

MD
44.788

I. KAMARÁS

FOLLOW ME, READER!

*(Reception, Interpretation and Influence
of Bulgakov's Master and Margareta
in Hungary)*

(Summary)

OSZK

Országos Széchényi Könyvtár

Országos Széchényi Könyvtár
Könyvtártudományi és Módszertani Központ

Budapest, 1985

KAMARÁS István:

F O L L O W M E, Reader!

/Reception, Interpretation and Influence of Bulgakov's Master and Margareta in Hungary/

/Summary/

I. INTRODUCTION

This study is a part of the Centre for Library Science and Methodology researches on reading studied the connection of a reader and literature for ten years.

For many respects Bulgakov's novel offers an excellent opportunity to examine reading experience, the interpretation, the appreciation and the impact of literary works mainly with sociological and psycho-sociological methods. It offers an opportunity to raise questions relative to the reader's consciousness, world view, as well as his philosophical, political, and moral views. This novel is no nauseating test meal. On the contrary. The plot is gripping like that of a thriller. The reader can easily identify himself with many of its characters. It is humorous offering a pleasant entertainment. It is full of information about both the antiquities and recent history. The three subplots merge into one in a cathartic dénouement. Why do we regard the novel unconventional? Because its value view and symbols used are difficult to understand. There are plots and underlying meanings. The reader is expected to be well-versed in many disciplines; philosophy mythology, history and literature. The treatment of time is unusual. The novel is a masterly alloy of farce, transcendancy, irony and realism.

We believe that it is worthwhile examining who and why selects now he reads it, how he interprets and appreciates it. The findings are to enable us to answer several questions.

1. We shall know more of the various reading attitudes, there are simplifying attitudes which over-emphasize certain elements and disregard others; there are genuinely subtle ones - and thereby of the artistic efficiency of the work.
2. We shall examine three types of readers; he who cannot penetrate the work beyond the factual level with the protagonist emotionally, and he who is able to analyze and the synthesize what he reads.
3. We are to come to know more of how the reader attempts to make his job of digestion easier.
4. We shall attempt to find out whether the novel can alter the reader's world view or the deep-seated views he holds defy all influence.
5. We hope to be able to establish the degree to which the reader gets involved and interested. /We assume that, due to differences in social practice, career, experience and system of values, the impact of the novel differs with the readers and group readers./
6. We shall examine how the reader relates this book to his earlier experiences in reading.

We are going to examine the availability and reception of the book in Hungary. Therefore we shall seek answers to the following questions:

1. When and in what editions was the novel published. How many copies have been sold. What about the layout, illustrations, postscripts, etc.
2. We should like to establish the past and present accessibility of the novel in public libraries.
3. How did critics react to the novel in Hungary as well as abroad.
4. How many and what sort of people have read it.
5. We should like to evaluate the reception of the novel.
6. We shall seek an answer to the question; who and why reads it during a given period /the second half of 1978/ among library users, whether they like it or not.

As far as the nature of the issue and our limited resources allow us, we should like to examine the process of the reception and comprehension of the novel.

1. What experience does the reader have before starting to read the novel; what books did he read; what was his attitude toward them, what is his world view like; what system of values does he have.
2. We wish to examine the comprehension of the work while subjects are reading it. /to see the development of interpretation and evaluation/
3. We intend to ask the opinion about the novel of readers who will have completed reading it by the time of the survey and those who read it years before.

The sample will be taken in the first place among the "spontaneous" readers of the novel. For this reason a record will be kept of the readers of novel in the relevant libraries. Some 200 to 300 library users are to represent the entire library using readership of the novel. Groups of twenty people each are to be set up comprising junior and senior manual workers, junior and senior technical intellectuals and professional men in the field of the humanities, university students studying literature and those studying the sciences, librarians and teachers of literature. Another experiment is envisaged with a secondary school class or literary circle. We wish to discuss with them not only issues arising during and after reading the novel, but also some other related problems.

II. WOLAND'S RECEPTION in HUNGARY

Master and Margareta /until 1984/ was issued in Hungary seven times, in 315 thousand copies. In this country it is a bestseller. It was issued in more copies than Roots by Haley /supported by television success/, The Butterfly, Bridge over Kwai, Flowers for Algernoon, Catch 22, In Cold Blood.

In Hungary this novel comes out in 1969 in 5600 copies after two years of the first English, Italian, Norwegian issues. We think the cause of the relatively fast issue although much less copies than expected in the careful culture policy.

Three issues appear in rather fewer copies. In 1975 there is a breakthrough as it is issued in 40 000 copies. In 1978 it comes out in 148 000 copies in the series of Masterpieces of World Literature with the postscript of Pál Fehérek E. He was the one, who reviewed the novel in Népszabadság, the paper of the communist party only three years after the first Hungarian edition. He

set such questions; whether Bulgakov is a Soviet writer, he can be considered a socialist author. Finally he asked readers not to let "suspicious people" possess Bulgakov. He repeats Fagejev's sentence: "Bulgakov did not see everything according to reality; this is not strange, it could have been worse if he told lies."

The novel met a favourable reception in Hungary. Among the plenty of essays there was no refusal, there were some reviews in superlatives however there were only few analyses. The most outstanding of the analyses are the works by László Kisbali and Ilona Kiss. Peter Szente's, Judit Barabás's and Sándor Radnóit's essays can be mentioned as well.

Twenty per cent of the library users who could get the novel without difficulties, read Master and Margareta in 1973, when it was issued only in 40 000 copies in the country. The 40 000 copies and 2-300 000 readers can easily indicate how succesful and fashionable it was at that time and how few copies were issued.

Master and Margareta can be found in every fifth family in Budapest, in every tenth in small towns and in every thirties in small villages. The novel is kept at home by every second intellectual family, by every fifteenth worker family and only by every sixties agricultural worker family.

We are interested in the Hungarian adaptations as well: the radio play made in 1972 and broadcast only in 1976, the drama. We made interviews with fifty people from the audience contrasting the opinions of the readers and the audience.

The reception of the novel in 1973 among public library users: +

	per cent of read- ers	index number of absolute approval	index number of relative approval
among public library users			
women	22	1,02	-0,33
men	20	0,90	-0,45
15-19 years old	17	1,20	-0,01
20-29 years old	26	1,25	+0,07
30-39 years old	21	0,90	-0,36
40-49 years old	22	0,69	-0,53
50-59 years old	20	0,63	-0,55
more than 60 years old	20	0,70	-0,75
agricultural manual workers	18	0,88	-0,42
factory hands	15	0,85	-0,39
skilled workers	22	1,06	-0,16
administrative employees	25	1,03	-0,16
intellectual workers without degrees	28	0,94	-0,24
secondary school students	17	0,75	-0,39
university students	50	1,57	+0,56
teachers and professional			
men in the field of humanities	28	0,87	-0,29
other intellectuals	38	1,31	+0,19
housewives	25	0,61	-0,63
primary school students from 1 to 7	19	0,66	-0,65
students finished primary school	20	0,85	-0,37
students finished secondary school	24	1,01	-0,17
students finished universities or institutes	29	1,04	-0,10

The basic of the index number of absolute approval: liked it very much: +2; liked it: +1; didn't like it: -2. The index number of relative approval intends how the reader appreciates it comparing with other readings, so the index number is either +, or -.

The great deviation in the appreciation of teachers' and students' views was very astonishing for us. Regarding some parts of an other research "Experience shapes" we assume the students are more open to some aesthetic values than teachers. The opinions of the 20-29 years old skilled workers are different from the same aged manual workers but close to intellectual workers.

We can suppose the novel was appreciated differently in the first years and five, six years later. In the first years the well-informed, eager to new books readers got the novel. However, difference are not considerable as the index numbers of approval of the researches in 1973 and 1978 indicate for us. But certainly it cannot mean the same reception in 1970 and in 1980. Since then "the reading historical position of the book changed": several reviews, studies came out, Zsuzsa Koncz, the popular pop-singer sang on Margareta; it was adapted to stage by Károly Kazimir; readers could discuss on it in school lessons, circles, tutorial lessons; it was part of a TV-quiz and a part of a church-oratory. Readers of Hungarian contemporary literature could meet poems offering to Bulgakov or connecting with Master and Margareta.

The position in the "experience shape" of the novel changed during years. As it is set among different experiences than it was ten years before. After ten years old career Woland fascinated his Hungarian readers with his criticism, values, letting readers behave naturally and refuse him as well. How Hungarian readers saw him, how they answered his questions is not the theme of this essay. Our subject is proving: this novel was a stop-gap, filled needs. It was so wide-spread that some expressions as e.g.: hot apricot juice, manuscript resisting fire, pouring out sunflower' became common sayings.

III. INTERPRETATION of MASTER and MARGARETA

According to the principle: interpretation of literary works are determined by concrete meaning structure of those, we cannot accept all the contradictory interpretations. There are a lot of contradictory interpretations among the "120 expert opinions" and the 250 "unprofessional readers' views". In both groups /1 and 2/ we could find several different right interpretations but several misunderstandings as well.

This research doesn't compare interpretations to a one excellent, and latest interpretation. However it doesn't want to lose discovering "readings faithful to the text".

1/ Polemic on the literary form

Among the more than one hundred experts⁺ there were only eleven ones who classified it into one literary form category: four of them regard it a satire, four of them: mennipesa, two of them: parody, two of them: fantastic tale, one: roman á clef /key novel/, one: science fiction. Although such determinations are more typical: polemic parody, mysthical-philosophical novel, ironic opera-buffo, tragic grotesque, mixture of humour and pety, fantastic-realistic-satiric-philosophical novel, satiric-sentimental-romantic-historical-picaresque-magic-occult-methaphysical novel.⁺⁺

⁺ We were able to collect the opinions, interpretations of 25 Hungarian, 21 Soviet, 17 English, American, Canadian, 12 Polish, 8 West-German, 7 Norwegian, 4-4 French, Finnish, 2-2 East-German, Danish, Rumanian-Hungarian, 1-1 Czech, Italian, Yugoslavian literary historians, critics.

Here are the frequency of the definitions of literary forms:

satire	32
fantastic	22
philosophical	20
humorous	11
grotesque	8
roman á clef and allegory	7
parody	3
tragedy	2
surrealist	2
picaresque	2
entertaining	2
symbolical	2

Satire was frequently used by Soviet and English-American, fantastic by German, roman á clef and grotesque by Polish, menipess by Soviet and humorous by English-American experts. It is remarkable that several simolifying interpretations can be found among the ones who regard the novel a satire or partly a satire. Satire or satirical as essential characteristic doesn't occur in the most valuable, acceptable interpretations.

Critical attitude is obvious towards Moscowian life. László Kisbali and Ilona Kiss say rightly: "However, this novel cannot be a satire because a standard system and a steady world concept can be necessary and because satire is counteracted by fear and distress taken place in the novel."

In this novel irony is rather a tone than an attitude; exactly it is a part of an attitude having various levels. It is the pathos supporting values that describes the novel besides the ironical attitude towards reality without ideas.

The presence of irony, either as a tone or as a component of attitude, is not equable in the novel. And in the end it seems to be absorbed by the mixture of idyll and rezignation. Although it is not entirely free from irony for Master's and Margareta's /as values/ saving is no without loss of values.

This novel is considered as a roman á clef by several critics /except the Soviet ones/. If the reader regards Moscow as a city or the City similar to Moscow, in this case the novel can be a roman á clef. And the realistic components can colour and enrich its meaning. Although it is not a roman á clef the novel is full of key elements.

Master and Margareta is not a novel of acquiring knowledge however several parts e.g. biblical story, describing Moscow at that time offer new knowledge for readers.

It is difficult to get an answer; how far is the condition of this reception knowing "cultural patterns." Because readers having no type of knowledge could understand the novel. The main question is: how readers can deal with the cultural inheritance placed in the novel.

Interpretation of the world of the novel may be determined by the readers's world concepts which use literature experience in most cases. These literature experiences can impact on the interpretation of the world of the novel in a lot respects. Readers's world concept determined by either the Bible, Faust, Dostoevsky or Ilf-Petrov. A literary work offering a real experience may occur as a literary form pattern or as a literary pattern. That is the reason why readers search and seek a new Faust story or a Bible paraphrase or an Ilf-Petrov satire in the novel. Such prototypes can be found among Hungarian readers. However, we can meet the impact of fairy tales with its devils, trials; sci-fi; Mario and the Juggler in the interpretations. Literarians often mention Rabelais, Gogol, Le Sage, E.T.A, Hoffmann, Kafka, A. France.

Both several critics and readers suppose this novel is only a pretext for saving treasures of culture: as the Bible, Faust, Jewish, German, masonic mythology, inheritance of Kant, Puskin. More critics e.g. S. Cusumano think the novel is far too rich. According to László Serfőző the novel builds world culture into itself. As to "the total cultural inheritance" we think Sándor Radnóti approach is close to the truth supposing the novel is modern because of its free-tradition choice.

The "main level" or the link is Woland or the Master or sometimes Ivan for the literarians supposing different levels, colours. We think the most successful type regarding the world concept, structure, communicative pattern of the novel is the Yugoslavian M. Jovanovic's type: "The secret mechanism" works in four concentric circles in one of the most complex "secret novels".

