The paragraph concludes with a review of some literary groups and figures which positioned themselves as “neo-futurists” or were identified as such in scientific studies. Proposing to distinguish between “neo-futurism” as a self-name and as a research concept, we raise the question of whether the work with the futuristic heritage alone always gives grounds to consider the adherents of such work as (neo-)avant-gardists.

In the second paragraph of the first chapter “Neo-avant-garde in Russian-language Poetry of the Second Half of the XX Century” we narrow the research field keeping only those authors or literary groups for whom the term “neo-avant-garde” remains relevant if we introduce several additional parameters in the description of their programs and creative practices. These are both time and spatial frameworks (open to the present day and existence outside of the metropolis) and taking into account the literary conjuncture (first of all, its existence in a non-censored literary field, which relieves the author of the task of measuring their aesthetic radicalism with the officially permissible framework), and also a number of other aspects, the key one of which being, as we see it, an orientation towards a radical creative experiment and renewal of the language of poetry inherited from the historical avant-garde and conflicting with the conventions of not only the official but also unofficial literary circles. Moreover, it

primarily relates to challenging not ideological or ethical conventions (to which the neo-avant-garde, unlike its historical predecessor, is usually more or less indifferent) but aesthetic ones, to turning a radical shift in the field of artistic forms and techniques into the main content of a creative work, which – in contrast primarily to the left-wing movements of the historical avant-garde with their political utopianism – confines it mainly in the sphere of the aesthetic.

The second chapter “Poets of the Neo-avant-garde” consists of three paragraphs devoted respectively to the poet of the Leningrad “philological school” Alexander Kondratov, the Ural-Yeysk “transfurist” poets Ry Nikonova and Serge Segay, and also a prominent figure first in Leningrad and then in American literary underground Konstantin K. Kuzminsky. All four poets are united not only by consistent work with the avant-garde heritage – both at the level of creative practices and (with the exception of the first of them) its active collection, studying and popularization. Their common feature is the exceptional productivity of original creative work and the well-known utopianism – bordering on megalomania – of their “total” projects. For Kondratov, such a project was the not fully fulfilled idea of a large-scale 12-volume collected works, which he described in the program text “My Trinities”. Parts of the collection not only exceed the limits of all three major types of literature (epic, lyrical and dramatic) but also the entire paradigm of genre forms and techniques, both those that existed in the literature of various cultures and periods (first of all, in the avant-garde or actualized by the avant-garde) and those invented by the author across the entire spectrum of his creative searches – from their ultimate minimization to their ultimately increasing complexity within the framework of the so-called “combinatory” poetry. The goal of the project was, as one might assume, to develop an algorithm that would allow transferring the task of generating any art form – from traditional to the most avant-garde – to cybernetic machines, thus abolishing – “nullifying” the creative subject. The project of the “transfurists” was similar: on the page of the Transponance magazine, which they published, (as well

as in numerous handmade and then printed books) Serge Segay was collecting the heritage of the historical avant-garde (sometimes exposing it to “transposition” – creative destruction that was a part of the “rewriting” strategy), and Ry Nikonova was developing a grandiose “system” of artistic techniques, presented both in theory and in practical implementation. This implementation was carried out not only by the transfurists themselves but also by a wide range of authors who were “recruited” to become the authors of the magazine – and thus into “trans-poets”. Thus, trans-poets simultaneously from two sides – both synchronically and diachronically – were solving the problem of synthesizing the entire heritage of the historical avant-garde, including the potential one that was not revealed due to being artificially interrupted, and in fact, taking on the mission of finishing it. Finally, Konstantin Kuzminsky also implemented a characteristic of the neo-avant-garde systematic approach – and archiving approach to the artistic heritage of the historical avant-garde, not so much developing his own individual style but trying to use the entire paradigm of artistic forms and techniques from its arsenal in his work. Therefore, at one pole of his work one can see experiments in the field of transrational (zaum) poetry and the ultimate minimization of artistic forms – up to the so-called “zero” texts, while at the other – the experience of creating “metatexts” – metagenral, metatextual, and metamedial. He took the same approach expanding the thematic range of his work and consistently violating corporate and general ethical taboos existing in literary circles, which brought him fame as a well-known provocateur and epateur. The quintessence of this approach was the 9-volume author’s “anthology” of unofficial poetry “By the Blue Lagoon” (1980-1986), in which an impressive selection of names and titles, facts and events of the unofficial literary environment, mostly unknown outside of the artistic underground, is passed through a selecting, systematizing and stratifying them subjective consciousness of the author-compiler.

