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Abstract

This dissertation explores the relationship between urban space and urban text according to the principles outlined by the Moscow-Tartu School of Semiotics in the 1980s and 90s. While the Petersburg Text in V.N. Toporov’s formulation has become a commonplace of Russian literary criticism, a typologically equivalent “Moscow Text” has repeatedly been dismissed. This study outlines the common arguments for dismissing a “Moscow Text,” suggests counter arguments, and proposes a model for analyzing Moscow space as a text in literary texts. The model is then used to prove the thesis that Moscow space functions as a text in M.A. Bulgakov’s Master and Margarita.

Three prominent loci within the Moscow of Master and Margarita demonstrate the textuality of urban space in literary texts: the monument to Pushkin on Tverskoi Boulevard, Margarita’s Mansion, and the Spring Ball of the Full Moon. Bulgakov cites the historical realia and the literary texts associated with Moscow’s monument to Pushkin to develop the theme of the poet in the novel. The semiotic principle of “labyrinthine Moscow” (moskovskaia putanitsa) enables Bulgakov to build the mysterious and ambivalent mansion (osobniak) that plays a central role in the paths of Margarita and Ivan throughout the novel. Turn-of-the-century photographs from the Sandunov Bathhouses uncover an additional layer of Moscow imagery at the Spring Ball of the Full Moon that reinforces plot connections between the Moscow, Iershalaim, and Phantasmagorical settings in the novel. Analyses of these loci demonstrate Bulgakov’s uses of the textual dimensions of Moscow space to represent the struggle between the humanist and those in power (vlast’) and contemplate the limits of artistic and personal freedom (volia).
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Introduction

Because Moscow space functions as a text, its hypostases in literature reveal a similar function. Moscow spaces become part of that intertextual framework from which authors and readers alike construct literary meaning. It is virtually impossible to read Dante’s *Divine Comedy* without having a spatial concept of medieval cosmology: in a similar way it is difficult to accurately read M.A. Bulgakov’s *Master and Margarita* without a concept of Moscow, not only as it exists spatially through time, in the historical sense, but as it exists in the Russian literary tradition through time, in individual works of Russian literature that draw upon one another with varying degrees of intensity.

In order to demonstrate my thesis that Moscow functions as a text in literary texts, and specifically in *Master and Margarita*, I have developed a model, a systematic approach to the study of Moscow space as a text in literary texts. I derived inspiration for my approach from a very specific body of literature on the subject, written by members of the Moscow-Tartu School of Semiotics from the early 1980s into the late 1990s. The centerpiece of this body of literary analysis is Vladimir Nikolaevich Toporov’s landmark work on the Petersburg Text of Russian literature. The development of the concept extends beyond Toporov’s own work however, to include the works of his contemporaries like Iurii Mikhailovich Lotman and Zara Grigor’evna Mints, as well as later scholars who in the first decade of the new millennium began taking a critical look at the theory, most notably in the 2005 anthology of articles edited by V. Shmid, *Sushchestvuet li peterburgskii tekst? (Does a Petersburg Text Exist?)*.

The model I develop addresses two major issues about the study of urban space as a text in Russian literature. First, I propose a new perspective on an old debate within Moscow-Tartu
Semiotics about the possible existence of a Moscow Text of Russian literature. The Petersburg Text has been accepted, while many important scholars, following the lead of Toporov, have denied the existence of a Moscow Text. I analyze some of the potential reasons for their positions, and suggest some ways of working around the theoretical obstacles they describe.

Second, I suggest that the utility of such a model should not be evaluated by its existence or non-existence, but by what it can reveal about a work of literary art. To that end I apply the model I create to analyze three important settings in *Master and Margarita*: the monument to Pushkin, Margarita’s mansion, and the Spring Ball of the Full Moon. In each case, Moscow space functions as a text in ways that influence the novel’s interpretation. The textual dimensions of the monument to Pushkin, addressed only briefly by the minor character Sashka Riukhin “the un-talented” (Сашка-бездарность), reveal a profoundly intertextual commentary on the Poet in Soviet society. Margarita’s mansion, set in the semiotic labyrinth of Moscow’s Arbat region, functions textually to develop the characters of both Margarita and Ivan as they navigate separate, but parallel paths through Stalinist Moscow. Imagery of the uniquely Muscovite Sandunov Bathhouses supplies the Spring Ball of the Full Moon with a specifically Muscovite flair; it augments the otherworldly atmosphere of the traditionally accepted prototype for the ball, Spaso House, with the native tradition of the supernatural in Russian bathhouse (баня) folklore.

My first thesis, that Moscow space acts as a text in literary texts, thus generates three additional theses about how specific Moscow spaces act as texts in *Master and Margarita*. I am able to prove each thesis based on the model I create, inspired by Moscow-Tartu semiotics. In Chapter 1, I provide a detailed discussion of the model, its genesis, and its implications; here I provide only a brief and general overview. The goal of such a cursory summary is to help the
reader follow the discussion of semiotic concepts from the linguistic sign, the simplest unit of
semiotic analysis, to the positing of a complex meta-text like the Moscow Text of Russian
literature.

In its most basic form, the proposed model facilitates the analysis of four types of urban
space in literature: the natural environment, the human environment, the built environment, and
the verbal environment.¹ To these basic categories of urban space in literature I juxtapose two
modes in which these urban spaces exist: locus versus *topos*. Finally, to account for historical,
“real” referents, as well as references to other works of literary art, I add the additional categories
of *realia* and citation. These four terms (locus, *topos*, *realia*, and citation) I borrow from the
theoretical literature of the Moscow-Tartu School. Within this matrix exist all the possible textual
dimensions of Moscow space in literature, which, once identified, reveal the potential for new
interpretations of one the twentieth centuries most important novels.

In the tables below I have provided examples, where possible from *Master and
Margarita*, of how these categories interrelate. These matrices are useful in and of themselves
only for conceptualizing and defining Moscow space in Russian literature in its various textual
dimensions: the interpretation of much of the data organized by the model appears in the body of
the dissertation. As with any theory, this model is imperfect and only worth the time it takes to
understand it if it leads to a more subtle understanding of great literature, in this case, *Master and
Margarita*.