The "more novels" concepts draw our attention to insufficiency and shortcomings of the aesthetical values of the novel. Several critics regard the novel less worked. Sándor Radnóti thinks the Pilate story marvellous and perfect, while on the other hand, Moscovian story reminds him the humour of the Soviet paper: Crocodile. O. Mihailov, I. Vinogradov and some others write on a "mathematical formed" novel structure. Peter Szente proves the totality of the novel with its time structure.

In our opinion it is a novel which is very complex comparing linear patterns. Although this complexity is relative. Complex because its subplots join loosely, elements have different places in the composition. Woland's visits are on the focus. Master and Margareta's stories, Ivan's story is an episode /rather separated from Woland's picaresque adventures/. The Jesua - Pilate story is an insert.

The narrative structure of the novel is the cause why readers feel more novels. The narrator changes his personality or his part in an unusual way.

Several ones consider the novel a mystery-play or a mystery-play as well. Agreeing Peter Szente: at first sight it is a mystery-play showing heaven earth, hell indeed. "However, the mystery-play makes a totality outside the stage, makes the audience believe: the hell exists under the earth, the heaven is above the earth according to God's will. The writer of the XXth century has to create the totality inside his novel.

There are some critics comparing the novel to utopias and travelling - novels before the time of Balzac's and Stendhal's classical novels, e.g. Bazzarelli regards it picaresque, S. Cusumano an adventure - novel appearing in the form of satire-buffo. The Finnish Mallinen's approach is interesting for us: as considering the novel a special alteration of the picaresque: it is Woland's carnival's visits in the country of dead souls. /He finds two "living souls": Master and Margareta, and a "resuscitated" soul: Ivan./ According to András Veres Bulgakov uses the basic structure of Dead Souls by Gogol. It has a dominant plot, parabolistic story with a usual solution in the frame of a journey when dead souls become live and lives become dead; that is, readers travelling with Woland can be the witnesses of similar value changes as Chichikov's fellows were.

The narrative pattern of the novel is not a pattern causing events and changes, arranged in casual relations of the acts, not progressive, cumulative but it deepens towards inside. - as László Kisbali and Ilona Kiss pointed in their study. "So an event becomes a meeting-point of the story not a consequence of a previous state." This poetical structure is an expression of a world concept. According to this view connections around individuals don't work, regeneration exists not with the accumulation of value, however, it is the result of the richness of life. A structure valid forever, described by itself, cannot exist in the world of such concept. In a world interacted this way examining attitudes, decisions of acting men we can find out only what happened, although what can be realized doesn't depend on men,

Readers can start in several ways: e.g. with the help of Goethe, Gogol or Heidegger. However, the joining-point of the discourse on this world may be Russian, German tradition, mysticism, manicheism, the Bible, satirical journalism, commedia dell' art or several other joining-points as Sándor Rad-

nóti mentioned. This novel can be read as a "series", a "social", a "psychological", "ontological" an "entertaining", "adventurous", a "humorous" or a "sentimental" novel.

We can say a bit simplifying the problem: Bulgakov's novel is a polyphonical thesis novel comparing with Dostoievsky's novels. Although it doesn't mean Master and Margareta a "concept novel" contrasting with "character novels".

2/ Interpretation of meaning-levels of the novel

Agreeing László Kisbali and Ilona Kiss we find the meaning of the novel in the superposition of the text of the novel. Readers have to change "their receivers" in order to join this discourse. Master and Margareta is not a traditional novel for many respects; deviating from the Tolstoy's traditions, traditions of narrative novels and traditions of "average reading". The modernity of the novel is relative even for an average reader because Gogol's traditions are very well marked in it - as András Veres writes. Mounting of different narrative structures can be new for the majority of readers.

Majority of critics distinguishes three levels, three meaning-levels, three underlying meanings, three poetical forms, three texts. We distinguish five different levels rather simplifying the rich poetical form of the novel.

1. The City, in this case called Moscow
2. Moscowians, not only the representatives of the city, but the outstanding ones as; Master, Margareta, Ivan
3. Master and Margareta's relation, a relation with value increase
4. Master's novel, a value deviating from its circumstances or the material proof of justice
5. Another existence, called either historical or transcendental, the dimension involved Woland and Jesua.

a/ The City

From the novel we can read out the sociography of the City that is the caricature of the sociography: dirty streets, flats without bathrooms, flat-sharings, not fresh bread, paper issue, bureaucracy, big-bourgeois life of some intellectuals, variety, propaganda against religion, oil-stoves and a currency "black market".

All these can bring out a life which represent, in spite of its low standard, customs of consumers's society where the slogan is: "to live pleasantly". The life in the centre of present is described by such value orientation from where such values as community or personality miss.

This kind of picture of society deviates from the usual picture of the twenties, thirties Soviet Union building socialism.

Some parts of critics read out, rather simplifying the problem, utilitarian, consumers', petty bourgeois society, while others bureaucratic society and others criticism of NEP era from the Moscovian text. Several ones feel the novel is only the representation of artisdome. The Soviet I. F. Belza thinks of only "literarian bandits". English and American critics emphasize that Bulgakov's novel wants to describe only an atheist materialist society. Some literarians regard the too controlling, others standardizing the most characteristic of the novel. In these interpretations only the Moscovian text itself is analyzed.

The writer's critical attitude is obvious. However it is not the novel of criticism of Moscow after the revolution as László Kisbali and Ilona Kiss writes. Raw communism /or personal cult/ mentioned by Marx as well is described from antropological respect. An interregnum appears at first sight

seeming to be a madhouse illustrating the decay of traditional world and value loss. In this world men's chances are narrowed down to transient, instead of me-you and me-he relations there are only me-it relations. In this world instead of unstable moving existents there are existents in safe, in their small life or in their egoism. This city divested itself from existence, and existents are pointed out by the power certifying or refusing the existence.

b/ The Moscowians

If Moscow is the first level, Moscowians are the first and the halfth level, because the majority of Moscowians belong to the first level and three of them are out of it. Although Moscowians are puppets, they are not results, victims of Moscow but causers as well, people saboturing historical tasks and themselves. It is Berlioz who rises from Moscowians as a key figure of the novel. Hungarian readers identify him with the victim of dark power. There are no literarians who regard him either a positive figure or a victim. But there are several ones who think Berlioz very intelligent. Is Berlioz intelligent indeed? He seems to know everything, but most likely he knows only parts. E. Mahlow discovers the representative of French atheism in him. We rather think Berlioz a racionalist, scientist, his self-satisfied racionalism can be described by safe-principled. He is the victim of his racionalism.

There is only a slight difference between Ivan and the ones having a certification of "mass literature". His artistic talent overcomes his half-educated atheism and dogmatism. This half-unconscious sensiteveness is a chance for the reception of new values, self-criticism and developing under the influence of Woland and the Master. The majority of literarians regards Ivan not an important part of analyses. However, it is who recognizes the mark /in his agony, hapiness, failure/, lives it winning a chance for an intelligent life.

c/ Master and Margareta

J. Mallinen calls them "living people" irregular ones among "dead souls". Their love story mainly the first part of it may seem a romance or a parody. It is a glaring contrast to the background, a different quality; a me-you relation in the middle of impersonality. The text itself means: two "fragment people" create existence increase, value increase: called love.

There are great differences in judging the Master between experts and simple readers.

Vinogradov and D. G. B Piper thinks him stoic. Several literarians /V. Laksin and A. Skorino/ compares him with the passive Jesua. While others /E. Thompson and H. Ssachno/ think him similar to the active Jesua. According to Anna Fábri the Master is not without actions rather a writer and an evangelizer. In Sándor Radnóti's opinion he is not a genius but a recorder of justice. D. Segal regards him the representative of intellectual values, V. Levin the humanist, I. F Belza the conscious writer. The Master is not the representative of passivity, however he declares the principle: "we have the right to suppose people are good and we have the right to behave in this way." /László Kisbali and Ilona Kiss/.

There are some readers among both critics and "simple" readers as well who think Margareta a demon. And in both groups there are readers considering Margareta as the representative of love. Several of them emphasize womanliness, beauty, the eternal woman, innocence, courage, passionateness as well. More critics regard her the representative of actions contrasting with the Master. Woroszylski and others feel her Faust's relative more than the Master. E. Bezzarelli interprets her the model of hope and the symbol of Margaret.

According to László Kisbali and Ilona Kiss two individual models occur in the two parts of the novel. In the first part there is a reduced individuality /Berlioz is the typical example for it/, in the second part there is an integrated individuality, who from herself, with her actions brings values to

a world strange for her. Margareta, as the first integrated person of the novel is rather similar to Faust than the Master. András Veres is right when he warns us in his study: the Master and the novel is a matter of life and death for Margareta. Margareta's descent to hell is richer in meaning than the trials of folk tales. It is a historical experience for the Satan's ball is the mirror of Moscow. Her descent to hell is penitence and purification: she enters the empire of sin alive and returns alive as well.

d/ The "Pilate-story"

Lots of readers had such an impression having read the Pilate story again, that it was an original work and only for its sake Bulgakov wrote the "frame-novel": The Master and Margareta. Several literarians regard it an "insert novel", e.g. Sándor Radnóti thinks the Pilate story aesthetically outstanding. As for the connection to the Bible literarians's opinions differ. According to A. C Wright it doesn't deviate essentially. E. Bazzarelli feels it the apocryphal variation of the Bible. According to Kalyzynski it is the Marxist variation of the gospel. The English E. Proffer, the Czech E. Olonov think it the revival of a realistic myth. As for the connection to the Bible, P. Kuncwicz is the closest to the truth declaring the Pilate story includes the archetype and its modern realization at the same time.

Those who emphasize the Jesua- Master parallel feel relationship in their passivity or activity. An other group thinks Jesua as the representative and realizer of love, trust, trust deposited in men, charity, morality, forgiveness. Several ones can see the powerless charity in him contrasting with the others who regard him couregeous, active evangelizer.

In the "Jerusalem text" Jesua is no the God, no a revolutioner, no the good Samaritan but a gentle wandering philosopher who preaches the most absurd philosophy: all people are good. He declares that the country of justice arrives. He considers cowardliness as the greatest sin and with his gestures he preaches the dictate of change.

English and American literarians often draw Pilate's figure in their interpretations. One of the groups considers him coward but sensitive, while the others think him as the representative and attender of the power. A. C. Wright adds; Pilate hates his role. The Italian Bazzarelli regards him a victim, a man destroyed by the power. The Soviet literarians /A. Skorino, I. F. Utahin/ thinks Pilate the man of actions - contrasting with the Master and similar to Margareta - for the tries to recompense his sin with having Judas killed. E. Proffer directs our attention to the fact: the "procurator" world can be read 82 times in the novel. It means Pilate is equal to his job. Although he causes Jesua's death directly, but the main problem is: he creates a God from his supervisor. /However, he suffers from him at the same time./ Beside cowardliness his political reason contributed to Jesua's crucifixion.

e/ The fifth dimension

Moscowians /or as V. Woroszylski writes: "the collective Pilate"/ are opposed not with Jesua but with the Satan that is with the measure: they are weighed in the scales and found wanting. Woland is not a traditional Satan; not an evil tempter, not an evil soul annoying at good, not a philosopher-Lucifer quarelling with the God. /Hungarian readers know this type very well from their readings./ In this novel not the heaven and the hell struggles for the earth with earth powers and earth fans as in the mystery plays. In this novel the earth is in the deep, not the hell; devilish things happen on the earth which are measured from the "height". In this world concept the Satan is the part of upper power but not only the darker part as his role is rather similar to the God than the devil. Woland doesn't judge only appears as an unusual challenge for Moscowians who became rigid in their everyday lives, customs.

Woland's most important means are the irony and the play sometimes with easier sometimes with a cruel form. These "devilish means" are the values missing from the Moscowians' scale of values. They are not happy only amus. László Kisbali and Ilona Kiss: "Woland shows his face not for proving devils exist,

but for demonstrating how humorous the reduced individuality is who behaves like a logos certifying his existence and doubling the world."

Not only critics but readers as well think Woland and his company use Stalinist methods. We feel Woland mislead them. Woroszyński is right: "Wolands resort to the complusory demagogy according to the aethical code of the society measured by them. Their destructive activity respects the norms accepted by the destructive society. The devilish tricks consist of filling the social norms with practices."

f/ The final conclusion

The end of the open novel cannot be understood without reading all the texts of the novel. Mária Kálmán simplifying the rich meaning of the novel when she writes: "Jesua, the moralist can forgive Pilate, but Satan, the materialist cannot. The Master learns the dialects not from Jesua: he turns from lights to shade consciously in the end of the novel." We think: the resort of suffering people become the cherry garden, the peace of Chekhov instead of the Paradise. All are arranged, readers can feel tranquility and restlessness: for it seems everything remained unchanged in the City. /reminding Moscow/ Its citizens did not change: they fall to their bottoms instead of chatarsis, then get on their feet, then seek and find a scapegoat. They give up their evil only because of their fearing, their own rest. /just for a time as we can get to know from the epilogue./ Only the unique good Ivan can bear witness to deepness and secrets of the world becoming clearly again for the others as well. Ivan's certainty and restlessness is readers' certainty and restlessness as well. For in the system all are arranged: light and nothing, tranquility and agony.

IV. THE PROCESS of READING

A new text mobilizes stereotypes putting cuirass with them a reader can feel brave enough himself to venture in the labyrinth of the unknown novel seeming well-known, however this cuirass can obstruct his movements so the condition of his progress may depend on throwing off these mobilized stereotypes or another parallel, whether he is able to change his reading strategy.