The third chapter “Near the Neo-avant-garde” is devoted to the analysis of the works of authors who can only partly be considered in a neo-avant-garde

context – owing to the interventions they made in the field of radical artistic experiment, while otherwise adhering to a more moderate artistic program. Two paragraphs of this part are devoted, respectively, to two key figures of the so-called “Lianozovo school” – Vsevolod Nekrasov and Genrikh Sapgir. The work of the former is considered in the border zone between three major literary phenomena, with which he entered into a creative dialogue without dissolving in them. Starting from the legacy of the “historical avant-garde”, Nekrasov proposed his own version of poetic “concretism”, while in many searches he coincided with the authors of the German-language “concrete poetry” as the largest phenomenon of the Western neo-avant-garde, rather than being influenced by it. In addition, in his work, Nekrasov anticipated a number of methods of poetic conceptualism, agreeing to the role of its founder but not a typical representative, and in the end entering into a fundamental polemic with it. As for Genrikh Sapgir, he had a similar to the neo-avant-garde’s focus on the systematic development of a specific artistic technique, as well as the wide range and variety of forms – from the most traditional and classical – to radically experimental, for example – presented on the pages of the Transpance magazine, with which he was invited to collaborate by its publishers.

The fourth chapter “Neo-avant-garde of the Post-Soviet Era” consists of two paragraphs, which are dedicated to two contemporary poets from a whole group of authors, one way or another developing their work within the framework of the neo-avant-garde paradigm – Sergey Birjukov and German Lukomnikov. Both poets began their work at the stage of legalization of avant-garde literature, being genetically related to it; both give the widest possible range of artistic forms – leaning towards the acoustic, “zvucharnaya” form, as well as the performative one (but paying tribute to visual poetry and other forms of poetic transgression). The concept of “meta-historical avant-garde” developed by Birjukov (which is essentially a neo-avant-garde concept) abolishes the idea of the progressive development of art: avant-garde “spatialization” (giving the properties of space to

time) in the “meta-historical avant-garde” acquires the features of a kind of “museification” – the transformation of the entire avant-garde heritage into a “museum” or “art gallery” with many halls, filling which with the legacy of avant-gardists and “proto-avant-gardists” Sergei Birjukov is engaged with as a researcher and publisher, with the work of his contemporaries – as a critic and organizer of literary life, with his own poetic practices – as a poet-experimenter. As for German Lukomnikov, at first glance, it is difficult to classify him as a representative of a specific movement in contemporary poetry: with the same number of reservations, he can be classified as the author of “adult” and “children’s” poetry, both features of minimalism, conceptualism can be found in his work – and features contradicting it, the constrained poetry, and many more. At the same time, Lukomnikov devotes a lot of effort to collecting and presenting little-known or completely forgotten names of authors close to him. The neo-avant-garde scope distinguishes his project “Online “Collected Works...”” – which is not just a body of the author’s works, but a special collection of texts, some of which do not belong to the author himself but were appropriated by him through the strategy of creative appropriation developed by him – “plagi-art”. For a number of texts that appeared situationally or existed only in oral form or in the private communication of their authors, such appropriation becomes a way to preserve them, and as a result, a corpus of texts of a very different generic, genre origin, different etiology and genesis acquires a hybrid nature, simultaneously being the author’s collection of works, his diary – and an archive of uncensored and contemporary culture.

Without a doubt, the work of a number of authors remained outside the scope of our study, even though they can be safely attributed to the neo-avant-garde paradigm – at least in some of their artistic manifestations. We can rank among them the Russian- and German-speaking author of sonorous and visual poetry, the “scribentist” Valeri Scherstjanoi, the “zaum” poet Gleb Tsvel; the poet who develops the “polyphonosemantics” Alexander Gornon; the polyglot author of “introxianalingvas” and “linguo-tapestries” Willy Melnikov, and a number of other authors. In addition, authentic neo-avant-garde interventions in the field of radical

experiments with language and forms of poetry can be found in the work of generally more “moderate” authors – the “helenukt” Vladimir Erl (see his neo-avant-garde “Book of King” 1965-1967), the “trans-poets” Boris Constrictor and A. Nik, the poets of the next generation – Konstantin Kedrov, Sveta Litvak, Pavel Mityushev and many others. Finally, a separate topic is the experiments of post-avant-garde poets, first of all, the conceptualists Dmitry A. Prigov, Lev Rubinstein, Andrei Monastyrski, Konstantin Zvezdochetov, and others: deconstructing the very neo-avant-garde orientation towards achieving fundamental novelty in formal searches, they achieved results that are recognized, for example, by transfurists as close to their own searches, thereby really replenishing the arsenal of avant-garde poetic forms and techniques.

