Title: Can There Be a Moscow Text of Russian Literature? A New Look at Theory and Praxis
Author: Sidney Dement, University of Kansas

        The Moscow-Tartu School of semiotics extensively codified the "Petersburg Text" of Russian literature in the 1970s and 1980s (in the theoretical works of Iu. M. Lotman, V. N. Toporov, Z. G. Mints, and others), but viewed the existence of a parallel "Moscow Text" with skepticism. Following Toporov's lead, many subsequent critics have also rejected the possibility of an independent, semiotic identity for a Moscow Text of Russian literature, identifying it, when they spoke of it at all, as the "Moscow Text of Russian *culture*." Meanwhile, the Petersburg Text gained wide acceptance, although diminishing theoretical acuity has accompanied its popularity (itself an interesting development).
        This paper asks the questions, "Why have critics assumed that there can be a Petersburg, but not a Moscow, Text of Russian literature? Are they right or wrong?" What factors created the discontinuity between critical readings of the "Moscow Text" and Petersburg Text in the extant scholarship? Are those discontinuities real or imagined? The paper responds to the call for methodological rigor in scholarship of the last decade (in the works of V. M. Markovich, V. Shmid, T. M. Nikolaeva, T. V. Tsivian, and others) by examining the theoretical assumptions that have stood behind the "city text of literature," exploring possible motivations for the denial of a "Moscow Text" of Russian literature based on those assumptions, and evaluating the applicability of the model to the pervasive presence of Muscovite language, themes, and settings in literature.
        An attempt is made to clarify the terminologically and methodologically opaque situation that has developed in the contemporary discourse about city texts in Russian literature, including issues of canonical indeterminacy, terminological obscurity, typological disparity, and general philosophical inconsistency. The results of this investigation suggest that, among the various factors that have shaped existing Petersburg and "Moscow Text" scholarship, the paired concept of *poetika realii* and *poetika tsitat* provides some solutions to these issues. Quotation, broadly defined along the lines of Lotmanian translation, is the foundation for both types of *poetika*. Together they provide a starting point for untangling the complex relation of space and text that initially inspired the identification of the Petersburg Text. Petersburg Text is characterized by dense quotation and self-quotation, and the same type of intertext exists in the "Moscow Text." *Poetika realii* and *poetika tsitat* provide a conceptual basis for viewing the Petersburg and Moscow Texts as typologically equivalent. A more agile language for describing an intertext results in a more flexible ability to read the literary works it generates.
        In the final analysis, the difficulty in defining a Moscow Text of Russian literature hints, not at its non-existence, but at its vast importance. The Moscow Text is a necessary tool for interpreting space in literature, particularly in works of the tumultuous twentieth century; the post 1991 rebuilding of Moscow seems to indicate it will be no less important in the twenty-first. Skalozub would say "*Moskva -- distantsiia ogromnogo razmera*."