¹ Hana Wirth-Nesher, *City Codes: Reading the Modern Urban Novel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Natural</th>
<th>Human</th>
<th>Built</th>
<th>Verbal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The park bench where Margarita sits in Alexander Garden</td>
<td>The crowd at the Varieté theatre as Woland’s test case for a question about Muscovites in general</td>
<td>Margarita’s Mansion near the Arbat</td>
<td>Malyi Vlas’evskii Lane, in the Arbat Region, in Moscow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Topos | Alexander Garden | The collective Muscovites, whose inner transformation interests Woland at the Varieté theatre | The roofline of the Arbat region | “Little Mother Moscow” “Moscow -- Third Rome” |

| Realia | The trees in front of the home at Malyi Vlas’evskii 9 in a 1906 photograph | Photographs of crowds at the monument to Pushkin at various historical celebrations | The “Roman pool” at Sandunov Bathhouses, preserved in turn-of-the-century photographs | The 1937 photograph of the banner with the last lines of Pushkin’s poem, “To Chaadaev,” hanging from the Strastnoi Monastery |

| Citation | In a literary text, any allusion to 19th century discourse about Petersburg’s stone and Moscow’s green parks | In *M&M*, any allusion to the crowds of people at the Pushkin monument, as described by Il’f and Petrov in *The Twelve Chairs* | In *M&M*, any allusion to the bathhouse described in Andrei Belyi’s *Third Symphony*, “Return” | In *M&M*, any allusion to Mayakovsky’s poem, “Jubilee” or “A Joke that Looks Like the Truth” |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Realia</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The monument to Pushkin, across from the Strastnoi Monastery in Moscow</td>
<td>1. Bulgakov’s allusion to various poems that address the monument to Pushkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The various suggested prototypes for Margarita’s Mansion</td>
<td>2. Bulgakov’s allusion to Skazka’s mansion in Belyi’s <em>Second Symphony</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The “Roman pool” in the Sandunov Bathhouses in Moscow</td>
<td>3. Bulgakov’s allusion to the “Roman pool” in Belyi’s “Return”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Realia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Panorama photographs of Moscow taken at different historical periods</td>
<td>In a literary text, any allusion to 19th century discourse about Petersburg’s stone and Moscow’s green parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. “Moscow -- Third Rome”</td>
<td>In <em>M&amp;M</em>, any allusion to the bathhouse described in Andrei Belyi’s <em>Third Symphony</em>, “Return”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topos</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bulgakov’s allusion to literary panoramas of Moscow</td>
<td>1. Bulgakov’s allusion to various poems that address the monument to Pushkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bulgakov’s inclusion of the Rome motif in <em>M&amp;M</em></td>
<td>2. Bulgakov’s allusion to Skazka’s mansion in Belyi’s <em>Second Symphony</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bulgakov’s device of creating parallels between Moscow and Iershalaim</td>
<td>3. Bulgakov’s allusion to the “Roman pool” in Belyi’s “Return”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1
The Moscow Text of Russian Literature as a Hermeneutic Tool for Analysis of Urban Space in Master and Margarita

The Moscow-Tartu School of Semiotics and the Study of Urban Space in Literature

The Moscow Text of Russian literature is really only a theory. But a theory is a tool, and, in the hands of the right craftsman, a tool can change the world. A grandiose thought perhaps, but one that researchers in the Humanities must remind themselves of (and convince others of) when their research seems arcane and pedantic in light of the utility brought to humankind through advances in the hard sciences. But that’s just the point, isn’t it? The Humanities are that branch of science that helps us remember our humanity as technology progresses in ways that threaten to magnify our collective inhumanity. As our lives intersect in increasingly sophisticated ways, our capacity for understanding the human cost and potential of those intersections must also increase. In the spirit of that logic Semiotics was born, and I hope (grandiosely, to be sure) that this dissertation contributes to one small element of its maturity.

Semiotics is the study of the linguistic sign. The linguistic sign is made up of two parts, the signifier and the signified. These two related functions are like two sides of a coin, inseparable. On the other hand, their relationship is arbitrary. In a world of possibilities, one signifier could be made up of the sounds a-p-e-l. Those sounds, having been spoken and heard would trigger, or signify, in the speaker and hearer a concept, the signified. This is the basic semiotic model for how language works to communicate meaning. On one hand, the physical sounds produced by breath, teeth, tongue and lips, a-p-e-l, have nothing to do with the fruit. However, in the context of communication between speakers of English (a code), they have everything to do with the fruit and it would be hard, if not impossible, to destroy the link
between those sounds and the concept of a type of fruit that they trigger in the brains of the participants. In the study of language, these two inseparable yet arbitrary sides of a sign must be constantly differentiated: the signifier and the signified. It is the first step towards breaking down language, in both linguistic and literary forms, into constituent parts for analysis.

It is possible to find an analogy of the relationship between a-p-e-l and the concept of a type of fruit it produces in our minds in a more non-traditionally linguistic relationship. Once my college roommate and I sat in his apartment at the kitchen table. On the shelf there was a red candle with a subtly glazed sparkling surface. We used that candle as an example to discuss the relevance of semiotics for my dissertation. Without any prior discussion of the candle, I started verbalizing what the candle meant to me, based on commonalities between my life experience and his. I noticed the sparkling red color and the shape, round like a globe. I noticed the white, new wick. I also noticed what surrounded it: a white picture frame without a picture, just a geometrical decoration. On the bottom right hand corner a snowman, complete with a black top hat, a button nose, and two eyes made out of coal, observed our conversation. Finally, a twig full of pine needles provided a backdrop for the whole decoration. Without his help, I knew that these decorations were Christmas decorations, that they probably appeared soon after Thanksgiving and that they would disappear soon after the New Year.

We went on to explicate the plurality of individual signs within the whole. What was it about these objects that communicated elements of our shared culture? They were signifiers that triggered in both of us a concept of Christmas: we understood them instantaneously, even subconsciously. In general terms, I understood them because I share and understand my friend’s
culture. In terms of semiotics, I understood them because they exist within a semiosphere, a "sign universe," out of which I construct all of the meanings in my life.

Semiotics is one of those bodies of theoretical knowledge that allow us to access, to digest, to analyze aspects of nebulous concepts like "culture" that remain difficult to define. What is culture? Well, it is everything, it is a word that has lost some of its meaning simply because it is such a useful word, because it helped us grasp something that was so basic to human existence that it easily goes unnoticed, like the proverbial fish trying to explain water. If culture may be defined as the totality of a given set of codes, texts, and signs (the semiosphere) one can analyze more objectively the relationships culture implies: material forms (signifiers) and ideal concepts (signifieds): a "scientific" definition of culture.

Having imagined the semiosphere, one readily grasps the complexity of the sign, signifier/signified relationship. Apple is an absurdly simple example, itself becoming a signified in the discussion of itself as a signifier. Concepts and the objects that signify them shift meaning-bearing capacity back and forth. Like negatively charged edges of two magnets, the more one forces them together, the more they resist stable union. For this reason it is almost absurd to analyze the linguistic sign in isolation. The creation of meaning ultimately requires the linking together of multiple signs into a coherent whole, in which each signifier stabilizes the next to create a logical progression of signified concepts: negative and positive charges in a stable, magnetic attraction: a text.

Just as in the examples of "sign," red candle and a-p-e-l, "text" does not necessarily refer to the written word on printed page. The decoration ensemble (candle, frame, snowman, twig) in the household of my college roommate is itself a text, arranged to create a definite message, an
atmosphere of holiday sentiment and seasonal change. Humans do this constantly. Lotman describes the creation of written texts as an “increase in organization”: “Итак, превращение зримого в рассказываемое неизбежно увеличивает степень организованности. Так создается текст.” His observation may also be applied to non-written texts. We organize signifiers with other signifiers to create “texts,” which then interact with other “texts” in surprising and provocative ways.