The **conclusion** presents the main results of the study, in which we come to the following conclusions:

1. The study of neo-avant-garde poetry allows not only to fill the gap between the poetry of the historical avant-garde and contemporary poetry but also to better understand the mechanisms of literary evolution, the influence of both literary and non-literary factors on it (which was the existence in the underground and/or emigration for most neo-avant-garde artists), to expand modern ideas on what is available to verbal art, including in interaction with other types of art, in terms of the arsenal of artistic means and forms.

2. Although the existence of the “historical avant-garde”, as well as the “post-avant-garde” (as a kind of radical branch of Russian postmodernism), is not in doubt even among those who are critical of them as significant artistic phenomena, the literary neo-avant-garde in the Russian-language artistic space is insufficiently reflected upon as an independent aesthetic phenomenon. On the one hand, it is assessed as an entirely secondary, epigone and imitative phenomenon: both within the framework of the avant-garde concept of “fundamental novelty” and in the context of post-avant-garde criticism of any discourse that claims to be authoritative and innovative, it is transferred to the category of a secondary artistic

phenomenon, literary “craft” (D.A. Prigov), and therefore is supposedly unworthy of a separate conversation.

On the other hand, the natural desire not to multiply entities allows most researchers to define any appeal to the heritage of the avant-garde – starting from the use of certain forms and techniques that have a reputation as “avant-garde” or “experimental” to belonging to the circle of certain authors – as “avant-garde”, “avant-gardism”. This often leads to grouping together the authors who only belong to the same time or even circle, but at the same time had fundamentally different aesthetic programs and attitudes: A. Voznesensky, G. Aygi, G. Sapgir, D.A. Prigov, K. Kedrov and many others.

3. It is possible to speak about specific authors belonging to the neo-avant-garde art system – either with the main body of their work or a part of it in which the authors enter certain “territories” – only if their work:

- consciously inherits creative attitudes and practices of the historical avant-garde;
- is polemical in relation to other artistic systems built on other models of artistic continuity and based on other principles;
- is typologically (and in some ways genetically) related to contemporary neo-avant-garde movements in world poetry;
- precedes, preparing for their appearance, the movements of post-avant-garde (primarily conceptualism), in part – polemically overcoming them, in part trying to appropriate those conceptualist experiences that, deconstructing the very neo-avant-garde setting to achieve fundamental novelty in formal searches, were identified by neo-avant-garde artists as close to their own searches, thereby definitely replenishing the arsenal of avant-garde poetic forms and techniques.

4. We consider the key feature of the neo-avant-garde in poetry to be the crisis of representativeness refracted in it: even if the author does not completely abandon the task of artistically capturing the sociophysical environment, this task recedes before the tasks of representing the form-creating experience of the avant-garde predecessors, as well as their own searches in the field of still insufficiently

developed or completely undiscovered techniques and forms. This was the reaction of the neo-avant-garde to the crisis of “grand narratives” and representativeness after the experience of the European totalitarianisms of both world wars. Neo-avant-garde is a kind of “aesthetic” (P. Bürger) project that seeks sanctuary in the space of aesthetic searches both from being biased by any ideology and from commodification by the emerging art market, and concerned primarily with questions of renewing the language of art, rather than non-aesthetic reality.

5. Neo-avant-garde searches, in contrast to the “raids” of the historical avant-garde, are systematic and even systemic in their nature, including both collection and display of existing achievements and discovery of gaps that have not yet been filled and filling which turns out to be the key mission of neo-avant-garde figures. This is the source of its retrospective nature that conflicts with the prospectiveness of the historical avant-garde, which not only looks to the future but sometimes already feels itself to have overcome the unidirectional vectority of time in it.

6. The task of the neo-avant-garde to continue and complete the avant-garde tradition itself – causes particular concern of its authors with the problem of the boundaries of the aesthetic: they try, as mentioned above, not to cross them where they might enter the territory of ideology, especially in the areas of social and political problems. Both loyalist and human rights advocacy engagements are alien to them, while the aesthetic radicalism of the search reliably protects both from chances of official publications and from trying again, as in 1917, to put their radicalism at the service of the political agenda: this is prevented by the well-known hermeticism of the neo-avant-garde, its focus on purely aesthetic tasks.

7. At the same time, neo-avant-gardists are actively testing the boundaries of poetry in several aspects at once. One of these areas is where poetry enters the field of interaction with related art forms – visual (visual poetry is born at the nexus between them), auditory (auditory or sound poetry), performative-theatrical (performative poetry); recently there has been an increase of experiments in using the capabilities of the computer and media, and this is where the neo-avant-garde

can afford the most radical experiments, performing the function of aesthetic avant-garde on new paths of artistry. Neo-avant-gardists are also interested in the boundaries between art and other spheres of human culture and knowledge: linguistics, semiotics, mathematics, natural sciences, cybernetics, etc., but even in this regard they are more interested in the means of expression found in the languages of these disciplines, rather than in unfolding of cultural or scientific problematics in a specific poetic discourse.