A/ First impressions and their further way /Examining the first chapter of the novel./

We don't have to emphasize how important the first words, first sentences, first paragraphs, characters appearing first, the title of the first chapter are in the literary works not only reproducing but varying, renewing the rules of the game. It can be decisive, using Gadamer's and Jauss's expression, how "the accepting horizont" comes out during reading the first pages, how readers are able to adapt themselves to the novel.

Certainly all readers want to overcome the situation, want to feel themselves safety. Lots of things, almost everything can be decided by reading the first chapter.

When studying the reception of Master and Margareta in Hungary we examined what happened during reading the first chapter we chose a rather risky method. We read the first chapter of the novel for those not having read it before. We stopped reading fifty times in order to register readers's first reactions and their variations getting answers from difficult questions. We chose 117 readers to represent different experience, different scales of value, different literacy and different taste.

1/ The text [the first chapter/

There is a part in the beginning of the novel which is extremely important and almost everything can be found out from it. The fact - that in the "Beer, mineral water" stall there is no beer, and no mineral water inspite of sweltering heat, but there is only apricot juice smelling as a hairdresser's - is able to proclaim a lot of things about the City called Moscow. Readers can feel how far such certainty as "beer, mineral water" can be changed the facts seeming irrefutable are effective. The "beer and mineral water stall" is an excellent example, symbol of a society with defects and value losings.

Culture and mythology, religion is a world concept for Bulgakov. Berlioz declares self-confidently its invalidity; however his atheism has no a constant point and his atheism misses values as well. As Kisbali says: "According to Berlioz something can take a part in our life if we are able to put in the relations examined and guaranteed by reality."

So Berlioz's comprehensive knowledge means he has only knowledge of those can be put in the rationalistic frame. Berlioz tries to prove: the problem is not whether Jesus good or bad, but we have to show up; Jesus as a person has never lived. Berlioz, who the aethical relation is missing from, can imagine Jesus as a strange object in the historical relation. "Christians have discovered nothing." This announcement is not the thesis of comparative religion education, however, it is an undervaluing of the tradition. Instead of it there is a vacuum in Moscow and for a short time it is safe and comfortable for Berlioz and the ones similar to him.

The greatest question seems to be the mortality. We think agreeing László Kisbali the question is; what mortality means for people. They are also right in the problem: Berlioz is not able to have a personal only a political attitude to his own death. His way of thinking is orientated by the Komsomol-intervention contrast.

2/ Readers' knowledge

We asked the interpretation of the motto and the "mass lit", and the recording of time, and the answers the following questions: Why did Berlioz want to order an antireligious poem from Homeless? Who was Jesus Christ? Did Jesus Christ live? Whose name have you heard among them: Flavius, Tacitus, Filon? What is the five God evidence? Who is the old Emmanuel? Who was Kant, Schiller and Strauss?

Only the one sixth of readers could recognize Mephisto or the devil in the motto. One third could not find out the meaning. Here are the most frequent answers: "men are good"; "men are bad"; "men can be mislead"; "such are men".

The expression "mass lit" was not enough to state the time: half of the answers was thinking of the time before 1917, however several ones were thinking of the last century. 40 per cent of readers thinks that Berlioz ordered an antireligious poem for his paper because of his personal conviction. The students attending religious secondary schools gave correct answers about Jesus. Here are some other answers: "a good man"; "the man who descended the earth"; "Mary's son"; "a prophet"; "a philosopher"; "born at Christmas". According to one fifth Jesus didn't live; one tenth doesn't consider him a God. Only every tenth discovered Kant in the old Emmanuel and only they knew he was a philosopher.

3/ Readings associations

We didn't put many questions in order to examine readers whether they understood Bulgakov's text. We were eager to know where they put the characters rather unknown for them, what they were able to guess from gestures rather insolvable. We could make consequences from these associations how the accepting horizon formed, how readers' temporary images changed. They had to answer the following questions: What is the novel with such title about?

/knowing the title/ Who can be the two characters? /after reading the first chapter/ Berlioz, Homeless, Mass lit: What is the impact of these names? /after reading the second chapter/ What nationality can be the stranger? /after his appearing/ What does he want from them? Why does the poet hate the stranger? Why did he arise Berlioz's interest?

4/ The perception and qualification of characters

WHAT KIND OF MAN DO YOU CONSIDER BERLIOZ? We put the question after the sentence: "Berlioz wanted to prove to the poet: the problem is not that whether Jesus was good or bad, we have to point out: Jesus as a person has never lived? Twenty, that is the most readers /mainly students/ consider him an atheist, eleven students a blinded atheist, six of them /all religious/ an atheist for his interest. Professional women and school leavers regard Berlioz educated. The majority, sixteen /mainly students/ consider Ivan suggestible and only eight of them determined. Two fifth characterize him negatively: vehement, cold, easy-going, suspicious, uneducated. Only five of them regard him straightforward, two sympathetic and one inquirer and friendly.

Characters force readers to take sides again and again. Readers' essential necessity is judging. Judging is easier if readers can identify or sympathize with characters. From this respect Bulgakov doesn't help his readers. It would be another situation if there was a certainty, if readers knew anything about the mysterious stranger. Who is the stranger? We put this question several times: first when Woland told he had a breakfast with Kant. One fifth of readers could not give any answers. The majority /mainly professional people - fourteen/ regarded him a philosopher or a scientist, five of them thought him Kant's student or opponent, four regarded him a writer. Several ones thought him an immigrant, seven /mainly students/ a spy. Twelve didn't consider him a human being, seven of them /five religious students/ discovered the devil in him.

WHO CAN BE THE STRANGER? we asked for the third time after the unexpected announcement. /Jesus existed and that's that!/ Every fourth reader mainly workers are embarrassed. The majority /seventeen - mainly students/ recognized Jesus in the stranger, twelve thought him a priest, three a devout, six a theologist. Four professional women regarded him a philosopher or a historian; four professional men a magus. Thirteen /mainly religious students/ considered him a devil, the others spy, an insane or a prophet.

The author initiates readers step by step to the novel. Readers got too much information in the first chapter. They have to understand them in the further parts. The poetical means of the novel /mainly the ominous intimation/ delay the interpretation of the text. Beside delaying /and with it together/ it is the irony which reduces understanding. The complicated text opposes the traditional reading strategy. However, the text will produce an effect for a lot of readers supposing the changes in their reading strategy.

5/ Who understood it?

A lecture doesn't oblige readers to change their "accepting horizon", however, a literary work opposes both literary acceptings and readers's experience. One condition of understanding is to understand the writer's language. We could perceive that the intuition of the writer's original aim or knowing the symbols of the novel is not the condition of understanding it. In several cases the lack of knowing the era did not make difficulties, although the insusceptibility to history was a great problem. We also could perceive the school stereotypies the literature lesson patterns in the perception of students. In spite of this fact students were more open than the intellectuals.

B/ Journey in a novel. /Examining the perception of Master and Margareta among students of secondary grammar school and teacher's training college/

Reading is an event, interpretation is an impression of a dynamic event. It is impossible both to reconstruct the reading as an inner event on the base of the interpretations and to watch readers during reading. We must ask readers to interrupt reading determined by the examiner and make them think over the parts and direct it with questions. This procedure is a rather rude system, interference to the self-regulating system, made by the reader and the text together, in spite the questions are very common in reading. e.g. What do you consider characters? How do you think the novel carries on? What do you think of this part? What does the writer want to say with it? Has you mind changed in connection with any characters? We have to take consequences of the laboratical studies into consideration. Sizing up the situation we studied reading's attitude of twenty secondary grammar school students and eighteen trainee teachers of literature. Our method was: to interrupt reading procedure for ten times putting fifty five questions to them.

1/ Our fellow-passangers' reading horizon

According to Jauss the condition of perception is putting in the aesthetical effect. Its existing depends on the so called perception attitude, reader's horizon. Several literarians /as Jauss, Józsa/ distinguish aesthetical and non-aesthetical /practical, everyday/ experience, attitudes, value shapes in the perception attitude. The most typical in Hungarian readers' aesthetical horizon is to bring it in connection with the novels by Jókai, Mikszáth, Gárdonyi or Hemingway.

2/ Orientation and position

HAVE YOU HEARD THE AUTHOR'S NAME? WHAT HAVE YOU HEARD OF HIM? WHAT DO YOU KNOW OF HIM? A quarter of secondary school students have heard of neither the author nor the novel, one tenth knew only the author's name. One third thought the writer Russian, one tenth Soviet. One fifth remembered the literature teacher's remark having studied Faust. There was only one well-informed student in this theme. One tenth of trainee teachers have heard only the writer's name, others could mention his famous novels as well.

WHO IS THE STRANGER? WHAT DID HE WANT? One sixth of secondary school students were unable to answer this question. There was only one among students and three among trainee teachers who symphatized to him. They could not put Woland in their horizon. They tried to reduce the tension with declaring Woland fabulous supernatural or with putting Woland and Berlioz in their pragmatic horizon. There were only few readers who could feel the characters' dis-symetrical relation after the first chapter. According to Peter Jozsa: "The majority of readers judge the characters' actions from the point of moral, they don't seek social powers in their behaviour. Instead of analyzing they judge."

For readers Woland was either too close /as a simple magus/ or too far /as a supernatural hocus-pocus/ nothing to do with him on the base of scientific world view.

WHAT DO YOU CONSIDER PILATE? In this question we had to take notice the fact: only two third of trainee teachers and one third of students read the Bible /or the part of the Bible/ so in their readers' horizon the biblical Pilate contrasting with Bulgakov's Pilate cannot be found. Twice as many trainee teachers than secondary school students disapproved him for being selfish, enjoying and serving power. There was only one student who symphatized to him and two trainee teachers could see more positive values than negative features. We could draw the conclusion from the perceptions; Pilate's interpretations were more simple than either Berlioz's or Woland's in spite of the biblical Pilate's missing from cultural patterns in several cases.

3/ Fixed-points are losing

The next question series came after the fifth chapter. WHAT WAS THE CAUSE OF BERLIOZ'S DEATH? The majority of students looked for a logical explanation. One third of them considered it a simple accident, one fifth thought it as an accident as a result of a bad state of mind. Then we put the first question referring to interpretation. WHAT DO YOU THINK BULGAKOV WANTS TO TELL, DESCRIBE IN THIS NOVEL? With this question we had no purpose to point out how far readers understood the novel after the first chapter and to realize how the readers' interpretations approached to the "absolute meaning". It is more expedient method regarding the reading, the reception procedure as a gradual putting in an aesthetical symbol language, that is a gradual reception position can be called an aesthetic perception pattern allowing the impact on the novel. A quarter of students and trainee teachers were absolutely embarrassed. Another quarter /from both groups/ felt only the description of an era in this "strange novel". There was only one student and four trainee teachers getting close to the text.

These perceptions represent clearly the determination role of the readers' point /readers' strategy/ in the beginning of the novel. However they can be changeable. This phenomena is called wandering viewpoint by Iser. The wandering viewpoint means not only readers' viewpoint supporting some characters and then others or changing viewpoints as readers getting more information. Although it means: readers meet the text as a result of increasing communication.

4/ Readers are falling into Ialta as well

After Stopa Lihogiev's falling into Ialta we put the following question: WHAT DO WOLAND AND HIS STRANGE COMPANIONS WANT? WHICH ROLE DOES THE AUTHOR INTEND FOR THEM? Readers had already bases. In spite of this one fifth of secondary school students, one tenth of trainee teachers were absolutely helpless. In both groups there were only few rationalization proposals: only two trainee teachers think it a hallucination /of Lihogiev/ and only three secondary school students think them the members of a criminal gang causing chaos and horror. Only three of twenty students regard Woland a person who makes trials the people personalizing the faults of the era. This is the most common interpretation among trainee teachers, however, such interpretations appear: "Wolands represents the disorder of the society"; "they practise upon people's weakness". Four students of the twenty feel them only the representatives of some sorts of power, demon power.

WHAT DO YOU FEEL REAL AND WHAT FABULOUS IN THIS NOVEL? From aesthetic point of view this question doesn't belong to the best ones, although it is reasonable regarding readers' reception. Considering general reading experience we have to rely on the following statements: "fabulous is negative" and "real is positive". Three secondary school students think the whole novel fabulous. Their measure is: Young guard by Fadeyev, The Miserables by Hugo, Two Lottis by Kastner and Dumas's novels; comparing with them; this is only a tale. Twelve secondary school students and thirteen trainee teachers consider Wolands's actions fabulous, one trainee teacher and one secondary school student thinks the biblical story as well.

5/ Whip or measure?

Next questions were put before title-heroes appearing, after reading the 12th chapter. WHAT DO YOU CONSIDER KORIOV? In the answers moralization judgements are dominated and only very few ethical judgements can be found: "Woland's right hand", exposes the real face of Moscow", "casts the truth with great cruelty in people's face".

WHAT IS YOUR OPINION ABOUT NIKANOR IVANITS? THE CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE? For this question answers were rather different. Secondary school students feel him less antipathic than Koroiov. One third of them judge him "sympathetic" /fair, honour, hard working/. An "honour little man", an "honour worker"

literary stereotypies were found. But pragmatistical readers' horizon, readers' scale of values appeared more frequently. WHAT CAME TO YOUR MIND DURING WOLANDS ACTIONS? The two groups reacted in different way. Readers' attitude was formed by aesthetic horizon among trainee teachers: nine of them compared Woland with Cipolla. They qualified Woland's behaviour from the point of people getting into degrading situation, who only appeared in Moscow and declared: people hadn't changed. Only four readers felt; in this novel something was measured and Woland was the measure.