On the broadest theoretical level, this dissertation examines the creation of texts and the functions those texts serve within the semiosphere. Having developed the concept of text based on the idea of the linguistic sign and the stabilizing effect that occurs as signifiers link up with one another to create increasingly complex signified concepts, one begins to realize that texts can function as signs as well. They become signifiers in an ever increasingly complex concept, a series of signified concepts of meta-narrative proportion, a meta-text. Concerning a-p-e-l and red candles, they are minute units (signs), which participate in larger units (texts) which function within still larger units (meta-texts). One can analyze a-p-e-l in its function as a sign within one text and its role in the meta-cultural function of computers in twenty-first century American society. Likewise, one could analyze red candles, eventually demonstrating their signifying potential in the “texts” of incarnation, kenosis, syncretism and cultural relativism.

On the level of literary theory, citation plays a key role in the semiotic analysis of text creation. The creation of new literary texts works like a recycling plant. Writers have at their disposal a very limited source of signs out of which to create new texts in a quickly proliferating field of competition. They have to recycle, and in order to create new meanings they have to rely

---

2 Iu.M. Lotman, *Semiosfera*, (Saint Petersburg: Iskusstvo-SPb, 2000), 36. “And so, the transformation of what is seen into what is narrated unavoidably increases the level of organization. That is how a text is created.”
on the meanings of those who created texts before them. They cite the texts of other writers in order to expand, to recreate, to alter the meanings created in previous texts, and in so doing, they effectually expand, recreate, and alter those texts. They tell the same stories, but in new settings. They tell different stories, but in the same settings. They tell a different story in a different setting, but arrange the telling (siuzhet) in the same way. Provided with a limited number of signifiers (form), writers connect them in an infinite variety of ways to produce innovative signified concepts (content). The way they recycle the limited resources at their disposal (i.e., citation) is what enables them to say something new.

An example from Russian literature demonstrates this recycling process. The superfluous man is one of the most famous character types in Russian literature: Erast, Chatskii, Onegin, Pechorin, Rudin, Oblomov, Raskol’nikov, the list goes on. That character has been written and rewritten for 150 years and yet he remarkably remains the same. Writers set him in different settings, unfold his story in different ways, give him different names and make different women fall in love with him, and yet they all cite one another, and with each addition to the expanding pantheon of superfluous men, they all change just a little bit, each one is seen anew, reborn in the light of the newest addition. They each become a signifier, which, when in relation to one another, tell a story all of their own, a story that is complete in itself, but which awaits a new addition at any time: a text, complete in itself and yet capable of expansion through the recycling process of meaning creation: citation.

There is more to the superfluous man, however. He does not exist in a vacuum. On the contrary, a strong, idealized Russian woman always accompanies his character development. Part of the creation of the superfluous man depends on the creation of his love interest, or, perhaps
more accurately, his failed love interest. Just as the citation of superfluous men may be represented in a list of characters, so may the strong, ideal Russian woman be so represented: Liza, Sofiia (of Chatskii’s pre-Europe days), Tat’iana, Princess Mary, Natasha, Ol’ga, Sonia, etc. The superfluous man “text” is accompanied by the strong woman “text” and so closely do they intertwine that one may be tempted to view them as a single text. It should be noted that the superfluous man has been treated in more detail than the strong woman, and that the strong woman is often seen, erroneously, as a product of the superfluous man.

A similar process is at work in the most famous setting in Russian literature: St. Petersburg. The Petersburg Text is the product of an accumulation of Petersburg settings; in a similar way the superfluous man is an accumulation of citations of superfluous men characters. And, as with the superfluous man, there is a strong woman to accompany Petersburg’s masculine text: Moscow. Furthermore, just as the strong woman has often been overlooked in favor of the more dominant superfluous man, so feminine Moscow has been harder to identify, codify, analyze: there is a different and yet complementary logic at work in Moscow and, like the strong woman, it functions as a background that allows Petersburg and the superfluous man the foreground, but a foreground that is defined by and easily absorbed into the background from which it emerges.

One reason for the widespread acceptance of the superfluous man and the Petersburg Text in Russian literary criticism stems from the numerous publications about the issue that date back to the mid-nineteenth century. Pushkin himself wrote of the superfluous man, and Gogol, Belinskii, and others wrote about the special literary setting of St. Petersburg. Literary thought about Petersburg culminated in the work of V.N. Toporov, who identified and codified the
Petersburg Text of Russian literature. His writing on the subject remains a classic of Russian literary criticism. Concerning the “Moscow Text” of Russian literature, Toporov’s work provides one of the major theoretical hurdles to overcome, since he refused to see Moscow as a “text” in Russian literature. Petersburg’s uniqueness gave birth to the dense semantic unity and commonality in its literary depictions, a level of unity that, according to Toporov, descriptions of Moscow fail to achieve.³

In terms of citation, the method for studying the Petersburg Text does not differ that much from the method for studying the superfluous man. The principle of citation, the recycling of textual meaning to create new textual meaning, is at work in both the superfluous man “text” and the Petersburg Text. Perhaps Moscow fails to exhibit the level of semantic unity that Petersburg does, and yet these same principles of citation and recycling define the creation of the strong woman and Moscow. The study of citation, then, becomes a means for studying many meta-narratives: how they are created, maintained and, with each new addition, modified.

In all of these examples from Russian literature, the superfluous man, the Petersburg Text, and their less well documented foils, the strong woman and the Moscow Text, authors draw on their own experience, the realia in which they are steeped while writing, to complement and enrich their use of literary tradition. Thus the language at their disposal, which they are forced to recycle, is recombined with their experience of a particular moment in history. For example, in Prestuplenie i nakazanie (Crime and Punishment), Dostoevsky relies on the superfluous man

³ V.N. Toporov, Peterburgskii tekst russkoi literatury: Izbrannye trudy (Saint Petersburg: Iskusstvo-SPb, 2003), 278. The debate about urban spaces as texts extends well beyond the Moscow-Tartu School of Semiotics. In their preface to one of the best introductions to Western urban semiotics, The City and the Sign, Gottdiener and Lagopoulos raise questions about the textual nature of cities in general: “… urban space is not a text but a ‘pseudo-text,’ because it is produced by non-semiotic processes as well as semiotic ones and because there is not always a sender in the historically conditioned built environment.” M. Gottdiener and Alexandros Ph. Lagopoulos, The City and the Sign: An Introduction to Urban Semiotics (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), 17.
“text,” but uses it to respond to a contemporary debate in which he was heavily invested: rational egoism. So there are two criteria at work in the creation of these multilayered “texts,” these palimpsests, where one character or setting gets written and re-written again and again: a poetics of citation and a poetics of realia.

Those two phrases carry a lot of theoretical significance in terms of Russian literary criticism. Z.G. Mints, M.B. Danilevskii and A.A. Bezrodnyi developed the terms in their 1984 article, “‘Peterburgskii tekst’ i russkii simvolizm” (‘The Petersburg Text’ and Russian Symbolism,” to explain the symbolist treatment of literary tradition in the context of their own historical moment: “От традиции и тяга символистского образа Петербурга к включению в него реалий городской жизни, и, шире, -- сочетание ‘поэтики цитат’ и ‘поэтики реалий.’”

They go on to explain, “Городские реалии, как правило, сложно переплетены с образами условными и цитатными. И только соположение реалий с дешифрующим цитатным пластом текста, определение их места в нем указывают на существенные стороны семантики и функции этих реалий.” In other words, authors create their Petersburg settings based on both literary tradition and their own contemporary experience of the city.