8. The neo-avant-garde is striving in its search for two limits of aesthetic search: at one pole – to the limit of the minimalization of the artistic form, which inevitably comes to the “zero of form”, to the complete disappearance of the main text and its replacement with paratext (which opens up prospects for post-avant-garde with its interest in concepts of works of art instead of the works themselves); at the other pole – to an equally extreme complexity of the artistic form and applying to it additional – beyond the usual conventional restrictions (the so-called “constrained poetry”). And when the form undergoes a consistent radical destruction – up to its own annihilation, and when, on the contrary, it becomes radically more complicated, all this turns out to be an artistic experience of defining the boundaries of poetry (and art in general), beyond which it either nullifies or turns into a kind of “Kunststück” at the very limits of the aesthetic, and the neo-avant-garde unfolds a broad paradigm of this kind of “ultimate” texts – both “zero” and “combinatorial” ones.

9. Any of the techniques or artistic forms known within the historical avant-garde (or peeped/picked up by it from its predecessors) are developed by neo-avant-garde artists on a systematic basis, whether they are experiments in transrational poetry (“zaum”), aleatoric (“naobumnaya”), macaronic or polylingual, and many others.

This systematic approach receives its interpretation in their program texts – both polemically directed against the approaches and tools of academic science and claiming to be systematic, inclusive and verified in creative practices: their own or

of other authors. Therefore, many of the authors of the neo-avant-garde are not limited to the role of practitioners – they simultaneously act as theorists of the modern avant-garde, collectors, researchers and publishers of the historical and “meta-historical” avant-garde, critics of the current literary process, in which they defend the right to have their own place and recognition, and finally, systematizers and popularizers of avant-garde art, giving lectures, organizing festivals, publishing anthologies and chrestomathies, releasing many, mostly small-circulation publications, addressed not only to initiates but also to future neophytes avant-garde neophytes.

10. The poetic subject of the neo-avant-garde, unlike the one of post-avant-garde, is not problematized as entirely absent or split: the apsychoicism characteristic of the avant-garde, nevertheless, leaves room for the establishment of the figure of the avant-garde creator as one in whose work, like rays in a prism, various avant-garde traditions and trends are collected to be refracted and thereby to be beamed into eternity. That is the author of a “total project” that collects and systematizes examples of works of all three types of literature, the broadest paradigm – from, sometimes, quite traditional to radically experimental, from extremely ruined to built on combinatorial super-constraints, from lyrically confessional – to subjectless and completely “zaumic”, from verbal – to visual, auditory, performative and many others. All anthologies, “systems” and periodizations in the neo-avant-garde are essentially subjective and subjectivist. Understanding the neo-avant-garde as “meta-historical avant-garde” allows such a subject to build a complex system of defense against accusations of the secondary nature of their work: the very montage nature of methods and forms already known in the history of the avant-garde (especially known only to narrow specialists) carries an element of novelty and artistic innovation, reinforced by the status of the neo-avant-garde author as a collector-archivist and researcher-popularizer. Thus, the close connection of neo-avant-garde figures (especially in recent decades) with the scientific environment, the combination of creative and scientific activities

blurs the boundaries between artistic creativity and scientific research, artistic and scientific experimentation.

The heterochrony of cultural processes as a distinctive feature of today's world allows various art systems to coexist quite conflict-free, both innovative systems and those aimed at keeping a particular tradition unchanged, while creating the necessary reading and publishing infrastructure around itself (publications, awards, festivals, etc.). Born in the post-war period, the poetic neo-avant-garde has survived to this day, entering into complex relationships (often polemical) with other artistic systems of contemporary literature, with one edge undoubtedly present in the subfield that can be called "professional" (even despite this concept being largely problematized), with the other – in the subfield of "amateur" poetry (first of all, uniting a certain number of adherents of the constrained poetry, who do not aim to participate in literary life and have turned their practices of poetic combinatorics into a kind of hobby). But it is obvious that the most powerful impetus given by the historical avant-garde to Russian and world culture still energizes not only the fine arts or theater but is also felt in contemporary poetry, giving birth to a number of most interesting both neo- and post-avant-garde creative practices. The study of these practices, as well as literary and sociological examination of many literary groups, communities, and institutions, generated by the neo-avant-garde will allow in the future to better understand both the scale of this phenomenon and the significance of its contribution to the history of Russian poetry and culture in general.