"I don't like those upsetting books which try to make me look into my face." How can it be explained the readers who disagree this statement have aversion to the novel? They may have been disturbed by the method of confrontation. It is not only because of their insusceptibility to Bulgakov's world concept, philosophy. Readers agreeing Berlioz and disagreeing Woland do not perceive that Wolands are rather the observers than provokators of the Moscowian life. The "denunciation of social preposterousness" stereotype doesn't work clearly in the novel being not regular, realistic, objective and easy to understand. This stereotype appears in an absolutely new /for readers/ poetical system.

6/ Heroes save the novel

The majority of readers were worried about the absence of title heroes. We could also hope appearing the heroes form a total notion of the novel modified by the novel having several subplots and by the wandering viewpoint. WHAT DO YOU CONSIDER THE MASTER? First we asked it after reading the 13th chapter. Five secondary students thought him sympathetic, six simpathetic and miserable, three sympathetic and frail. The majority of trainee teachers sympathized to the Master, only three of them were hazy in their judgement. The "twin questin" was: WHAT DO YOU CONSIDER MARGARETA? For fourteen secondary students and thirteen trainee teachers she was absolutely sympathetic. Several ones among trainee teachers felt the independent personality in Margareta while secondary school students regarded her as the part of the Master.

Bulgakov wrote a very well known love story in the complicated novel. It's an ironic style of the romantical traditions. The well known, used a lot of times stereotypies from readers' horizon began to work. Using these stereotypies only few readers recognize the irregular figures, the loving couple floating over Moscow. The couple is connected by an irregular value; a literary work and Margareta can be its discoverer and co-author as well. These hypotheses are streightened in the answers of the next question: WHAT DO YOU THINK THEIR ROLE IS IN THE NOVEL? Twenty-six secondary school students could not give any answers as well as six trainee teachers. One trainee teachers replied they "would become heroes", three secondary school students: "they found each other".

7/ Readers becoming doubtful and readers becoming clear

Woland's victims increase with a new type. Berlioz died, Ivan became mad, Nikanor Ivanits and his denunciator was taken by the police /that is by "unknown fellow-citizens"/, the audience of variety suffered humiliation.

The two worlds /the measure and the measured world/ join together, the devil appears in civil life and the civilian Varenuha without shadow. We tried to find the perception of these two world with the next question: WHAT DO YOU CONSIDER VARENUHA? In both groups Rimsky was qualified as a positive and negative character in the same proportions. It was surprising that judgements of secondary school students were the same; six of them voted for him, eight against him, three of them thought him Woland's victim. The trainee teachers were hazy judging the administrator lost his shadow: six of them weren't able to put him anywhere, three thought Woland had terrified him.

The question we put referring to the whole interpretation of the novel. HAVE YOU CHANGED YOUR MIND ON WHAT THE WRITER WANTED TO SAY IN THIS NOVEL? We noticed two-way changes among secondary school students: the numbers of answering "I don't know" increased from five to ten. But the answers became tinged and self-confident. The numbers of entirely hazy decreased by half

among trainee teachers. We could not regard the fact accidental; the interpretations expending with sociological and social-critical elements were those readers' interpretations who explained Woland's role in such way: "he recognizes the contradictions and lights on them", awakens people to mine their real personality from the everyday irrelevant matters." They may be the readers who are able to receive the social-political message not only in the form of an easily intelligible novel but in the form of Bulgakov's novel as well. After it we asked again. WHO DO YOU CONSIDER SYMPATHETIC AND WHO ANTI-PATHETIC AMONG CHARACTERS? After the title heroes appearing the sympathetic characters' order changed in both groups. Master got on the top. Only two students felt Margareta antipathetic, eleven sympathetic, nobody disagreed her and nine regarded her sympathetic among trainee teachers. The most marked difference was the majority of hazy readers formed an opinion and made up their mind. The judgement of Jesua and Pilate did not change at all while judging the others changed to some extent. More readers withdraw their sympathy from Woland's victims and more judged them similar to Woland.

8/ Having a dogmatic and a dialectic measured

In the "Execution" chapter a new character appears: Matthew Levi. Readers can undergo Jesua's suffering with Levi's eyes identifying with his attitude. After reading the 18th chapter we asked: HOW DO YOU JUDGE MATTHEW LEVI'S ATTITUDE? Matthew Levi is a key figure. Woland, the master of light and shade theory hates the faithful but dogmatic student. His own master, the representative of light criticizes him very much. Berlioz, Ivan and Matthew Levi can be interpreted as the representatives of different types of dogmatism. It is Ivan who breaks out or rather recovers from his circle. Comparing with him the others are static figures however rather differ from each other. Matthew Levi's fanaticism is not only passionate but self-sacrificing. Berlioz is selfish and a man consulting his own interest. In both groups there was only one reader who found Matthew Levi antipathetic. There were more reservations among secondary school students; five of them and two trainee teachers judged him measuring his faults and virtues.

Although after the performance of the variety Woland kept in the background and yielded his place to his assistants, we thought the next question justifiable. WHAT DO YOU THINK WOLAND'S AND HIS FELLOWS' ROLE? Five secondary students drew the line between themselves and Wolands for: "they destroyed a lot of lives"; they were cruel". Eight discovered positive and negative attitude as well. Five judged them absolutely positively finding their role in the administration of justice. Half of secondary school students and four fifth of trainee teachers changed their minds in connection with them. The trainee teachers' opinion turned rather into negative than positive.

9/ The celebrated heroine tries her enthusiasts

Four Margareta chapter comes helping the traditional readers' attitude turning into active. Because - at last - there is a positive hero who something happens with, whose feelings, behaviours can be identified rather than with any other characters. Even she is a witch. The test of the connection with Margareta is; the union of the heroine and Woland. We could reckon the sympathy and identifying separates at this point.

Before opening the Satan's bal we put the next question: WHAT DO YOU THINK OF MARGARETA'S BEHAVIOUR? Only three secondary students condemned her for: "she behaved as a blinded lover", "she went mad from her sorrow". Four trainee teachers could not reconcile themselves with her because "a hypnotizer gang possessed her" and because "she is revenging." Trainee teachers and secondary school students judged Margareta's attitude for the same reasons however, there were some typical differences. Two readers thought she took revenge not only for Latunsky but for her all life. They felt something from the integrated person opposing the reduced individualities.

On the contrary of Margaretas in the Middle Ages who put their soul and body at the devil's disposal, Bulgakov's Margareta remains clear in the "black mass". The ball is rather the Purgatory than the Hell for she suffers together with Frida and she purifies. Their love join others' happiness. She proves with her risky question that their relationship isn't egoism of two persons, but a field of force creating values. /a novel, solidarity with others/. We put the next questions before the epilogue after the lines had converged and characters of three dimensions had got into one space-time level. The "solution" is a problem again for the readers used the traditional solutions of the traditional novels. The novel left more opening certainty than closing ones in the readers. László Kisbali writes: "The novel is not progressive, cumulative narration, but it deepens toward inside." He calls Bulgakov's novel an open literary work, a discourse on the world. Readers must join it if they want real readers of this novel. WHY DID THEY SET THE PROCURATOR FREE? Who did the greatest sin when not taking over the values? Five trainee teachers were hazy. Four trainee teachers and nine secondary students felt Pilate had been punished. Two trainee teachers and two secondary school students thought Pilate had confessed his sin. Two students and one trainee teacher thought he would get opportunity for recompensating for his sin.

HOW DO YOU INTERPRET THE END? Seven secondary school students and the same trainee teachers declared the following phrases: "all is well that ends well", "Wolands did justice", "they deserved their reward". Four secondary students felt the end pessimistic for not winning the happiness in this world. Five trainee teachers opinion were the same, however they took account of other elements as well. The majority's interpretations can be divided into two categories: 1/ Readers, rooting for the heroes and considering the end happy 2/ Readers, worrying about human beings, values, society and thinking the end pessimistic as values cannot be saved in this world just can be saved out from this world.

c/ How to read Bulgakov's text?

We made fifty-three readers read the 24th chapter, Master's setting free again to get to know how they understood Bulgakov's language and how they interpreted one of the most important parts of the novel. This is the part where lines converge for the first time. We can meet Woland and his company, the title heroes, Aloyzy Mogarits, the vampire Varenuha, Nikolay Ivanits changing from a barrow into a pigfaced fellow-citizen, Natasa becoming a witch, Anne in the staircase. Several characters are mentioned as Frida, Pilate, Ivan, Latunsky, Lapsonnykova, Rimsky, Monsieur Jacques and Earl Mengel.

1/ The text

In this chapter time is very strange. Peter Szente writes: "It stops or even it becomes reversible while it goes forward in his traditional rhythm" He draws our attention that the traditional truth becomes false in the actions lasting only moment before Master's appearing and one hour after it. Important truth is said in this part sometimes in a solemn way, sometimes slightly, sometimes with ironic pathos. We could hear from Woland: "manuscript never burns", ; from Behemot: "history will justify us"; from Koroviov: "the thing that is visible can be caught by anybody"; from the Master: "if there is no document there is no man, either"; from Woland: "Charity penetrates sometimes falsely, unexpectedly into the smallest part as well".

If we examine the context of five announcements we can find the mixture of pathetic, ironic, humorous, absurd, tragic, satirical. The atmosphere, the style and the value system of this part differs from the soft irony of the first part or the loud humour of the variety part or the fireworks of Gribodyedov's dinner or the title heroes's sentimental romance.

2/ What remained in the memory?

There was only one among the fifty three readers who didn't remember anything from this part. Three remembered only Margareta's nakedness. The others - that is fifty one among fifty three readers - remembered they had met the title heroes in this part. /thirty of them knew Master's recapturing from the asylum/. Twelve /mainly professional people/ remembered Frida's saving; ten /mainly people on the field of humanities/ the finding of the manuscript?; six: the getting back the cellar. In the 24th chapter everybody remembered Woland, Margareta, Master, although nine from ten remembered Behemot and only eight Koroviov. It's remarkable that fewer readers remembered Frida than Hella or Anne. It's typical that mainly intellectuals remembered Frida and Aloyzy Mogarits.

3/ Vocabulary

Discourse can be described with pleasant, witty, wise, vehement attributes. How are readers able to join the discourse after the bal and how are they able to follow the unexpected stylistical marks? Aren't they surprised having heard "full evening suit", "caviare", "titles", "Messire", "Candelabrum", after these words: "barrow", "it becomes a drop", "donotknow"? After the second reading we tried to measure our readers's vocabulary with the interpretation of 23 words.

We got the following result.

	among 53 readers	
	gave an acceptable answer	didn't give any answers
hallucinate	52	-
caviare	50	-
illegal literature	50	-
title	49	-
vampire	48	-
globe	48	1
inspire	48	3
moonlight-lea	48	4
donotknow	46	4
accurately	45	1
the Kremlin	41	-
candelabrum	40	5
Sadovana	40	5
accent	36	-
full evening suit	36	-
burnt-burnt	32	15
Messire	25	3
donna with the diamonds	24	9
cross signs himself	21	1
noblesse oblige	21	29
barrow	16	10
undergrowth	11	34
opus	10	16

4/ Perceiving of the ambiguity in literature

"The most interesting in this lie is that it is a forgery from the first to the last word". Woland described Behemot's story /wandering in the desert, capturing and eating the tiger/ in this way and it was considered a simple lie by the others. Behemot's reply may be unexpected for us: "history will justify us." Only very few readers discover irony in his answer; five are entirely hazy; the majority takes it serious. They feel Behemot thinks of the triumph of justice; the people not understood nowadays but justified in the future; the people able for miracles; the events unbelievable nowadays but real in the future; the proving of onnocence. Those - five readers - were only intellectual men who felt; Behemot quoted and parodied this statement.

Koroviiov proves Margareta that Azazello is able to make a hit in any atriums of the heart. Margareta exclaims: "But they are all hidden." Koroviiov: "The joke is: they are all hidden." "The thing, that is visible, can be hit easily by anybody." Skilled workers, secondary school students, office workers don't agree this statement upon logical consideration. Half of agreers regard Koroviiov's sentence an evidence. And only a quarter of readers, mainly people on the field of humanities give such answers: "hidden characteristic features must be discovered as well", the essence in Woland's world is to find the real substance."

5/ Perceiving the fifth dimension

The miracle means an unsoluble task for several readers. These ones as Berlioz try to rationalize the miracle. Koroviiov in vain gives the key of mytery: "How is it possible detectives watching in the staircase didn't hear the shindy?" Only two third of readers /four fifth of intellectuals and one third of skilled workers/ answered: the shindy was in an other dimension. There were some who denied detectives, there were some who didn't remember the shindy and there were some thinking the bal was only a vision produced by an illusionist. The next question referred to the connection of the fifth and other dimensions/ the past told by Woland, written by the Master, dreamed by Ivan and the Moscowian reality measured by Woland/: Where else can the full moon be found in the novel? Is there any connection between these parts? The majority couldn't mention two or more points in spite of the fact; the full moon appears at every essential point of the novel and the three heroes /Master, Margareta, Ivan/ are upset about the full moon.