I highlight these phrases from Mints et. al. because they indicate a structure that repeatedly appears in scholarship on setting in literature. In City Codes, comparative literature scholar Hana Wirth-Nesher developed a similar apparatus for her analysis of the modern urban novel. Wirth-Nesher writes, “I am concerned primarily with the representation of the city in the

4 Z.G. Mints, M.B. Bezrodnyi and A.A. Danilevskii, “‘Peterburgskii tekst’ i russkii simvolizm,” in Semiotika goroda i gorodskoi kul’ tury: Peterburg. Trudy po znakovym sistemam 28, ed. Iu.M. Lotman (Tartu: Tartuskii gosudarstvenny universitet, 1984), 84. “Drawing on tradition, the symbolist image of Petersburg tends to include realia of urban life, and, more broadly, a combination of a ‘poetics of citation’ and a ‘poetics of realia.’”

5 Mints, “‘Peterburgskii tekst’ i russkii simvolizm,” 84-5. “Urban realia, as a rule, are complexly interwoven with images that are conditional and cite other works.”
modern novel, with the way in which a locale that exists in the ‘real city,’ where it already serves as a cultural text, functions as a problematic site for the novel’s main concerns.”

She continues to describe how the city as a text in its own right interacts with representations of itself in a literary text: a double layering of text (11). Wirth-Nesher most explicitly states this duality as follows,

> When authors import aspects of “real” cities into their fictive reconstructions, they do so by drawing on maps, street names, and existing buildings and landmarks, enabling a character to turn the corner of a verifiable street on the map, to place him in a “realistic” setting. … On a secondary level of signification, the novelist draws on a repertoire of urban tropes inherited from previous literature, tropes that have secured a place for themselves in the literary or artistic tradition, such as the image of the underground man, the sinister connotations of a city like Venice, or the passerby.

Even though she does not use the language of Mints, her ideas echo those of Mints and the Moscow-Tartu School of Semiotics.

> While there appears to be no connection between Wirth-Nesher’s conclusions and Mints’s terminology, Mints actively participated in the Moscow-Tartu School, and it is less surprising that her ideas and the ideas of Iu.M. Lotman echo each other. Lotman's idea of “text within text” (текст в тексте) relies on a similar combination of realia and citation: “Характерным примером введения пьедестала в текст памятника является скала, на которую Фальконе поместил своего Петра Великого в Петербурге. Паоло Трубецкой, создавая проект памятника Александру III, ввел в него скульптурную цитату из Фальконе: конь был

---


7 Wirth-Nesher, *City Codes*, 11.

8 Wirth-Nesher, *City Codes*, 10.
Lotman goes on to describe the playfulness of Trubetskoi’s version and how it relies on Falconet’s statue for its meaning: Peter’s horse jumps off the cliff over the Neva, while Alexander’s comes to a lumbering stop at the edge of an abyss.

Lotman explicates not only the playful citation, but the way in which the “real” city is incorporated into the artistic sculpture.

In both cases, the placement of the sculpture in the “real” city (material reality) becomes part of the meaning of the sculpted horse on the edge of a precipice (artistic reality, citation).

Trubetskoi’s sculpture adds the element of citation, when it includes elements from Falconet’s “artistic reality.” Trubetskoi’s sculpture, then, may be productively analyzed in terms of its “poetics of citation” as well as its “poetics of realia,” corresponding to Lotman’s terms “real” and “conditional” (реальное/условное).

The result of the principle of the “combination of a ‘poetics of citation’ and a ‘poetics of realia’” is that Petersburg as a literary setting remains static, while the development of its “text,”

9 Lotman, Semiosfera, 66. “A characteristic example of introducing a pedestal into the text of a monument is the cliff on which Falconet placed Peter the Great in Petersburg. Paolo Trubetskoi, while drafting his monument to Alexander III, included a sculptural citation from Falconet: the horse was placed on a cliff.”

10 Lotman, Semiosfera, 67. “The playful moment is intensified not only by the fact that these elements are from one perspective included in the text and, from another, excluded from it, but that in both cases the degree of conditionality differs from the degree inherent to the text itself: when figures of baroque sculpture climb or gallop off a pedestal, or crawl out of a painting’s frame, this underscores rather than diminishes the fact that one of them belongs to material reality while the other belongs to artistic reality.”
the way it accrues signifiers and the meanings they create, is dynamic. On the synchronic plane, *realia* of the city are interpreted in terms of the literary tradition and vice versa, while on the diachronic plane, the text, comprised of *realia* from multiple periods and the constantly agglutinating citations, changes. Critic Terrence Hawkes summarizes Tzvetan Todorov’s position on the subject: “Each literary text contains a potentiality for transforming the whole system that it embodies and that has produced it: it does not merely rehearse preordained categories and combine them in novel ways. On the contrary, it modifies what it consists of.”\(^1\) To refer back to the superfluous man “text,” we read Erast as a dramatically different character after having read Chatskii, Onegin, Pechorin, and Rudin.

What differentiates setting as text from character as text is that settings correspond to a more permanent reality. Without a doubt, Erast, Chatskii, and Onegin have their prototypes in real people observed by their author-creators, but those people no longer exist in the material world, as Petersburg and Moscow do. As a result, one more aspect of the *realia/citation* combination is a tangible effect on the city itself: “The interaction of city as text and representation of city in the literary text is most dramatic when it doubles back upon itself, when invented words themselves may be sought in the physical cityscape. Tours of London based on Sherlock Holmes…. The city text is a palimpsest, therefore, of the history of its representation in art, religion, politics – in any number of cultural discourses.”\(^2\) To Wirth-Nesher’s list we may add the tours one can take to discover Pushkin’s Petersburg, Dostoevsky’s Petersburg, and, not least among these, Bulgakov’s Moscow. In terms of semiotics, the process parallels that of the semiosphere:


\(^{12}\) Wirth-Nesher, *City Codes*, 11.
In this sense, setting, because of its permanence, provides a unique glimpse into the semiotic processes at work in the creation of literature and the continuation of literary tradition. Space is a signifier that, when ordered a certain way, becomes a text that authors can cite, and when they do, the space-signifier itself is modified.