Author's publications

The main content of the study is reflected in the following publications:

Articles published in high profiled journals recommended by HSE-

University

1. Pavlovets M. G. Na granitsakh tvorcheskoy svobody. Konferentsiya "Filologicheskie traditsii v sovremennom literaturnom i lingvisticheskom obrazovanii", sektsiya "Nepodtsenzurnaya i "legal'naya literatury v Rossii XX veka: formy vzaimodeystviya" (MGPI, 17 marta 2012 g.) // Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie. 2013. № 119 (1). С.426–433. Scopus Q3
2. Pavlovets M. G. «Konkretsii» Aleksandra Kondratova kak opyt russkogo konkretizma // Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya 9. Filologiya. Vostokovedeniye. Zhurnalistika. 2014. № 4. S. 156–163. Spisok S. Scopus Q2
3. Pavlovets M. G. «Vakuumnyye teksty» Ry Nikonovoy i «sverkhmalyye teksty» v literature // Novoye literaturnoye obozreniye. 2014. № 6 (130). S.289–294. Scopus Q3. spisok B.
4. Pavlovets M. G. Sshivaya grani razryva: Russkaya nepodtsenzurnaya literatura v issledovaniyakh i vospominaniyakh. Konferentsiya «Istoriya russkoy nepodtsenzurnoy literatury: odinoshki. soobshchestva. vyrabotka novykh form i kanonov» (MGPU. 22 marta 2014 g.) // Novoye literaturnoye obozreniye. 2014. № 6 (130). S.398–403. Scopus Q3. spisok B.
5. Pavlovets M. G., Orlitskiy Yu. B. Tri tvorcheskikh lika Aleksandra Kondratova // Russian Literature. 2015. T. LXXVIII. № I/II. S. 1–13. Scopus Q4. spisok A.
6. Pavlovets M. G. "Otpuzyrites iz nulya!": "nulevyye" i "pustotnyye teksty Aleksandra Kondratova. // Russian Literature. 2015. T. LXXVIII. № I/II. S. 15–41. Scopus Q4. spisok A.
7. Pavlovets M. G., Orlitskiy Yu. B. A.M. Kondratov. Izbrannyye proizvedeniya. Podgotovka teksta i kommentarii. // Russian Literature. 2015. T. LXXVIII. № I/II. S. 44–507. Scopus Q4. spisok A.
8. Pavlovets M. G. Apologiya stalinizma v postsovetskikh uchebnikakh literatury // Logos. 2017. № 5 (120). S. 65–86. Scopus Q4. spisok B.

9. Pavlovets M.G., Orlitskiy Yu.B. Nasledniki Khlebnikova: Genrikh Sapgir. Gennadiy Aygi. Aleksandr Kondratov. Sergey Biryukov // Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta. Yazyk i literatura. 2018. T. 15. № 1. S. 94–110. Scopus Q2. Spisok S.
10. Pavlovets M.G. «I vse chto obrazuyet pustotu»: destruktsiya slovesnoy formy v poezii Genrikha Sapgira // Novoye literaturnoye obozreniye. 2018. T. 5. № 153. S. 252–268. Scopus Q2. spisok B.
11. Pavlovets M. The School Canon as a Battlefield: A Baptismal Font without a Child / Per. s rus. // Russian Education and Society. 2018. Vol. 59. P. 555–582. Scopus Q4. spisok C.
12. Pavlovets M. G. Subyektnost v usloviyakh limitatsionnosti formy: opyty predelno malykh form, sluchay Germana Lukomnikova (Bonifatsiya) // Russian Literature. 2019. T. 109-110. S. 137–150. Scopus Q2. spisok A.
13. Pavlovets M.G. «Tematicheskiye knizhechki» Konstantina K. Kuzminskogo kak poeticheskiye knigi neoavangarda // Zbornik Matitse srpske za slavistiku. 2022. № 2 (102). S. 225–237. Scopus. spisok B.
14. Pavlovets M.G. «Tom V. Programmy» Aleksandra Kondratova: na puti k kiberneticheskoy poezii. // Novoye literaturnoye obozreniye. 2023. № 3 (181). Scopus Q3. spisok B. – in print
15. Pavlovets M.G. Russkoyazychnyy poeticheskiy neoavangard 2-y poloviny XX veka: k voprosu o granitsakh primenimosti ponyatiya // Studia Litterarum. 2023. Scopus. spisok B. – in print

Publications in journals, collections of articles, collective monographs, conference proceedings and other publications

1. Pavlovets M.G. «Assotsiativnyye rifmy» Davida Samoylova i traktat Vasiliska Gnedova «Glas o soglase i zloglase» // Uchenyye zapiski Moskovskogo gumanitarnogo pedagogicheskogo instituta. T. II. Moscow: MGPI. 2004. S.202–207.