6/ Manuscript and inspiration

"There is no a document for there is no a man" This Master's aphorism was interpreted entirely well. And it was unambiguous as well for everybody why Aloyzy Mogarits denounced the author of the novel on Pilate. It proves an exact knowledge of the historical situation. However, readers' hesitating on the interpretation of "a manuscript never burns" was surprising for us. Rationalizating defendence against ambiguity of literature can be discovered in this case.

"So back to the Arbatian cellar flat? But who will write? And the inspiration and the dreams?" Woland asks the Master. And we asked our readers: Why are dreams and inspiration important for Woland? Answers were important in Woland's interpretation as well. Six of them were hazy, other six gave such banalities: "you can realize a lot of things while dreaming". Nine answered; it was important for the Master. Four thought that inspiration and dreaming was important for everybody without exception. Four readers on the field of humanities indicating their great sensitive for literature told: "Woland is the son of the world which is the scourse of inspiration and dreaming."

7/ Margareta and Woland

Why wasn't Margareta embarassed because of her nakedness? Only few readers /mainly intellectuals - ten/ explained it with the fifth dimension used by this book. And only two thought her nakedness was the symbol of her clearness and purification. Three thought she was a witch and four thought others also had been naked there. Several ones tried to give rational answers: "it was her interest so she tolerated it"; she was invisible"; "she felt she was dreaming"; "she was in the state of unconsciousness"; she was under the charm".

Why didn't Margareta want to bring up a question? According to the majority /mainly skilled workers/ Margareta was proud. They remembered Woland called her proud when he took off her heavy gown making ker sit on the bed. Several ones explained her hesitating for not to pledge herself to the Satan. Several ones thought she had been touched, and others felt she hadn't want to seem to be selfish.

Why did Woland entrust Margareta to save Frida? The answers are different. Several readers explain it as a trial of tales. Some think Margareta becomes

Woland's assistant and it is her task. Several ones reduce the problem saying that it was such a small matter what Margareta was able to do it as well. Typical interpretation was: "a man's guilty-conscience cannot be done away with an imaginative person".

We could see joining a discourse taken place in the fifth dimension however, its language is not the language of that meant difficulties for all readers. Bahtin's statement about novels: "it is a joining of different social-manner of speaking, different individual-manner of speaking and different languages" is true for this novel as well. Not only the people's language in the fifth dimension and the language of persons getting there are different, but the language of the roles and persons differ as well.

Value structure of the text is rather different as well, for various value-worlds are mounted into one. In addition to clear value groups complicated ones are created. Both contrasting and harmonic value groups are interspersed with irony, however, with different measures. Sometimes it appears with the company of satire or grotesque or humour or tragic or pathos. Interpretation of the certification indicated to the police and then the wife /the order is typical! / was not difficult. But the remark: with the date the certification is invalid was complicated for readers. Time means a rather different category than the traditional linear time for Woland. And the remarks indicates the limits of validity and the just of certificates.

One part of the readers on the base of "if it is a tale let it be a total tale" tries to interpret everything in the dimension of fantastic, tale and dream-world. There are some readers thinking secret policemen to be Woland's men. And it's typical they expend Margareta's witchness.

The other way of defence /twice frequent than the previous way of thinking/ is rationalizing. We could meet different ways of it. Some readers try to explain everything even Woland with reason disciplines. Several ones try to limit when it is a tale, it is a reality so a particular dualistic interpretation comes out. The explanations of the division of labour among Master and Margareta are excellent examples for it. We could realize not only the perception of philosophy formed by irony but the mixture of humour, irony, grotesque meant great difficulties. Readers could understand the language of satire, but "translating" of irony formed by pathos was very completed.

V. THE RECEPTION

A/ Sympathy, viewpoint, interpretation /The heroes of Master and Margareta among Hungarian readers/

We tried to bring out with the reception of the first chapter and reading process what Allport said about percept in general is right for reading as well. Percept /perception and meaning together/ is a proception determined by individual cognitive style and cultural types.

1/ Sympathetic and antipathetic

We put the question in connection with the characters: How far do you consider them sympathetic? Readers could choose from the following answers: "absolutely sympathetic", "rather sympathetic than antipathetic", "in certain respects sympathetic in other respects antipathetic", "rather antipathetic than sympathetic", "I cannot decide" and "I don't remember".

According to the answers /225/ we can qualify three characters absolutely sympathetic: Jesua, Margareta, Master. In the case of three characters: Ivan, Matthew Levi and Behemot answers fell on sympathy side. The same positive and negative answers were voted for Woland, Koroviov and Pilate. Berlioz was judged rather antipathetic than sympathetic. Judging of Koroviov, Behemot, Matthew Levi was unambiguous.

2/ Changing and stabilization of judging

We could perceive from the essays mentioned above how far characters' judging had changed. However, these essays use only smaller types. We could get a total picture from the answers of the next question. "Is there a character, if yes, who, that made you change your mind on him/her while reading the novel?"

Beside the most sympathetic Jesua it was Berlioz /for our greatest surprise/ who seemed to be the stablest.

Not regarding one case /Matthew Levi/, the direction of changing is positive and in the majority of cases is absolutely positive. We can feel the relation of cause and effect of Woland's turning into positive and Matthew Levi's turning into negative.

3/ Identifying with characters

The order of identifying is not the same with that of sympathy: 41 per cent felt Margareta near to him, 35 Master, 15 Jesua, 13 Woland and Ivan, 9 Pilate, 8 Matthew Levi and Behemot, 4 Koroviov, 3 Berlioz. We could realize /it was proved by several studies as well/ although sympathy and identifying different cathogories, they determined each other.

4/ Who have you met before?

Life experience, the feeling "I have met him before" can be an important interpretation frame. We could not expect mentioning creatures cannot be placed in the human beings' cathogory as Woland and his company and Jesus. Our supposing was justified because characters were familiar for readers in the following proportions: 11 per cent: Jesua, 12 : Woland, 13 : Koroviov, 16 : Behemot, 18 : Matthew Levi, 21 : Pilate then came Margareta with 24 per cent, Master with 29, Ivan with 32 and Berlioz with 43.

It was outstanding that people on the field of humanities found all the characters familiar. This fact cannot be explained only with life experience. Various knowledge, various experience mix in the feeling "I have met him before." We must reckon the important role of literature experience as the high proportion /20 percent/ of university students on the field of humanities indicates us. We could feel literature experience and life experience strenghtened each other, while their mixture could strenghten the knowledge of human character and empathy-sense. More intellectuals than other readers think that life experience may join literature experience.

5/ Measure of judgement and intuition

Attitude of the ten examined groups was the most divergent in the feeling of familiarity and the less divergent in the sympathy dimension. Regarding all the four dimensions the religious readers' opinions were the most divergent, then those of the people on the field of humanities and technical intellectuals and then secondary school students.

Among the characters it was Woland whose judging and intuition differed the most in the ten readers's group, then came Ivan, Pilate and Margareta and then Berlioz.

6/ Describing and interpretation

We put four types of questions examining the interpretations of the most important characters:

- a/ we asked our readers to describe them briefly. Getting mainly attributives we could come to the conclusion of the perception /rather proception/ and valuation of characters.
- b/ we made readers qualify them with the help of our interpretations, that is, we made them interpret seven among characters
- c/ we made readers interpret some manifestations and actions of characters.
- d/ we made readers interpret the interaction of some characters.

a/ Woland's most frequent qualifications:

does the justice	19
wicked, devilish	11
all-powerful	9
rude, vulgar	8
intelligent, clever	5
determined	5
mysterious, mystical	4
sarcastic, ironic	3 per cent

They chose 2,5 answers from the given interpretations.⁺

Here is the order of agreeing.

representative of critic and dialectics, revealing human shortcomings	62
goodness and wickedness, mixture of God and devil	37
a helping creature representing human values	33
sarcastic, funny, playful creature	24
the history himself, measuring present to and with him	21
a creature instead of God, judging justly	18
outstanding artist	17
wicked spirit, who destroys humiliates, changes people as he likes it, abuses with his power	13
heavenly goodness and love in the mask of a devil	12
ruling spirit of a heavenly world without God having no goodness or love only irony and wisdom	12 per cent

b/ Jesua was described only by 85 per cent of readers /however, he was the most sympathetic in all groups/

considerate	15
naive	9
passive	7
couregous	5
dreaming	4
wise	4
just	4
divine	4
the biblical Jesus	3
man	2
paper figure	2
tolerant	2
clear	2 per cent

^x Interpretation patterns are experters' and simple readers's approaches without making an effort to describe characters totally

They chose two from the offered interpretations:

representative of love against egoism and power	70
Jesus Christ, the God from the Bible who sacrifices himself for people	35
revolutionary philosopher telling sympathetic ideas	34
psychologist knowing people excellently	28
revolutioner rising against power	24
dreamer unable for actions	9 per cent

More men than women discover a revolutioner in him. Our assumption was justified: the motive of identifying with Jesua was quite different in the case of religious intellectuals and people on the field of humanities. Love and good-will are dominated in the religious interpretations while various Jesua-pictures exist in the other approaches.

c/ Master was described by 81 per cent of readers

fallible, weak, faint-hearted	18
artist	8
idealist	8
passive without purpose	6
clear	5
clever	4
determined	4
genious failed in the reality	4
crazy	3 per cent

Mainly the religious students' qualifications - regarding the Master talented but weak - differed from the others. They sympathized and identified with him less. And another typical deviation: Master was thought an artist by mainly people on the field of humanities and religious readers.

The offered interpretations referring to Master were equally chosen:

talented scholar and artist who is a victim of his petty age	56
real artist, choosing a biblical story is an original idea, brave action	42
talented intellectual unable for acting	36
frail unable to take himself	25
dissappointing in art he runs into love	11
coward, unable to act leaving his love and artistic career	8
crazy	6 per cent

Four groups' interpretation were divergent: technical intellectuals felt him talented but coward, students on the field of humanities saw the artist living in him, secondary school students emphasized his courage and tragical fate and religious students regarded him coward and frail.

d/ Margareta was qualified by nine readers from the ten.

unselfish, self-sacrificing	12
determined, brave	9
faithful	8
unsignificant getting her light from Master	6
real woman	6

representative of love	5
woman of moods	4
loose	3
good	2
clear	2
romantic	2
beautiful	2
able to sacrifice for happiness	2 per cent

Religious students's opinion were the most divergent: they saw the woman able to sacrifice for her happiness in Margareta. /29 %/

The interaction of the two title heroes is not more than a simple "love story". However, it cannot be placed in the love story category. Proving the fact: Master wasn't shocked by Margareta's beauty, but by her loneliness coming from her eyes, what wasn't noticed. And readers didn't notice it as well. In spite of "the yellow flower" Margareta was put in the "ingenue type". The majority of readers could discover; Margareta wasn't only Master's lover, but discoverer of a great work and unselfish patron, for readers had similar archetypes. However, they could not notice that Master's novel was a matter of life for Margareta although "her life was written in this novel".

The offered five interpretations were only agreed in part, for readers chose only two of them.

a real woman who dares to show her emotions in a world where everybody tells a lie	62
wonderful, brave rising against obscurity and egoism in the name of love	57
discoverer of a great work and unselfish patron of its writer	45
superstitious woman not only believing in witches but being a witch herself	5
easy-going, frivolous woman who leaves her husband unfaithfully and tempts a great artist	2 per cent

Two third of readers agreed the first two interpretations totally. Three groups' opinions were different: two students's groups felt her unselfish and a faithful Muse; religious intellectuals regarded her unselfish and ready for sacrificing.

e/ Ivan was qualified by nine readers from the ten.

able to change, develop	19
cantankerous, humorous	11
weak, easy to lead	11
unimportant	5
stupid	5
man to be pitied	4
untalented	3 per cent

Religious readers' opinion deviated from the others: feeling more sympathy to him, seeing the model of a developing man in him, and not regarding him funny. However, his talent, knowledge was not appreciated by them.

Master's intellectual inheritor the only Moscovian /except Margareta/ who understands what happened and realizes his life's vapidty	56
man who draws the lessons of events, realizes his narrow-mindedness, powerlessness and changes totally	44
talented young poet chased into madness by strange events	24

Wolands's victim revenging him	
because he reveals their deceptions	16
naïve man of weak nerved giving to	
his personality and being under the	
influence of Master	16

The ones who agreed the first interpretation did the same with the second. Different groups think in different way in connection with him. Women and skilled workers consider him a victim or a man is easily lead. Religious students regard him stupid, but able to develop, and a frail inheritor of Master. Religious intellectuals judged him the most positively: honest, talented, ready to develop.

f/ Pilate was qualified by only eight readers from the ten.

man with guilty conscience	15
tyran	12
representative of power	9
hazy	8
clever	5
human	5
wicked	4
victim	4
frail	4
two-sided	4
well-disposed	4
coward	2 per cent

The most sympathetic character, Jesua regarded cowardness to be the greatest sin in vain for only every fiftieth reader qualified Pilate coward. In this case religious qualifications were different as well because 29 per cent // considered Pilate coward. Qualifications and interpretations were rather negative.

representative of power	59
lonely, sad, disappointed	56
sensitive in the mask of a	
tyran	40
hesitating man	39
man of good intentions, but weak	31
tries to practise his power humanely	16
two-sided	13
tyran	12
anti-Semitic	11 per cent

The ones regarding Pilate a tyran, two-sided, anti-Semitic thought him the representative of the power. The religious students sympathized and identified with Pilate discovering his loneliness, guilty conscience, humanity and good intentions. Our assumption was justified: religious students for who clear conscience is a dominated value, feeling Pilate's guilty conscience, sympathized and identified with him.

g/ Berlioz was described by only three quarters of answerers.

clever, educated	13
self-important	12
representative of his age	6
dogmatic	6
careerist	5
unbeliever	4
half-educated	3
man to be pitied	3 per cent

He was considered half-educated by skilled workers; clever, self-important careerist by technical and religious intellectuals, clever atheist by secondary school students and clever unbeliever by religious students.