Up to this point I have provided a theoretical background for discussing urban setting in literature as a “text.” The culmination of this theoretical background is the combination of a “poetics of realia and a poetics of citations.” One difficulty arises, however, when one turns to defining which realia and which citations belong to an urban setting and which do not. The “real” urban landscape is complex. It is much more than buildings, parks and streets; it is also passers-by, parasols, parades, and poodles. It is a fractured totality, a constantly changing aggregate of individual entities, a locus as well as a topos composed of multiple loci. The linguistic city is no different: it is the melting pot of languages and cultures, a seething ocean of information. Lotman describes it thus:

Город, как сложный семиотический механизм, генератор культуры, может выполнять эту функцию только потому, что представляет собой котел текстов и кодов, разноустроенных и гетерогенных, принадлежащих разным языкам и разным уровням. Именно принципиальный семиотический

13 Lotman, *Semiosfera*, 320. “Here one discovers an important principle of a person’s cultural thought: real space becomes an iconic image of the semiosphere -- a language, in which diverse non-spatial meanings are expressed, but a semiosphere that, in its turn, transforms the real spatial world surrounding a person, into its own image and likeness.”
In this passage Lotman makes clear the complexity of a city’s semiotic function. In order to create a framework from which to discuss the city’s multiple dimensions, I will propose several categories to help identify different types of urban space in terms of both realia and citation. The first pair of terms is used in Moscow-Tartu scholarship on urban space to make the distinction between space that functions as a topos and space that functions as a locus. The Mandel'shtam scholar Iu.L. Freidin describes the binary pair well, “Место действия может быть существенно меньше ‘топоса’ (собор, улица, дом, квартира, комната) – тогда мы будем именовать его ‘локусом’ -- и не ‘приписано’ внутри стихотворения к какому-либо

14 Iu.M. Lotman, “Simvolika Peterburga i problemy semiotiki goroda,” in Semiotika goroda i gorodskoi kul'tury: Peterburg, Trudy po znakovym sistemam 28, ed. Iu.M. Lotman (Tartu: Tartuskii gosudarstvennyi universitet, 1984), 35-36. “The city, as a complex semiotic mechanism, as a generator of culture, can fulfill this function only because it is a crucible of variously structured and heterogenous texts and codes that belong to various languages and levels. It is primarily this principal semiotic polyglotism of any city that makes it a field of diverse semiotic collisions that under other conditions would be impossible. ... The source of these semiotic collisions is not only the synchronic juxtaposition of various types of semiotic formations, but also diachrony: architectural structures, urban rites and ceremonies, the map of the city itself, the names of streets and a thousand other relics of past epochs act like programmatic codes, continually generating anew the texts of the historical past.”

15 Some readers may find this distinction confusing since both locus (an English borrowing from Latin) and topos (a Greek word) mean approximately the same thing. In this dissertation I use them to describe different types of space. A locus refers to a specific point or set of points within a larger space. A topos refers to a more complex space, in which distinct loci may exist simultaneously. The categories are not mutually exclusive: Margarita’s mansion is a locus within the topos of Moscow’s Arbat region; likewise, the Arbat is a locus within the topos of Moscow. Moscow itself is a locus within the topos of Russia. These two terms facilitate one of the confusing principles of space: it is infinitely divisible. While this is a distinction that I am emphasizing for this study, examples of similar usage (in addition to the quote from Iurii Freidin, below) may be found in the secondary literature quoted in this dissertation (cf. Levkiesvskiaia, “Moskva v zerkale pravoslavnykh legend,” 829, in this dissertation p. 20; Tsiv’ian, “Rasskali strashoe, dali tochnyi adres...,” 600, in this dissertation p. 26). Also see I.S. Veselova, “‘Logika moskovskoi putanity’,” (na materiale moskovskoi ‘neskazochnoi’ prozy kontsa XVIII -- nachala XX v.),” in Moskva i moskovskii tekst russkoi kul'tury, ed. G.S. Knabe (Moscow: RGGU, 1998), 100.
The distinction is important for sorting out descriptions of spaces within Moscow that reflect the semiotic nature of the whole from panoramic visions of the entire city: in *Master and Margarita* the interior of apartment № 50 (a locus) is just as much a part of the Moscow Text as Woland’s panoramic view from the Pashkov Mansion (Moscow viewed as a *topos*).

The distinction is also important for establishing the relationship of the city to its surroundings. Moscow can be a locus within Russia, but it can also stand in for the rest of the all-Russian *topos*. For most of the twentieth century Moscow is both a capital city and a synecdoche for the empire.

И в легендах о чудесном спасении Москвы и России в годы войны страна и ее столица не отделяются друг от друга, а воспринимаются как органическое целое, так и в легендах о людях, подпольно сохранявших живую жизнь православной церкви, Москва не выделяется из общерусского топоса. Она – один из связанных друг с другом сосудов, образовавших единую кровеносную систему православной жизни в годы атеистического террора.

In these religious and patriotic senses, Moscow is synonymous with the country it symbolizes, a *topos*. However, the twentieth century also brought to Moscow the distinction of “new Babylon,” an epithet that decisively separates it into a locus within and distinct from the *topos* of Russia.

---

16 Iu.L. Freidin, “Zametki o khronotope moskovskikh tekstov Mandel’shtama,” in “‘Moskovskii tekst’ russkoi kul’tury,” *Lotmanovskii sbornik II*, eds. M.L. Gasparov et al. (Moscow: RGGU, 1997), 707. “Setting might be substantially smaller than a ‘*topos*’ (a cathedral, a street, a house, an apartment, a room) -- then we will call it a ‘locus’ -- one not ascribed within the poem to one or another toponym.”

17 E.E. Levkievskaia, “Moskva v zerkale pravoslavnykh legend,” in “‘Moskovskii tekst’ russkoi kul’tury,” *Lotmanovskii sbornik II*, eds. M.L. Gasparov et al. (Moscow: RGGU, 1997), 829. “In legends about the miraculous salvation of Moscow and Russia in the war years the country and its capital are not divided from one another, but are perceived as an organic whole. Similarly, in legends about people who preserved the living life of the Orthodox Church underground, Moscow is not distinguished from the common Russian *topos*. Moscow is one blood vessel connected to many others, forming a single circulatory system of Orthodox life during the years of atheistic Terror.”

18 Levkievskaia, “Moskva v zerkale pravoslavnykh legend,” 834.
In addition to the locus/topos opposition, I propose to borrow four categories from Hana Wirth-Nesher to deal with different types of urban space Lotman references.\textsuperscript{19} She defines them as follows:

1. \textit{The ‘natural’ environment} refers ... to the inclusion or intervention of nature in the built environment” (my emphasis).
2. \textit{The built environment} refers to city layout, architecture, and other manmade objects such as trams, curtain walls, and roofs” (my emphasis).
3. \textit{The human environment} does not refer to the characters whose actions or thoughts constitute the main movement of the plot, but rather to human features that constitute setting, such as commuter crowds, street peddlers, and passersby” (my emphasis).
4. \textit{The verbal environment} refers to both written and spoken language: the former includes the names of streets and places, and any other language that is visually inscribed into the cityscape -- advertisements, announcements, or graffiti” (my emphasis).\textsuperscript{20}

The interaction of these six different types of space, when multiplied by the possibility of their existence as both \textit{realia} and citations in multiple literary works, reveals the complexity of an urban text in literature and provide useful matrices that make it possible to discuss the poetics of citations and \textit{realia} behind the imposing Moscow Text of Russian literature.\textsuperscript{21}

Finally, the concept of \textit{realia} demands further clarification. What qualifies as \textit{realia} and what exactly is the relationship between \textit{realia} and their textual incarnation? Or to phrase the question in another way, what is the typological relationship between \textit{realia} and literary citations? To help clarify my use of these terms I suggest a comparison to the more commonly used word, “prototype.” In general, critics use “prototype” to discuss the real life referent(s)

\textsuperscript{19} Iu.M. Lotman, “Simvolika Peterburga i problemy semiotiki goroda,” 35-6 (see quote above).

\textsuperscript{20} Wirth-Nesher, \textit{City Codes}, 11-13.