2. Pavlovets M.G. Russkiy futurizm. // Istoriya russkoy literatury. XX vek. V 2 ch. Ch. 1: uchebnik dlya studentov vuzov. / Pod red. V.V. Agenosova. Moscow: Drofa. 2007. Ch.I. S. 348–375.
3. Pavlovets M.G. K voprosu o nazvanii futuristicheskoy gruppy «Gileya» // Filologicheskiye traditsii v sovremennom literaturnom i lingvisticheskom obrazovanii. Sb. nauch. statey. Vyp. 6. T. 1. Moscow: MGPI. 2007. S. 32–38.
4. Pavlovets M.G. «Pars pro toto»: Mesto «Poemy Kontsa (15)» v strukture knigi Vasiliska Gnedova «Smert iskusstvu» (1913). // Toronto Slavic Quartely. 2009. # 27 (1). URL: <http://www.utoronto.ca/tsq/27/pavlovec27.shtml>
5. Pavlovets M.G. Minimizatsiya teksta kak konstruktivnyy priyem knigi Vasiliska Gnedova «Smert Iskusstvu» (1913) // Filologicheskiye traditsii v sovremennom literaturnom i lingvisticheskom obrazovanii. Sb. nauch. statey. Vyp. 8. Moscow, MGPI. 2009. S.70–77.
6. Pavlovets M.G. «Nulevyeye teksty» v russkoy nepodtsenzurnoy poezii // Filologicheskiye traditsii v sovremennom literaturnom i lingvisticheskom obrazovanii. Sb. nauch. statey. Vyp. 9. Moscow: MGPI. 2010. S.271–278.
7. Pavlovets M.G. Emansipatsiya zaglaviy v knige Dmitriya Dmitriyeva «Poloye Sobraniye Sochineniy» (2002) // Mezhdunarodnaya Internet-konferentsiya. posvyashchennaya 70-tiletiyu professora O.I. Fedotova: «Problemy sovremennoy stikhopoetiki: tvorchestvo. ontologiya. paradigma». 2010. URL: <http://conf.stavsu.ru/conf.asp?ReportId=1306>
8. Pavlovets M.G. «Neofuturizm» v russkoy nepodtsenzurnoy poezii vtoroy poloviny XX veka // Russkaya literatura XVIII–XXI vv. Dialog idey i esteticheskikh kontseptsiy. Diskurs o sovremennosti. / Literatura rosyiska XVIII–XXI w. Literatura rosyiska XVIII–XXI w. Dialog o współczesności. / pod red. O. Głowko I E. Sadzińskiej. Łódź: Primum Verbum. 2010. S.174–184.
9. Pavlovets M.G. Tri «prachechnykh (futurnykh)»: Anna Akhmatova. Aleksey Kruchenykh. Genrikh Sapgir // Totonto Slavic Quarterly: Academic Journal in Slavic Studies. Spring 2011. № 36. P. 105–118.
10. Pavlovets M.G. O stikhotvorenii V. Krivulina «Khlopushchiy Ierusalim»:

literaturovedcheskiy kommentariy k kommentariyu lingvisticheskomu // Filologicheskiye traditsii v sovremennom literaturnom i lingvisticheskom obrazovanii. Sb. nauch. statey. Vyp. 10. T. 2. Moscow: MGPI. 2011. S.82–89.

11. Pavlovets M.G. Literaturnyy andegraund v nauchnom osveshchenii. Konferentsiya «Filologicheskiye traditsii v otechestvennom literaturnom i lingvisticheskom obrazovanii». sektsiya «Nepodtsenzurnaya literatura XX veka (1930–1980 gg.): problemy bytovaniya. poetika i retseptsiya». (MGPI. 12–13 marta 2011 goda) // Novoye literaturnoye obozreniye. 2011. № 111. S. 437–442.

12. Pavlovets M. G. O smysle zaglaviya poemy Genrikha Sapgira «MKKh – mushinyy sled» // Studia rusycystyczne Uniwersytetu Jana Kochanowskiego. Tom 19. Kielce: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jana Kochanowskiego. 2011. C.57–65.

13. Pavlovets M. G. Kanonizatsiya russkogo futurizma v nepodtsenzurnoy poezii 1950–1960-kh godov // Filologicheskiye traditsii v sovremennom literaturnom i lingvisticheskom obrazovanii: Sb. nauch. st. Vyp. 11. V 2 t. Moscow: MGPI. 2012. T.1. S.154–161.

14. Pavlovets M. G. Nekotoryye nablyudeniye nad retseptsiyey «futuristicheskogo pisma» v poezii Lva Loseva // Russkiy Kharbin. zapechatlennyy v slove. Vyp. 6. K 70-letiyu professora V.V. Agenosova: Sbornik nauchnykh rabot. Blagoveshchensk: Amurskiy gos. un-t. 2012. S.96–106.