The offered five interpretations were agreed, however, none of them became dominant.

representative of dogmatic thinking	40
half-educated, self-satisfied figure	40
bureaucrat abusing with his power,	
talented ones as Master unable to get	
on because of him	35
funny example of that type trying to	
explain everything with arguments	31
educated atheist sticking to his ideas	
can be set aside only dishonestly	29

The last interpretation was frequent among women and secondary school students who felt sympathy to him. Mainly people on the field of humanities regarded him dogmatic.

h/ Matthew Levi was described by only seven.

faithful	14
fanatic	12
primitive	7
servant	6
unable to change his life	5
exploits Jesua's theses for petty ends	4
man with good intentions	3
dogmatic	3 per cent

Regarding Matthew Levi a servant skilled workers felt him faithful while the others servile. He is considered fanatic by technical intellectuals; stupid with good intentions by religious intellectuals; an absolutely positive figure who is faithful, with good intentions and able to change his life by secondary school students /including religious students/. It is difficult to explain why engineers felt more sympathy to him than people on the field of humanities.

i/ Behemot was described by eight from ten readers.

The majority 20 per cent regarded him playful, silly, 10 per cent, Woland's mean; 7 per cent sympathetic, sarcastic and cynic; 6 per cent cruel; 4 per cent sly, fantastic and antipathetic; 3 per cent trouble maker. Behemot's judging was rather positive mainly among religious intellectuals and people on the field of humanities.

7/ Various types reductions for characters' receptions

László Kisbali and Ilona Kiss: ⁺ "The narrative pattern of the novel is not a pattern causing events and changes, arranged in casual relations of the acts, not progressive, cumulative narration, but it deepens towards inside. It is not arranged in the connections of consequence, but in the connections of explanation and interpretation. Being not realized becomes an event the centre of narrative connections. Master and Margareta is an open literary work, not an image reflected by mirror, but a discourse on the world".

Readers should join this discourse that is not easy at all, for the majority only can hear, review, enjoy novels. And the most difficult is: to hear interference among different discourses, fill the gaps of discourses, go on broken discourses. Readers try to hear "clear" voices from disharmony; if it cannot be; otherwise to leave "disturbing voices".

⁺ KISBALI László - KISS Ilona: "Unreliable Individuality"
World concept and novel form in Master and Margareta.
1980. Manuscript

A/ From light and shade to black and white

The majority of readers produced unambiguous black and white figures from the characters mixed light and shade in order to understand the discourse only between two characters in the following ways:

a/ Characters, their actions. By this way Woland becomes a trouble-maker, Margaret an adulterial, Berlioz a discomfited, Master a crazy, traitor of his love.

b/ Characters: their fate. It is difficult to sympathize with light and shade characters or judge them however, can be felt sorry for them. So Berlioz, Master and Pilate becomes a "poor fellow".

c/ Judging instead of getting to know. Ethical judging is essential requirements for readers. Its ways, levels can be rather different; readers may judge comparing with an ideal, on the base of comprehensive ethical system or characteristic features judged either negatively or positively. It may be denouncing as well as glorifying.

d/ Correlation patterns. A paper figure is formed by joining similar features to a selected one. So in some cases the educated atheist Berlioz is considered to be a man "living only for his work", "a gentleman friendly to the strangers".

e/ Characters: only one of their features. This is the most common version for simplifying a person to a paper figure with one dimension. Matthew Levi is passionate, fanatic; Berlioz is educated, unbeliever; Jesus is naive, spotless, dreamy, Ivan is quarrelsome, impressionable, stupid.

f/ Identifying characters with the heroes of other literary works. After reading the first chapter Woland was identified with the spies of adventurous novels. Later he was identified with Mefisto, Cipolla and Ostap Bender.

g/ Identifying characters with historical persons. For the first time Berlioz was identified with the composer himself. Woland who proves Jesus's existence is identified with Jesus by a quarter or third part of the readers. Jesus is identified with the biblical Jesus by several readers.

h/ Identifying characters with ideas. Several readers can see the representative of charity in Jesus, progress in Berlioz, love and destruction in Margareta.

i/ Characters, roles. This was the second common simplifying method.

B/ Simplified perception and interpretation of interaction among characters

a/ In the shoe of a character Berlioz and Woland seems to be sympathetic for one third of readers. In a lot of cases they sympathize with Woland just for Berlioz pays attention to him. Much more readers identify with Margareta than with Master and one part of them considers Master to be a coward and a traitor from the faithful, willing Margareta's point of view.

b/ Supplementary roles. The title itself meant roles /a master and his student, a sculptor and his model/ for lots of readers. Having said nothing readers already "find out", because of their appearance, that Ivan and Berlioz is rich and poor, a master and a student, a factory owner and a worker, a father and a son. Reading some chapters the problem was that these role-pair-patterns could not work any more.

c/ Making after abstract patterns. In several cases the whole novel's interpretation was determined by an interaction between Woland and Berlioz arranged in a good-bad pattern.

d/ A victim and a scapegoat. The readers making victim figures from some characters interpret the interaction between Berlioz and Woland, Ivan and Woland as a victim-scapegoat relation proclaiming Woland to be a scapegoat in both cases.

e/ A person is repealed. Woland is thought not to be more than a hallucination, a hocus-pocus, not to be taken serious or communicative, only the mark of Berlioz's mood.

C/ Simplifying relation system into interactions

A common way of ceasing the tension, increasing all the time as going on the novel, is to simplify the relation system into one or two parallel interactions leaving "disturbing moments" and the "disturbing third one".

a/ Novel with one dimension. Not taking care of "the other persons" /or considering them as episode characters/ several readers regard this novel as a traditional love story. Leading characters are thought to be representatives of a bluish-lila romance; or Faust and Margareta; or a tempter and a seduced; or an artist and a muse.

b/ Interactions torn from interactions that is the loss of perceiving inherence. This is the most common event. Interactions between Berlioz and Woland, Pilate and Jesua, Master and Margareta are interpreted in this way.

c/ Leaving out intellectual interactions. Only few readers can perceive as Ivan, Master and Margaret gets in closely touch with Pilate without having met or talked to him.

D/ Comprehensive interpretations

1/ Comparing of literarians' and readers' interpretations

Comparing the answers of our questionnaire and the reviews of papers, the essays, studies, monographs are complicated however, not impossible and useless. We used statements by literarians referring to the comprehensive interpretation and the concept of the novel.

interpretation elements	% of 100 literarians from 15 countries	% of 25 Hungarian literarians	% of 255 Hungarian readers
relation of good and bad	29	32	15
transcendence	27	24	9
social critic	24	36	15
contrast of power and value	22	44	10
creating, art	16	24	4
justice, dispensing of justice	14	24	9
personality, achievement, estrangement	13	28	4
cowardice, responsibility, conscience	13	16	7
egoism, utilitarianism	12	8	7
passivity, action, escaping	12	24	2
punishment, redemption, hope	12	8	1
liberty, determination	11	20	3
exist, non-exist, catastrophe	11	8	1
love	9	6	7
Woland, the measure	8	24	1
man is the history	9	16	4
charity, humanity	6	8	5
openness, dogmatism	6	8	2
value losing, value missing	6	12	1
suffering	6	8	0
mortification, revenge	6	4	0

Woland, the order of changing	5	4	1
chaos, madness	3	0	2
contrast of material and			
spiritual world	3	4	2
chance for the new	2	4	0
order, legality	2	8	0
title heroes are private persons	2	8	0
joy, play	2	8	0
moral	1	0	5
man can be manipulated	0	0	2
literary life	0	0	1
chance for god	0	0	1
Jesus existed	0	0	2
spotless, beauty	0	0	1
devil doesn't exist	0	0	1

Studying this comparison we could realize the similarity of the interpretation-elements, mainly in frequency and order. This similarity can be explained with Bulgakov's text in addition to the differently educated readers's genetic programme, European culture and historical experience.

However, deviations are remarkable. Readers' interpretations consist of more /about 2500/ elements than those of literarians. We can find more reduced elements regarding only one type of text from the novel in the readers' interpretations. These reduced elements cannot be found in those of literarians. Love, power, relation of good and bad, social critic can be discovered in the "experters" interpretations, however, in the case of readers they are the interpretations.

Sociological approaches are typical for German; ethical, theological for Polish; theological and sociological for American; philosophical-antropological for Hungarian interpretations. Soviet interpretations are rather heterogenous, described by the missing of the elements as: justice, punishment, exist and non-exist, suffering, love, value losing and the elements mentioned less: social critic, cowardcy, responsibility. Although we mustn't forget two facts. 1. Among Soviet critics there was a great polemic on the novel so they had to concentrate on the points, problems turned up in the debate. 2. Soviet literarians dealt with philological problems and the question of literary form in great detail. The frequent elements as transcendence, social critic came out in the articles of popular English, American papers /Time, Times, News-week, Times Literary Supplement/.

2/ Comprehensive interpretations by literarians

On the basis of reading attitude that is which parts of the novel were mainly reacted - interpretations can be placed in the following categories: sociological and historical-social; moralizing and ethical; accepting antropology and antropological; accepting ontology and ontological; religious and technological; and the contrast of good and bad.

a/ Sociological interpretations. The centre of the novel is bureaucracy, Stalinism, the citizens of the new system, the mortification story of East European intellectuals.

b/ Historical-social interpretations. According Éva Ancsel: Moscow's history stopped and that is its sin; bureaucratic, inhuman world is described by the contrast of the power and the ones suffering the power; socialist evaluation of thirties is measured; changing is necessary.

c/ Moralizing interpretations. The essential point of the novel is the problem of courage and cowardcy declaring the necessity of moral base as moral stoicism, moral responsibility, individual autonomy and moral stability.

d/ Ethical interpretations e.g. D.G.B Piper's Sin is unavoidable in spite of ideas, dreams, myths. However, demand on impunity appears in the guilty.

- e/ Simplifying the essence of the novel to the contrast of good and bad was similar in the Polish, Hungarian, Soviet, French, English, American interpretations.
- f/ Religious interpretations. Selfish, materialist world is contrasted with metaphysical level, the next world, religious hope and supernatural powers.
- g/ Theological interpretations. According to E. Ericson this novel proves the miserable insufficiency of materialist perspective; life includes mysticism.
- h/ Accepting antropology. In this category even simplifying interpretations show important justice. e. g. According to the Soviet M. Vulis the main point of the novel is: bad is bad because it's inhuman.
- i/ Antropological interpretations e.g. Jenő Alföldi: the subject of the novel is: the human persons' most typical mark; liberty, creating, love, joy.
- j/ Accepting ontology interpretations. This novel indicates the triumph of justice.
- k/ Ontological interpretations. Polemizing with Goethe Bulgakov proves with his novel: "irreproducible moment can be stopped and filled with particular essence". /E. Olonova/ Géza Féja's approach is a real "existence interpretation": wickedness is less possible in the existence than in the existence in the world. E. Bazzarelli summarizes his interpretation in this way: love is more than justice.
- l/ Social-antrophological interpretations e.g. Gyula Király The new socialist work doesn't work with the people dreamt by Marx, that's why it stalls.
- m/ Social-ethical interpretations. According to F. Schonaer cowardry is not effective but the cause and explanation of the abuses with political power.
- n/ Historical-theological interpretations. The American J. Delaney reads out from the various texts of the novel: the impact of revolution wasn't prosperous; only religious hope remains for men.
- o/ Antropological-ethical interpretations. Man can make good or bad in the decision situation. The Polish W. Maciage thinks wakening the conscience in this way.
- p/ Antropological-theological interpretations /Pál Belohorszky/ man has a metaphysical level; this materialist transcendence is as well his main feature as love.
- q/ Antrophological-ontological interpretations. Basic values as liberty, personality and justice are in the centre of this novel according to Julia Szilagyí.
- r/ Ethical-ontological interpretations. Woroszylski agrees Jesua's statement: the greatest sin is cowardry.
- s/ Theological-ethical interpretations. The novel presents free ethical choosings appearing in the supernatural believe and love /M. Jovanovic/
- 3/ Structure of readers' interpretations

What do you think the most important idea of the novel?
 We expected these answers the comprehensive interpretation of the novel. "What do you think of the novel?" We regarded these answers supplementary information. We weren't surprised not getting acceptable answers: for readers unable to tell feelings, ideas. Their number was the highest among skilled workers and secondary school students. /20 and 16 per cent/.