\textsuperscript{21} See the tables on p. 6 for examples of how these matrices can organize space in its textual dimensions.
depicted in a character. For example, when Pushkin published the 1823 lyric poem, “Demon,” a rumor spread that the prototype for the demon of the poem’s title was A.N. Raevskii, a rumor Pushkin hoped to squelch by directing attention to the more substantive side of the poem.\(^\text{22}\) In the case of Bulgakov’s Margarita, scholars have posited many prototypes, including Bulgakov’s wives as well as literary prototypes like Gretchen, the heroine of Faust.\(^\text{23}\) This last example demonstrates my distinction between realia and citation: Bulgakov’s wives belong to the category of realia, whereas Gretchen belongs to the category of citation. Both are a type of citation; realia have their source in “the language of life,” citations have their source in other literary works.\(^\text{24}\)

In her article “Gde sprialalsia lev?” (“Finding the Hidden Lion”), M.O. Chudakova neatly summarizes the set of theoretical problems and possibilities posed by the critical analysis of prototypes. In particular, she relies on the insights of the noted Chekhov scholar A.P. Chudakov. I reproduce some of the quotes she comments on here because of their significance to this topic:


\(^{23}\) Margarita’s character is very complex; I do not intend this treatment as comprehensive. I only wish to mention some of the more well known and generally accepted prototypes in order to illustrate my use of the terms ’realia’ and ’citation.’ Spaces in Master and Margarita are just as problematic as character. An entire cottage industry fills the internet and Russia’s bookshelves with a range of literature devoted to “Булгаковская Москва” (“Bulgakov’s Moscow”).

предметного ареала? И каким особенностям поэтики этот отбор отвечает?25

Thus in working with both realia and citations, the importance is not the source itself, but what the author does with the source, how “the selection” works to create a system of aesthetics, a “poetics” in the new text.

Building on that idea Chudakov writes,

“Ситуации реальные и вымышленные, лица действительные и персонажи, предметы эмпирические и художественные существуют в пространстве “Евгения Онегина” на равных правах, диффундируют, свободно переходя из одной действительности в другую” -- и это “создает постоянно вспыхивающую между разными точками текста вольтову дугу высокого напряжения.”26

Realia and citations work together in this way, on equal footing, to create many of the tensions and meanings in a literary work of art.

Chudakova also notes the problem of the difference in how realia and literary citations exist for the critic who analyzes character: “... разница между прототипом и источником цитаты существуетена. Она в том, что цитируемый литературный текст -- неподвижен, он -- один и тот же для всех, кто к нему обратится; реальное же лицо, к которому отсылает нас

---

25 A.P. Chudakov, “Poetika i prototipy,” in V tvorcheskoi laboratorii Chekhova, eds. L.D. Opul’skaia, Z.S. Papernyi, and S.E. Shatalov (Moscow: Nauka, 1974), 182; as cited in M.O. Chudakova, “Gde spriatalsia lev?” in Novye materialy i issledovaniia po istorii russkoii kul’tury, vyp. 05. I vremia i mesto: Istoriko-filologicheskii sbornik k shestidesiatiletiiu Aleksandra L’vovicha Osipovata, eds. Ronald Vroon et al., (Moscow: Novoe izdatel’svo, 2008), 490. “The question of prototypes always begets an argument: “copied” or transformed? There is no cause for argument. The artist, of course, “copies” ..., but also “transforms,” organizing the material of reality according to the laws of their artistic world. The questions that should be asked are different. Which features of the prototype has the author borrowed? Which moments of the prototypical situation? Which details of the target locality? And to which particulars of the artist’s poetics does this selection correspond?”

26 A.P. Chudakov, “Kakoi vorotnik byl u Evgeniia Onegina,” in Vestnik Literaturnogo instituta im. A.M. Gor’kogo, ed. E.A. Keshokova (Moscow: Izd-vo Literaturnogo in-ta im. Gor’kogo, 1999), 7-9; as cited in M.O. Chudakova, “Gde spriatalsia lev?” 491. “‘Situations both real and imagined, real people and characters, objects both empirical and artistic exist in the space of Eugene Onegin with equal rights, they diffuse, freely going back and forth from one reality into the other’ -- and that ‘creates between different points of the text a constantly sparking arc of high tension voltage.’”
автор, известно разным читателям в заведомо разной степени.”27 As this quote makes evident, Chudakova restricts her theoretical focus in this article to the study of character. However, her comment has important implications for the study of spatial prototypes (realia and citations) as well. Space is more textual than character, because the essence of space is more easily captured, preserved, “textualized” in the form of photographs. In my approach to the study of spatial realia in literary text, the photograph becomes the textual link between the chronotope of critic and the author, the captured realia, and a source which I argue is nearly as stable as that of the literary text. It is in this sense that I argue that realia and citations may be considered typologically equivalent categories for analysis of the Moscow Text of Russian literature.

**On the Existence of a Moscow Text**

The final question needing consideration concerns the actual existence of a Moscow Text. The Petersburg Text has been clearly defined, for the most part by V.N. Toporov, while the existence of a Moscow Text of Russian literature is still debated. The debate centers around two aspects of Toporov’s work on the Petersburg Text. First, Toporov explicitly writes that a Moscow Text does not exist.

Во всяком случае единство описаний Петербурга в Петербургском тексте не исчерпывается исключительно климатическими, топографическими, пейзажно-ландшафтными, этнографическими-бытовыми и культурными характеристиками города (в отличие, напр., от описаний

27 М.О. Чудакова, “Gde spriatalsia lev?” 492. “The difference between a prototype and the source of a citation is substantive. The cited literary text is immovable, it is one and the same for everyone who reads it; the real person to whom an author may refer is knowable to different readers to admittedly different degrees.”
This claim could, perhaps, be explained away in light of new scholarship, were it not for the more theoretically substantive definition Toporov provides for the Petersburg Text. It is an “aggregate of texts” (совокупность текстов) marked by an unusual level of “semantic connectivity” (семантическая связанность): “… созданный ‘совокупностью текстов русской литературы’ ’петербургский текст’ обладает всеми теми специфическими особенностями, которые свойственны текстам вообще и – прежде всего – семантической связанностью …,, хотя он писался (и будет писаться) многими авторами.”

Numerous scholars have approached these barriers to the definition of the Moscow Text only to back away from asserting its existence as a full “text” in the Lotmanian sense. For example, N.E. Mednis writes,

Таким образом, рассматривая отдельные составляющие того, что иногда исследователи решаются назвать Московским текстом русской литературы, мы обнаруживаем некоторую общность в системе кодификации, но именно произведения, рисующие, казалось бы, единообразную Москву периода кризиса, ясно показывают, что этой общности явно недостает для того, чтобы можно было говорить о единой системе художественного языка и той степени связанности субтекстов, которые вкупе только и позволяют признать в том или ином

28 V.N. Toporov, Peterburgskii tekst russkoi literature: Izbrannye trudy, 278. “In any event, the unity of Petersburg’s descriptions in the Petersburg Text cannot be exhausted solely by the climatic, topographical, landscape, ethnographic, or cultural characteristics of the city (unlike, for example, the descriptions of Moscow from Karamzin to Andrei Belyi, which do not, however, form a separate “Moscow” text of Russian literature).”