15. Pavlovets M. G. «Pustotnyye» teksty i refleksiya «pustotnosti» v poezii Lva Loseva // Stikh. Proza. Poetika. Sbornik statey v chest Yu.B. Orlitskogo. New York: Ailuros Publishing 2012. S.258–264.

16. Pavlovets M.G. Funktsii ssylochno-snosochnogo apparata v poezii Lva Loseva // Folia Litteraria Rossica. 2012. № 5. S.142–148.

17. Pavlovets M.G. Funktsiya i obraz ramki v poezii Vs.Nekrasova // Vsevolod Nekrasov: Sayt. [Elektronnyy resurs] – URL: <http://www.vsevolod-nekrasov.ru/O-Nekrasove/Kritika-issledovaniya/Funkciya-i-obraz-ramki-v-poezii-Vs.Nekrasova>

18. Pavlovets M.G. Tvorchestvo Genrikha Sapgira i poeziya konkretizma: ot tipologicheskogo skhozhdeniya k tvorcheskomu osvoyeniyu // Rusistika i komparativistika: Sbornik nauchnykh statey. Vypusk VIII. Vilnyus-Moskva:

Educologija. 2013. C. 79–90.

19. Pavlovets M.G. «Nulevyye» i «pustotnyye» teksty v russkoy poezii: ot «istoricheskogo avangarda» k nepodtsenzurnoy poezii vtoroy poloviny XX veka // Sto let russkogo avangarda: sbornik statey. / red.-sost. M.I. Katunyan. Moscow: NITs «Moskovskaya konservatoriya». 2013. S.375–384.

20. Pavlovets M.G. Sovetskiy byt v poezii Lva Loseva // Poetik des Alltags: Russische Literatur im 18.-21. Jahrhundert / Poetika byta. Russkaya literatura XVIII-XXI vv. / Pod obshch. red.: A. Graf. München: Herbert Utz Verlag. 2014. S. 299-306.

21. Pavlovets M.G. Funktsiya parafrazisa romana F. Dostoyevskogo «Besy» v povesti G Sapgira «Armageddon» // V kn.: Susreti naroda i kultura. Mezhdunarodni tematski zbornik. 2015. S. 147–164.

22. Pavlovets M.G. Shkolnyy kanon kak pole bitvy. Chast pervaya: istoricheskaya rekonstruktsiya. // Neprikosnovenny zapas. Debaty o politike i kulture. 2016. № 2. S. 73–92.

23. Pavlovets M.G. Torzhestvo metoda: stikhotvornaya poetologiya Genrikha Sapgira // V kn.: Podrobnosti slovesnosti: Sbornik statey k yubileyu Lyudmily Vladimirovny Zubovoy. SPb.: Svoye Izdatelstvo. 2016. S. 251–258.

24. Pavlovets M.G. Sovetskaya poeziya v 1926 godu v zerkale anketirovaniya pisateley i chitateley // Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Litteraria Rossica. 2017. № 10. S. 81–90.

25. Pavlovets M.G. «Slovo „poeziya” zdes ni pri chem... my priglashayem chitateley ubeditsya v etom»: Evgeniy Golovin kak «kritik» i propagandist evropeyskogo literaturnogo neoavangarda // Toronto Slavic Quarterly. 2017. № 61. S. 232–249.

26. Pavlovets M.G. «Kod Velimira» i «poeticheskiy kanon» Sergeya Biryukova // V kn.: Russkaya literatura XIX–XXI vekov: metamorfozy smysla: Yubileynnyy sbornik nauchnykh trudov. posvyashchenny N.I. Yakushinu i V.V. Agenosovu. Moscow: IMPE im. A.S. Griboyedova. 2017. S. 182–190.

27. Pavlovets M. G. Naslediye Mayakovskogo vs Khlebnikova v retseptsii avtorov

nepodtsenzurnoy literatury // Vestnik Russkoy Khristianskoy gumanitarnoy akademii. 2017. T.18. Vyp. 1. S. 269–275.

28. Pavlovets M. Deutschsprachiger Konkretismus und russische inoffizielle Literatur // Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie. 2018. Bd. 74. Heft 1. S. 75–112.

29. Pavlovets M.G. Yazyk manifestov neofuturizma // V kn.: «Vakansiya poeta» – 2: materialy dvukh konferentsiy. Voronezh: AO «Voronezhskaya oblastnaya tipografiya». 2020. S. 26–45.