56 per cent of approaches /as we could realize comparing "spontaneous" readers' and literarians' interpretations/ is only interpretations with one dimension, that is: readers pick up one plot, one level, one idea from the novel. This "one dimension" type can be divided into other three groups: 1/ expressing everything with banalities /love overcomes everything, good has got its just desert/; 2/ describing by arguments, analysis, originality; 3/ without the qualifications of the first two groups. We also can divide the readers forming their interpretations from various plots, various texts /half of the previous group/. One third of interpretations is abstract /being either a banality or an original idea/. The others join either some characters or the story. 11 per cent of interpretations refers to Moscow on the base of Moscovian text. 8 per cent of readers /28 per cent of secondary school students/ refers only to the love of Master and Margareta. One third of secondary school students read the novel only as a love story. Mainly intellectuals without degree /15 %/ thought only the "Jerusalem scene" in their interpretations. Approaches including Woland as well, were in the lowest proportions among skilled workers and technical intellectuals.

4/ Subject of readers' interpretations

a/ Historical-social approaches were typical for 33 per cent of readers. 6 per cent gives sociological approach. In the case of historical-social approaches they utter such generalities: "Moscow of thirties" "social critic", "epoch". The connection of art and society turns up in the deeper interpretations.

b/ Power is mixed with historical-social approach. Political or moral approaches of the power can be found in 15 per cent of interpretations. It is the most frequent among students and people on the field of humanities and the least frequent among secondary school students.

c/ Artist, creating man is the motive of the interpretations mentioned above, although as a comprehensive interpretation is very rare /1%/.

d/ The matter of good and bad can be discovered in the 15 per cent of interpretations. It is twice frequent among women than men. It is the most frequent among intellectuals without degree, the least frequent among secondary school students; twice frequent among religious readers than any others.

e/ Dispensing of justice appears in 13 per cent, however, as an only element in 2 per cent. 4 per cent of readers emphasize the triumph of justice and 5 per cent Woland's role in the dispensing of justice.

f/ Ethical norms, human values and humanity can be found in 16 per cent of interpretations. In 5 per cent it is the only approach. It is three times frequent among women than men and two and half times frequent among religious readers than others.

g/ Love turns up in the 9 per cent of interpretations and it is in a unique position. Secondary school students and women mention it twice frequently than others.

h/ Man's behaviour, attitude can be found in 18 per cent and it is the only approach in 5 per cent. Interpretations are such generalities: "secret of human spirit", "contradiction of human spirit", "human attitude".

i/ The basic problem of human exist can be found in 9 per cent and as an only interpretation in 3 per cent. These types use generalities /2 %/, however the others aren't ontological interpretations, either.

j/ Connection of real and unreal gives the 4 per cent of interpretations. According to them the message of the novel is: "devil exists", "God exists", "next world exists".

We made our readers qualify 21 interpretations. We formed our "interpretation test" using simplifying opinions as well.

Our question was: "I am reading literarian historians', critics', philosophers' views, interpretations. Compare their views with yours and tell if you agree entirely, partly or disagree with them."

Examining the result we have to find out; this picture is similar to that one formed by readers' own qualifications. The most frequent approaches were the ones not touching all essential interpretation possibilities; not being in the centre: social critic, faithfulness, dispensing of justice. However, there were approaches based on important texts of the novel accepted by several readers. Majority of readers didn't accept frail interpretations, banalities.

C/ Effect1/ Did you like it?

In addition to this question we put two other ones. What do you think of the novel? What do you think of its artistic value? According to the answers judging of the novel is absolutely positive.

What do you think of it?	Did you like it?	Is it valuable?
absolutely positive 42 %	I liked it the best 4 %	I haven't read any more valuable ones 2 %
	I liked it very much 43 %	Outstandingly valuable 61 %
rather positive than negative 32 %	I liked it 28 %	not particularly valueable 15 %
I liked it step by step 5 %		
indifferent for me 8 %	indifferent for me 1 %	has got average value 4 %
	both liked and didn't like it 17 %	I cannot decide 16 %
rather negative than positive 4 %	I didn't like it 5 %	has got little value 2 %
absolutely negative 6 %		

Here is the order of reception using a five-degree approval index:⁺

professional people on the filed of humanities	1,53
25-29 years old	1,51
religious intellectuals	1,39
religious secondary school students	1,33
20-24 years old	1,22
men	1,23
women	1,17

⁺ "I liked it very much: +2"; "I liked it +1"; "I didn't like it: -1"; "both liked and didn't like it: 0"; "it was indifferent: 0";

technical intellectuals	1,10
students on the field of humanities	1,08
30-39 years old	1,00
intellectuals without degrees	0,92
secondary school students	0,86
more than 40 years old	0,86
15-19 years old	0,77
skilled workers	0,61

The order of this approval index indicates clearly; how "I liked it" answers hides deviations in the interpretation and effect.

"What do you think of the novel?" Certainly these answers indicate more about the reception of the novel. From the acceptable answers the most frequent /35 %/ were the ones qualifying the novel entertaining, interesting, fascinating. Eight per cent regarded it complicated, extraordinary, strange. Seven per cent went into extasis over it.

"Did you like it?" The motives of the evaluative answers indicate more about the effect of the novel.

Positive values of the novel:

I liked it	% of the answers
it made me entertain	17
its ideas	13
its social critic	10
its structure	8
effect	8
its modernness	7
it can be identified with	5
its fantasy	5
biblical problems	5
style	5
form	4
mixture of real and unreal	4
its humour	4

We could see the effect of many aspects of this novel, realizing its impact both on the emotional and intellectual levels.

3/ Are you satisfied?

"Did you get from the novel you had expected?"
Here are the answers.

got it	31
didn't expect anything	23
more than he expected	21
didn't get it	9
partly	4
different from he expected	5
other answer	3
didn't answer	4 per cent

Being no similar question in the Hungarian studies we want to say only: the novel is positive from the point of view of satisfaction.

We could distinguish the following events examining the measure of expectation and reception.

less expectation colder reception than the average	skilled workers, technical intellectuals
less expectation average reception	intellectuals without degree
more expectation colder reception	secondary school students
more expectation average reception	people on the field of humanities religious students
more expectation warmer reception	students on the field of humanities religious intellectuals

4/ What did they feel?

They could choose the most convenient answers from 32 possible ones. If they had chosen all the answers equally we would have got 22 per cent. Certainly it happens not this way. 13 answers were chosen by 10 per cent, although one answer by 20 per cent!/. Here are the readers' choosings reflecting their emotions and the effect of the novel.

it made me think	70
it made me entertain	38
"racked my brains"	36
showed me new inherence	33
widened my horizon	33
told new things	27
made me have an attitude	24
gave me knowledge	22
delighted me	20
made me sad	19
made me touch	19
confirmed me	17
formed my ideology	15
set me free	13
justified my concept	13
disturbed me	13
made me upset	12
made me brighten up	11
gave me a task	10
made me fresh	9
gave me an example	9
made me calm	7
irritated me	7
made me act	6
cause disappointment	6
made me tired	6
held a mirror in front of me	6
shattered me	5
was indifferent for me	4
I became another person	4
caused guilty conscience	3
frightened me	3 per cent

Readers chose the answers having unpleasant effect less frequently /22 per cent/. Answers representing pleasure were in high proportion /"it made me entertain" was the second/. The proportion of the elements meaning affirmation /"made me upset", "made me touch", "made me sad"/ was the same. "Modernity" and "knowledge" elements were more frequent /22 %/ than expected. The elements referring to changing and catharsis were in the same proportion.

In the seventies Master and Margareta impressed with its modernness as an informative novel. "Did you get to know anything new from the world?" According to 44 per cent of readers: well-known things appeared in new light, in-herence. Two third of concrete answers are in the connection with the Soviet Union and the Bible.

"What do you think of it?" "Why did you like it?" "What did you feel?" From these answers we could notice this novel could be read as a comedy or a burlesque. But we asked: "Did it occur you were laughing reading the novel?" to get to know whether readers felt or appreciated Bulgakov's humour mixed with irony.

Behemot made secondary school students and skilled workers laugh. People on the field of humanities liked Woland's humour. Students on the field of humanities enjoyed Moscowians' life. Margareta in the role of a witch made secondary students laugh.

"Why did you like it?" 9 per cent mentioned its style or literary form. The novel made 20 per cent of readers delight. From these answers it is not easy to conclude the impact of the formation. "Can you mention any parts from the novel you can call "beautiful"?" Only ten per cent answered "no". Here is the frequency of various types of answers:

love of Master and Margareta	32
the biblical part	19
its end	11
describing Pilate	8
describing the bal	4
Margareta's flying	4
Wolands' flying	4 per cent

Three questions referred to the deepness of the effect. "Did you find dull parts in the novel?" "Is there anything you can see in different way under the influence of the novel?" Does this expression: shocking suit to any parts or scenes of the novel?" 62 per cent didn't find it dull at all; less the students on the field of humanities in 80 per cent. However, secondary school students and skilled workers were sometimes bored /45-45 %/. "Does this expression: shocking suit to any parts of the novel?" 78 per cent answered with yes. Here are the most frequent answers:

Master's life	13
the biblical part	12
Moscowians' punishment	8
its end	8
Pilate's fate	8
Berlioz's death	7
Margareta's faithfulness	6
Ivan's fate	4
the bal	4
the whole novel	2 per cent

Among people on the field of humanities emotional-intellectual shocking, illustrating conscious, cognitive, rational elements, was the most frequent. Secondary school students' opinions deviated at two points: Berlioz's death and Margareta's faithfulness was twice frequent. However, religious readers' opinions were the most divergent: they found Pilate's and Ivan's fate, that is the suffering and converted person's fate, shocking. In their case the novel impressed on the moral dimension.

Feeling the whole novel or any parts of it shocking are the readers, who:

appreciated it for its irony
the novel made think
the novel delighted
the novel confirmed
the novel made be calm

the novel set free
the novel made fresh
felt being another person
the novel disturbed
concept was justified

The readers seeing the world in different way under the influence of this novel were in the highest proportion, who

appreciated this novel very much
liked its humour
appreciated it for its modernness
liked it for it's about them as well
got what they expected or more
told them new about recent history and the age of Jesus
felt guilty conscience
made them shock
made them delight
gave an example
set free
showed new inherence

D/ Readers' attitude

Peter Jozsa concludes his essay on reading interpretation of The Great Journey by Semprun: "One should not come to the pessimistic conclusion that the meaning of the text doesn't come about but vanishes in the aesthetic practical experience of the society: that is not true at all. However, the symptom exists." The previous parts can prove well how far this symptom exists. The text can come about, and not only as a reconstruction, however, as a sense-surplus, as a result of the discourse the readers taken part in as well.

a/ Induction with synthesis. As it could be seen induction without synthesis was typical for the interaction between readers and characters. A more tinged perception and interpretation or interaction was left out because of identifying with some persons without any distance. Several readers' example can prove, one possible way of comprehensive interpretation, identifying with the problem is the interpretation of character's all interactions; not only identifying with the character but analysing his interactions and drawing conclusions as well.

b/ Deduction with analyses. Several readers started in this way but stopped at deduction not daring to throw stereotypies away. That is why simplifying sociological, moralizing, ontological interpretation-fragments came about. Some managed to descend from the height of absurdity and noticed the persons, seeming paper figures, representating ideas and theories from that height. Both sociological deduction completing with analysis and ontological abstraction completing with analysis seemed to be possible ways. However, it was much more efficient to mix ethical, sociological and ontological abstraction completing with analyses.

A. H. Maslow distinguishes perception leading by interest and holistic aesthetic perception. The previous is abstract, judging, interfering while holistic is concrete and less selective. This perception seems to mean a more favourable condition for reception of an artistic text. However, real readers cannot be put in this type. We managed to see the perception of an open reader is also a proception determined by cultural models, values, interests. We could also feel readers' essential need is judging either in the form of a dull moralization or ethic judging. Although, it is true that Maslow's type is a perceiving type, but we could see; perception, valuation and interpretation is a close unit. That is why, for us a receptive type is more useful than a two staged perceiving-receptive one.

Leenhardt's and Jozsa's systems could give me a real support to create a type in order to place the most characters into. Leenhardt distinguishes three types of approaching mood of reading: a/ reading without distance; b/ judging

on the base of ideals and coherence ethical system; c/ synthetical sociological one. They are called: systems of reading. We could also meet approaches without distance; especially a naive identifying without distance. But we could describe these cases by too great distance as well. As for the synthetic reading system; we could also meet ethical, sociological and ontological versions, respectively three various mixtures of them both among inductive-summarizing and deductive-analytical approaches as well. Józsa determines two accommodating moods of readers: individual and social ones. /regarding readers' most general orientation, focus of their attention/. He distinguishes three reading moods /readers' relation to the story/: factual, identificative-emotional and analytical-synthetical. We could feel individual and social orientation in the inductive and deductive approaches. Readers' attitude and reading strategies examined in our study can easily be placed in these three reading moods. Building on these theories the following reading strategies seem to be the most suitable ones to place readers' attitudes examined by our study.

a/ Factual reading strategy. These readers can record actions staying only on the level of symptoms, things, stories. Among the readers of Master and Margareta only few ones could be found; as this reading strategy not allowing a dialogue with Bulgakov. This novel can be read as a love romance, but not as an adventurous novel.

b/ Naive reading strategy. These readers are too close to the novel having a too intimate relation with characters. They identify with the characters and not with their interactions and problems. Induction without synthesis, lack of distance /although neutralized by naive gazing/ is typical for them totally. Perception leading by interest and assimilating approach /however, not merging the whole story, only their favourite hero/ is typical for them partly. They became parts of the dream world of the novel. That is, they simplify the world of the story into a small dream world according to their measure. They are described by individual orientation more than sociological orientation, and moralization more than ethical judging. The first impression has got an important impact on them. It can be disturbing for them if their favourite hero struggles, wears away, becomes ambiguous, dies "in vain". They expect the realizing of their desire from literary works.