29 V.N. Toporov, Peterburgskii tekst russkoi literature: Izbrannye trudy, 78. “... created by an ‘aggregate of texts of Russian literature’ ‘the Petersburg Text’ possesses all of the specific features inherent of texts in general and -- more than anything else -- semantic connectivity... , although it has been written (and will be written) by many authors.”
Mednis’ scholarship provides an example of the type of logic that dismisses the Moscow Text based on the “semantic connectivity” (семантическая связанность) argument from Toporov. Other scholars bypass the question, acknowledging methodological problems before going on to the body of their analysis. T.V. Tsiv’ian writes,

аКасается ли это только Петербурга и ограничивается ли, при всей исключительности Петербурга для русской традиции, эвентуальный текст города только петербургским; только ли в Петербурге и петербургском тексте топография и история оказались пресуществленными в идею разрешаемого на нравственном уровне конфликта между жизнью и смертью, и есть ли другие основания для постулирования текста города – мы не решаемся ни ставить эти вопросы, ни отвечать на них. Во всяком случае, в любом городе могут быть семиотически отмеченные “хронотопически” локусы, и Москву с подмосковными обойти нельзя, хотя, повторяем, мы твердо остаемся в стороне от теоретической проблемой московского текста.

Tsiv’ian insists on the semiotic nature of Moscow space, but finds a semiotic analysis possible without insisting on its textual nature.

30 N.E. Mednis, Sverkhteksty v russkoj literature: Uchebnoe posobie (Novosibirsk: Izd-vo NGPU, 2003), 69-70. “When considering individual components of what researchers occasionally decide to name a Moscow Text of Russian literature, we do discover a certain commonality in the codification system. However, works that depict what might seem to be a united image of Moscow at a time of crisis clearly demonstrate that this commonality obviously falls short of creating a single system of artistic language; it lacks that level of connectivity among its subtexts that, taken as a whole, allows one to recognize in one way or another the presence in literature of a completely formed meta-text.”

31 T.V. Tsivian, “Rasskazali strashnoe, dali tochnyi adres…,” in “Moskovskii tekst’ russkoi kul’tury,” Lotmanovskii sbornik II, eds. M.L. Gasparov et al. (Moscow: RGGU, 1997), 600. “Does this only concern Petersburg? Is an eventual urban text, given the exceptional nature of Petersburg for the Russian tradition, limited only to a Petersburg Text? Was it only in Petersburg that topography and history were transubstantiated into an idea of ethical conflict between life and death? Are there other bases for postulating an urban text? We have not resolved either to ask or answer these questions. In any case, semiotically marked “chronotopic” loci may exist in any city, and Moscow with its suburban regions must not be overlooked, although, we repeat that we remain strictly unengaged in the theoretical problem of the Moscow Text.”
L.F. Katsis likewise acknowledges the theoretical debate about the Moscow Text and also finds a way around it:

Когда речь идет о том, что “московский текст” русской литературы действительно существует, сразу же возникают возражения. Действительно, вряд ли для Москвы можно указать те один или два начальных текста, с которых все началось. … Естественно возникла необходимость “пересадить” русскую литературу “петербургского периода” на принципиально новую московскую почву коммунистической эпохи. В этой связи и появляется возможность поставить вопрос о становлении нового “московского текста” русской литературы. А анализ включенности “старой” дореволюционной традиции в новый “советский московский текст” позволит … понять, чего хотели его созидатели.32

By relying on the semiotic shifts that occurred when the capital moved from Petrograd to Moscow, Katsis finds a way to pose the question in a different way and, in so doing, find significant “semantic connectivity” in a “Soviet Moscow Text.”

Within my emphasis and redefinition of text according to a poetics of citation and poetics of realia I propose my own method of circumventing Toporov’s negation of the Moscow Text and his theoretical requirement of “semantic connectivity.” There are several benefits to using “a combination of poetics of realia” and a “poetics of citation” instead of “semantic connectivity” as the basic requirement for the analysis of an urban text. First, it is less subjective. What is the quota for asserting that something is “semantically connected”? When do signs cease to be

---

32 L.F. Katsis, “Konstruktivistskaia Moskva I. Sel’vinskogo i I. Erenburga,” in “‘Moskovskii tekst’ russkoi kul’tury,” Lotmanovskii sbornik II, eds. M.L. Gasparov et al. (Moscow: RGGU, 1997), 729. “Objections arise immediately whenever discussion turns towards the question of whether or not a ‘Moscow Text’ of Russian literature really exists. Indeed, it is unlikely that for Moscow one can identify those one or two initial texts from which everything began. ... Naturally the need arose to “transplant” Russian literature of ‘the Petersburg period’ onto the fundamentally new Muscovite soil of the communist epoch. Thus the opportunity to pose the question of the formation of a new ‘Moscow Text’ of Russian literature appears. But an analysis of the inclusion of the “old” pre-revolutionary tradition in the new ‘Soviet Moscow Text’ permits the possibility of understanding what its creators wanted.”
“semantically connected”? Is it possible to conceive of signs that, when placed in proximity, are not “semantically connected”? Toporov’s phrase indicates that there is a sliding scale of “semantic connectivity”; at what point on the scale does, to use Lotman’s words, an “amorphous collection of signs” become a text? Toporov provides no tool for objectively quantifying the primary defining feature of “text.”

Second, citation provides a more precise description of the type of connection under analysis. A citation is a connection, and a semantic one. Within this more specific type of connection the scholar can identify its types and relationships to the realia of the city, “citations from the language of life,” and the city’s hypostasis in literary tradition. A more specific definition allows for more objectively quantifiable evidence. While citations are, perhaps, more quantifiable than connections, I maintain that quantity alone is an inadequate criterion for bestowing the status of text on an aggregation of cultural signs. Short, compact texts are no more and no less textual than long, diffused texts.

Thirdly, the combination of a poetics of citation and a poetics of realia provides a model for “text” which allows for the finite and yet expanding nature of texts of this magnitude. As demonstrated by the passage from Todorov, the addition of each new text, or text functioning on the level of sign within a larger meta-text, changes the text to which it is added. The beauty of this principle is that it implies that Erast, Chatskii, and Onegin completed a “text” before the


34 In Civilization and its Discontents Freud compares the mind and memory to the history of Rome. He imagines the ability to see simultaneously every building and architectural structure that ever existed. In so doing he begins to set forth an analogy for the way memory and the repression of memory works. Instead of only seeing the church of Santa Maria sopra Minerva one would see as well the temple on the ruins of which the church is built. He describes the city’s existence as a palimpsest, arguing that the vision of sequentially replacing old memories with new ones is false. History and memory, history’s analogue in the human mind, are not sequential but cumulative. While Freud abandoned his attempts to create out of Rome an analogy for the individual mind, his remarks apply to the creation of city texts and invite provocative thought on their potential as an analogy for the collective mind (42-45).
addition of Pechorin. However, when Pechorin was added, the text was irrevocably changed, it became a new text, complete, at least until the addition of Rudin, and then later, Raskol’nikov, etc. In terms of the Petersburg Text, there is no need either to create a canon of artistic texts that belong to it or sustain the inevitable arguments that accompany the inclusion of one or another work in any canon.