30. Pavlovets M.G. Eksperimentalnaya «metapoetologiya» v poiskakh novykh form sovremennoy russkoyazychnoy poezii // V kn.: Subjekt und Liminalität in der Gegenwartsdichtung. Bd. 8.1.: Grenzen. Schwellen. Liminalität und Subjektivität in der russischen Gegenwartsdichtung / Subyekt i liminalnost v sovremennoy poezii. Tom 8.1: Granitsy. porogi. liminalnost i subyektivnost v sovremennoy russkoyazychnoy poezii T. 8.1: Granitsy. porogi. liminalnost i subyektivnost v sovremennoy russkoyazychnoy poezii. Berlin: Peter Lang. 2020. S. 239–254.

31. Pavlovets M.G. «Moy slovar» Vs. Nekrasova: mezhdou neoavangardistskimi «sistemami» i postavangardistskimi «seriyami» // V kn.: Subjekt und Liminalität in der Gegenwartsdichtung. Bd. 8.1.: Grenzen. Schwellen. Liminalität und Subjektivität in der russischen Gegenwartsdichtung / Subyekt i liminalnost v sovremennoy poezii. Tom 8.1: Granitsy. porogi. liminalnost i subyektivnost v sovremennoy russkoyazychnoy poezii. Berlin: Peter Lang. 2020. S. 363–378.

32. Pavlovets M. Das poetische Subjekt von Sergej Birjukov als Akteur der „meta-historischen Avantgarde“. in: Neuere Lyrik. Interkulturelle und interdisziplinäre Studien: Band 8.2. Subjekt und Liminalität in der Gegenwartsliteratur. Vol. 8.2: Band 2: Schwellenzeit – Gattungstransitionen – Grenzerfahrungen. Sergej Birjukov zum 70. Geburtstag. Berlin: Peter Lang. 2020. P. 167–181.

33. Pavlovets M.G. «Lianozovskaya shkola» i «konkretnaya poeziya» // In: «Lianozovskaya shkola»: mezhdou barachnoy poeziyey i russkim konkretizmom / Sost.: M. G. Pavlovets. G. V. Zykova. V. G. Kulakov. M.: Novoye literaturnoye obozreniye. 2021. S. 32–59.

34. Kulakov V.G. Pavlovets M.G. Lianozovo: Vvedeniye // In: «Lianozovskaya

shkola»: mezhdru barachnoy poeziyey i russkim konkretizmom / Sost.: M.G. Pavlovets. G. V. Zykova. V. G. Kulakov. M.: Novoye literaturnoye obozreniye. 2021. S. 5–15.

35. Pavlovets M.G. «Proto-kontseptualizm» poeta leningradskoy «filologicheskoy shkoly» Aleksandra Kondratova // In: ETO ne moskovskiy kontseptualizm. Filologicheskiy fakultet Belgradskogo universiteta (Sevojno: Grafichar). 2021. S. 134–145.

36. Pavlovets M.G. Antologiya Konstantina Kuzminskogo i Grigoriya Kovaleva «U Goluboy Laguny» kak avtorskiy zhanr // Na beregakh Goluboy Laguny: Konstantin Kuzminskiy i ego Antologiya. Sbornik issledovaniy i materialov. S.-Petersburg – Boston: Academic Studies Press / Bibliorossika. 2022. S. 336–359.

37. Pavlovets M.G. Zhizn kak «konkretnyy teatr»: kheppeningi i performativnaya poeziya Aleksandra Kondratova // V kn.: Leningradskaya nepodtsenzurnaya literatura: istoriya i poetika / Sost.: Yu. B. Orlitskiy. Yu. M. Valiyeva. S.-Petersburg: RUGRAM_Palmira. 2022. S. 68–82.

38. Pavlovets M. The Lianozovo School. in: The Oxford Handbook of Soviet Underground Culture. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2021. Ch. 15. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780197508213.013.39>

39. Pavlovets M.G. «Odnotochechnaya poeziya» v kontekste poezii predelno minimalnykh form // V kn.: Veshchestvo poezii: K 70-letiyu Yuriya Borisovicha Orlitskogo: Sbornik nauchnykh statey. M.: RGGU. 2022. S. 295–304.

40. Pavlovets M.G. Genrikh Sapgir kak poet-transfurst // Vosem velikikh / Otv. red. Yu.B. Orlitskiy. Moscow: RGGU. 2022. S. 414–423.

41. Pavlovets M.G. Russkaya nepodtsenzurnaya poeziya i nemetskoyazychnyy konkretizm: mezhdru tvorcheskoy retseptsiyey i refleksiyyey // Rossiya – Germaniya: literaturnyye vstrechi (posle 1945 goda): Koll. monografiya. / Otv. red.-sost. T.V. Kudryavtseva. A.A. Strelnikova. Moscow: IMLI RAN. 2022. S. 438–467.