The readers, who liked it or liked it very much appreciating are in this category. More readers identify and sympathize to characters than the ones in the first category. These readers show more sympathy to Berlioz and less to Woland than the others. They hesitated judging the characters. /except title heroes/ Their comprehensive interpretation is with one dimension, moralizing, accepting ontology and psychology, their main motive is justice and love. They were unable to get on with the ironic value structure of the novel, its social critic, its exist-philosophy and transcendence. They interpret several parts as a tale.

c/ Rational reading strategy. These readers are very far from the novel, the distance is too wide. They are unable to identify or do it less than expected. They are able to perceive characters and their interactions not having an intimate relation with them. They observe the novel from a far distance. They can be described by deduction without analyses, rational, critical attitude. Social and ontological approach is more typical than personal one. Ethical examination is more common than in the previous group, however, simplifying, moralization with good-bad categories is common as well. The form of self-justification for desire's realization is typical. The novel is not a dream world, however, a world to get to know, a non-fiction world getting knowledge from it.

The readers in this category didn't like this novel so much. The effect of the novel is described by getting knowledge widening the horizon. Typical effective elements are in-difference disappointment, making think, making have an attitude and affirmation. More dimensions, fantasticality, transcendence. The number of readers identified with characters was low, and felt sympathy was less. The end of the novel was considered bad,

fabulous, chaotic; they suggested a real, unambiguous end. Their comprehensive interpretation was sociological, moralizing, political. The proportion of the readers not understanding the novel or parts of it, was higher. They found fault in the novel and not in themselves.

d/ Analytical-summarizing reading strategy. These readers are described by active, open minded reading attitude, taking intellectual work, however, out in the form of interfering but in the form of a dialogue. Deductive approach with analyses and inductive approach with synthesis and approaches of individual and social orientation are equal variations of this reading strategy. The reader of analytical-summarizing reading strategy stands partly on this world and partly another existence, using another parallel: taking part the communication vessels between two worlds; his world around him and the world of the novel. He identifies not with characters but their problems judging and living them. Value-harmonization, facing is more typical than assimilating and accommodation and these readers have got better opportunity for catharsis, that is for intellectual and emotional shocking at the same time.

These readers liked it very much, causing the novel an emotional and intellectual shocking. Their comprehensive interpretations were: ethical, ontological, anthropological, historical-social. /and their mixtures/ They felt sympathy to less characters than naive readers and more than rational readers. They understood Woland's role and interaction of Woland and Matthew Levi. They felt the irony of the novel /understanding the role of the tram lead by a Komsomolst/. They identified the head appearing in Pilate's vision with the emperor.

E/ Factors influencing reception

We intend to indicate only the determinant role of sociological, socio-psychological factors /not regarding proception, interpretation, valuation, effect, cultural patterns and reading strategy/ not with the most exact method being the sample too small. We examined the influence part of the man-woman roles, education, age, life experience /including reading/, social position /job/, ideology /religiousness/, value order, reading horizon. Although we studied those important factors: as personality, career, sense of transcendence, sense of existence, the question, how readers' attitude changed towards the novel became open.

1/ Man and woman role

Among men "wonderful", entertaining; while among women "strange", "difficult", "I didn't understand it" was a frequent answer.

This novel caused more problems for women than men. They often chose such simplifying interpretations: "love overcomes everything", "the triumph of love and art over the power", "man can hope only in the next world", "in this crazy world everything is upsidedown", "good has got his just desert".

2/ Age, lifeexperience

Mainly readers over twenty liked the novel best. Teenagers and people over twenty like it as well /not in the same way/. However, among them we found more readers refusing the novel. Twice more people between 20-29 admired the book without reservation than younger or older ones.

The novel impressed on people over 40 less than the others /perhaps for their taste and value orientation/.

Secondary school students' opinion were divergent: they used three times frequent "I don't understand it" and less frequent: "entertained me".

Secondary school students' interpretations can be described by infantilism. Their typical interpretation was: "The message of the novel is: Margareta's

faithfulness and standing for an unrecognized genius." Among them "love overcomes everything", good has got its just desreye" are popular interpretations.

3/ Education

We compared only the groups having secondary or higher education. Education impressed deeply on the valuation of the novel. The novel was refused by skilled workers and then technical intellectuals proving the not determinant role of this factor.

4/ Philosophical and engineering attitude

According to the approval indexes there was no difference between them, however, their motives were quite divergent. Among people on the field of humanities the elements: universal problems, form and modernness, among technical intellectuals elements: irony, social critic, mixture of real and unreal, describing man, attitude, style, were more frequent.

Philosophical and engineering attitude was a more influencing factor in judging and interpreting characters.

Shocking-affirmation effect, catharsis was the most unambiguous for people on the field of humanities and was frequent among students on the field of humanities. "Shocking" element was more and "touching" was less frequent among them. Two typical groups are among technical intellectuals: who enjoyed the novel and who suffered it.

Getting acquainted with twelve engineers we can realize; engineers' attitude is more parcatical, logical, rational emphasizing self-control and efficiency. They try to get an information in the most rational way without less effort,

5/ Value order, ideology

The effect of the novel was rather different among the people of various value orientation. The novel impressed on the people with dynamic life principle as on the others. The novel entertained the readers with safety principles in higher proportion /48 %/, it made them have an attitude, gave knowledge, formed their world concept in lower proportion, however. Readers building their personality chose "confirmed me", "made me have an attitude", "widened my horizon", "set me free", "made me act" more and "made me tired", "was disappointing" less frequently.

Religious readers differed in a high degree from the others in Ivan's judging and interpretation, the title heroes' judging and Jesua's interpretation. They were disturbed less than expected by "apocrive" treatment of the Bible on the dualistic view typical to eastern Christianity interpreted by Bulgakov. Jesua was believed to be humane and the representative of love against the power. They felt Margareta as the woman take herself and make a sacrifice. They discovered both the weak, the passive and the brave and the one brought values about in Master's figure. They could see generally see characters more tinged, they judged not less than others, however, not so much moralizing but on the base of their ethical system. In their value orientation there is an outstanding role for clear conscience, truth, spiritual peace, belief, creation.

Typical feature of the religious readers' approaches is the catharsis represented by Ivan. We can perceive both the stimulating and restrictive effect of ideology. G.W. Allport's statement about the relation of religiousness and prejudice seems to be justify.

We could suppose from several points; the condition or supporter of the reception is the sense towards transcendence. It is not justified in the case of religious readers: their sense towards transcendence was rather heterogenous. There were some readers measuring the fifth dimension of the novel

with the Bible or the catechism, in the spirit of theological rationalism or Matthew Levi's dogmatism.

6/ Reading horizon, literary taste

Books of the readers, admiring the novel without reservation, are philosophical, psychological, theological and art historical ones. Books of the readers, refusing this novel, are mainly scientific, hobby ones.

In judging characters literary taste was a strong, influencing factor. Judging and interpretation differed from the others whose taste was dominated both by modern literature with high aesthetic value and good reading literature with low aesthetic value. The greatest difference was recorded in Berlioz's, Woland's, Master's, Ivan's, Margareta's and the Moscowians' interpretation. Readers of modern taste Joyce, Faulkner, Camus, Golding, Kafka, T. Mann/ suppose the representative of human values, spirit of criticism and dialects in Woland, the woman taking her emotions in Margareta, Master's intellectual inheritor in Ivan, the dogmatic in Berlioz, the victims and guiltyies of Stalinism in Moscowians. Readers of lecture-taste /fans of Mitchell, Cronin, Knight, Cusach/ could hardly feel the representative of human values or the spirit of criticism in Woland, although they felt Master talented, but unable to act dreamer and coward, Jesua a dreamer, Berlioz a bureaucrat. Readers sensitive towards humour and irony /Hasek, Ilf-Petrov, France, Swift/ excelled in Berlioz's judging from the others as considering him half-educated, bureaucrat abusing with his power, dogmatic.

Active-positive attitude towards literature was stronger influencing factor than reading-structure or literary taste. Readers with safety and pleasure principles regarded it tiring, frightening, disappointing. Although, some of them found it amusing, entertaining. We can conclude: the readers who searched living down, pleasure, escape were satisfied as well.

Reading attitude with safety and pleasure principles caused a serious, insuperable obstacle in the valuation of the novel.

7/ Descending to hell and unclouded optimism

The readers, who regarded the novel tiring, never felt their life hopeless, never lost trust in themselves. On the contrary, the readers, who often felt their life hopeless, often felt being good for nothing, used the following effect-elements: "made me fresh", "confirmed me", "made me touch", "made me act", referring to a deeper reception or a catharsis.

Unclouded optimism, self confidence, rational attitude was not efficient in the dialogue between the novel and its readers. Sense towards problems, seeking the sense of life with varying success, conscious living of uncertainty suffering /forming people's sensitive/, descending to hell are efficient conditions from the point of view of the effect.

VI. E P I L O G

We could follow the reading and reception of a novel having no solution. Readers can only meditate on it. It has no allegorical meaning can be noticed or not; can be understood or not; can be interpreted either this way or that way. However, it has an ethical subject can be discovered or faced with. Readers can find their own novel in a such open type one. Our research proved; they had found it in spite of having no archeotype of this novel. The readers, either approaching it as a love romance, a historical novel, a social picture or a moral allegory, could see something from the whole, could learn something from Bulgakov.

This novel is not suitable for getting knowledge, information, that is, readers' instruction and brainwash. However, it is suitable for readers to get to know new methods of communication, to learn the contingency of his viewpoint so to change something in their world concept. This novel is suitable /for "beginners" and "advanced" readers as well/ to be a catalyzer in the fulfilment and formation of desire, creating an ego image, a man image, a world concept and a future image.

Readers were hardly able to keep the right distance between the novel and themselves. Getting too close or too far they were unable to catch the literary text. The readers, who even have a right connection with the novel, rather judge than analyze; although we hope the novel impressed their value system. The changing of the value system occurred among the readers can be put in the analytical-summarizing category. Their analysis and view is not moralizing or psychological, but rather ontological, sociological, ethical.

Readers can be stimulated by the realized misconception as their attitude proved. We could see the rationalizing, defensive readers who perceived selectively, wrote their own novel, longed for a positive heroic and happy end. And nevertheless, the novel became an emotional-intellectual shocking experience for them as well. We could feel that the reading-reception process could be illustrated by accommodation, fight, brightening up, living.

Master and Margareta was an outstanding point, event in the Hungarian reading history. The novel became a top experience in a much higher degree than expected. The reception of the novel was a considerable consense. However, we have to mention the factors breaking this consense: The difference of literary horizon, life experience /or the lack of it/, social position /described by education, job/, sense of humour and irony, world concept, integrated individualities.

Our whole essay is the answer for the secret of success. The novel may have got in connection with important political and moralizing life experience. How long will the success take? How far is the success supported by the fashion of the novel? We aren't able to tell it. This novel filled some information-absence, supplied a historical lesson. It had an important role in arousing people's interest toward religion, the Bible and transcendence /typical for seventies and eighties/. However, its "modernness", its mysterious "turning up" unraveling of the taboo had a determinant role as well. In spite of its formal peculiarities it can be read /with more or less difficulties/ as a historical or a love novel, exposing satire and as a book ends well. It is affirming, exciting, ceasing tension. And last but not least, it was a good opportunity for facing, interpretation of life experience.

Which group is this in the Hungarian society? We cannot give an answer described by the exact sociological methods. Our answer is: The readers who filled the requirements mentioned above. This group is illustrated by the presence and lack of some social and professional groups. This research justifies Gábor Bonyhai's statement: aesthetical sensitive is more determinant than education by the society.

According to Berger and Luckmann a human person's life is not absolutely social. The reception and effect cannot be explained by only social factors not because the deficiency of sociological and psychological means. This phenomena spreads to another level where the social laws are invalid. So we are not able to explain the extraordinary, unexpected effect entirely in the case of those readers who hadn't met similar literary work or had indicated passive attitude towards literature, art. We could realize the effect of this novel is greater among the readers expecting living down, pleasure, escape than the rational readers with safety principles. Unclouded optimism didn't give the dialogue between the novel and its readers preference, however, melancholic state of mind was not an obstacle. Sensitive towards problems, seeking the sense of the life with varying success, suffering and its artistic formation, "descending to hell" conscious living of limit situations, that is: the demand of the interpretation of life existence are the efficient conditions for the effect of the novel. Or: An integrated person can join this discourse with greater chance.

In addition to primary socialization the secondary socialization had a determinant role in the reception of literary works as we could see with the example of Master and Margareta. The two types of socialization may fight with each other. This fight, struggle may be a chatartic experience. These problems made readers shock, change or confirm. They were strenghtened on the principle of "who has got, that is given". We could only feel, guess the types of chatarsis caused by the novel: personal creating; lighting new values; demonstrating our limits.

Master and Margareta's peculiarity may be the catharsis demonstrating our limits, that is, an urging for re-creating the relation of limits and liberty setting to our individuality.

OSZK

Országos Széchényi Könyvtár

OSZK

Országos Széchényi Könyvtár

963 201 233 X

OSZK-KMK 1985/1.
Munkaszám: 85167