The question of a canonical “aggregate of texts” (совокупность текстов) requires more detailed commentary. The development of the Petersburg Text in terms of a canonical list of literary works stems from Toporov’s classic analysis. He refers to individual units as “concrete texts” that act as a “substratum in relation to the Petersburg text.”35 This relationship between the individual literary work and the meta-text, is most often expressed through an “aggregate of texts” that expresses a larger concept, held together by “semantic connectivity.”

Almost immediately, however, scholars noticed that not all texts exhibited the same level of “connectivity,” although they contributed to the meta-text. Mints, Danilevskii and Bezrodnyi write of the “core” of the Petersburg Text, listing works like Mednyi vsadnik (The Bronze Horseman), “Pikovaia dama” (“The Queen of Spades”), Peterburgskie povesti (The Petersburg Tales), Bednye liudi (Poor Folk), Dvoinik (The Double), Zapiski iz podpol’ia (Notes from the Underground), Prestuplenie i nakazanie (Crime and Punishment), Idiot (The Idiot), and Podrostok (A Raw Youth). They go on to suggest that The Bronze Horseman, Crime and Punishment, The Idiot, and A Raw Youth form a “core of the core,” while other works, cited less often, exist on the “border” of the Petersburg Text: “Dom v Kolomne” (“A House in Kolomna”), the urban lyrical poetry of Nekrasov, some works by Apollon Grigor’ev, the publicist writings of

Chaadaev, the Slavophiles, and the pochvenniki (“Native Soil” movement). One does away with the necessity for positing a “core,” a “core of the core,” and “peripheral” texts within an “aggregate of texts” when defining the Petersburg Text according to its combination of a poetics of realia and citation. Any work of art may cite the text of the city (realia) and/or its artistic incarnation with differing degrees of intensity: they nonetheless contribute to its totality. Debate about which texts belong to the canon simply obscures the more important questions about the manner in which, as opposed to the frequency with which, artists use realia and citation from Petersburg (or Moscow) to recycle tradition in the creation of new meaning.

One must be careful not to go too far in the opposite direction, however, from the exclusivity of the canon to a pastiche created by every conceivable mention of the city or some aspect of its existence. By emphasizing the combination of a poetics of realia and a poetics of citation, one avoids this looser definition exemplified by Freidin’s treatment of Mandel’shtam’s “Moscow texts” (московские тексты). Freidin’s work tends towards the analysis of a theme or motif within Mandelshtam’s oeuvre as opposed to Mandelshtam’s interaction with a meta-text. He defines as “Moscow texts” any of Mandelshtam’s poems which directly mention the capital as well as any poems in which the capital is present tangentially or by implication:

Легко атрибутировать как московские такие тексты, где описывается, упоминается или вспоминается прямо или косвенно (например, как столица) поименованная Москва или даются какие-либо ее характерные приметы. … Остальные два десятка московских текстов в этой книге стихов приходится

---

36 Mints, “‘Peterburgskii tekst’ i russkii simvolizm,” 81.
Freidin’s definition (which does not purport to define a Moscow Text, but only “Moscow texts”) indicates the definition of a theme, or image, but fails to point out the connections between those texts and literary tradition, the type of relationship which lies at the root of the concept of Petersburg Text, the superfluous man, and, for our purposes, the Moscow Text of Russian literature. Freidin discusses Moscow in Mandelshtam, not the Moscow Text. His work exemplifies the opposite pole of Toporov’s canon in terms of defining an urban text. He finds texts, but not a Text.

E.E. Levkievskaiia describes another weakness in the “canonical” approach to the Petersburg Text of Russian literature. She imagines identifying a “corpus of texts” (корпус текстов, compare to Toporov’s “aggregate of texts”) but fails to find within that “corpus of texts” a distinct Moscow Text and concludes that the task is technically daunting and semiotically meaningless. Levkievskaiia does, however, find the Moscow Text in the Orthodox folklore she analyzes. She abandons the search for a “corpus of texts” in favor of what she describes as a “semiotic” approach. Her analysis reveals an archetypal resonance that unifies citations of Moscow according to a combination of the realia in which the subjects of her analysis live and the way in which they cite traditional texts about Moscow. The unity expresses itself in three related “bundles” (пучки): Moscow as Third Rome, Moscow as Kitezh, and Moscow as

---

37 Iu.L. Freidin, “Заметки о хронотопе московских текстов Мандельштама,” 716. “One may easily categorize poems as Moscow texts if Moscow is named, described, mentioned, or recalled directly or indirectly (for example, as the capital) or if some characteristic features are given. ... The remainder of the twenty or so Moscow texts in this collection of verse must be categorized only by indirect reference, by context, subtext, biographical data, and the witness of memoirs.”


Babylon. These three contradictory spaces exist simultaneously, much as a palimpsest, and their unity results from people making sense of the *realia* of the Moscow in which they live through literary and cultural tradition. It is this form of citation, in which language from literary tradition is excerpted to become a sign in a new text making sense of different *realia*, that makes it possible for Levkievskaiia to identify a Moscow Text.

Fourthly, by focusing on the type of connection, in contradistinction to the quantity of connection, one does away with a lot of terminological obscurity. One literary text may contribute to numerous meta-texts of Russian literature quite independently. *War and Peace* is the best example. Tolstoy’s masterpiece undoubtedly cites elements of the Petersburg Text, and yet it is not included in the traditional canon of the nineteenth century Petersburg Text. Were a Petersburg Text and a Moscow Text to be defined according to the “combination of a ‘poetics of *realia*’ and a ‘poetics of citation’,” *War and Peace* would contribute to both, as well as to what Toporov defines as a “subtext” of the Petersburg Text, the “comparative Petersburg-Moscow” text.

Not only does citation resolve some of the issues around the terminology of Petersburg, Moscow, and comparative texts, it answers some of the terminological questions that arise in the study of the city in literature: Moscow can act as “myth,” image, leitmotif, or theme. For example, Moscow has been analyzed under the rubric of “Moscow Myth.” Scholars may analyze myths according to the mythologems from which myths create meaning out of universal existence. Likewise, scholars analyze texts to find patterns in the recycling of particular language

---

40 What Levkievskaiia calls “bundles” may be productively compared to French semiotician Greimas’ term “isotopies” (Greimas 1986).

41 Toprov, *Mif, ritual, simvol, obraz*, 327n20.
to create meaning out of the experiences of daily life. The categories are not mutually exclusive; myths are texts in their own right, while texts may certainly become mythical in meaning, and yet a distinction must be drawn.

The “increased organization,” to use Lotman’s terms, we know as the Petersburg Text is caused by a series of citations. When one discusses the Myth of Petersburg, one discusses mythemes like the power of nature (floods, swamp, water) and the ability or inability of human will to conquer it (Peter the Great’s “taming” of the Finnish swamp), the overlay of Western reason and structure over Eastern intuition and chaos, and the very nature of empire and power. When one discusses the Petersburg Text, one deals with citations like Andrei Belyi’s “Bronze Guest,” who “dooms irrevocably” and pours white-hot liquid metal into the veins of Dudkin, strengthening his revolutionary resolve.

Furthermore, shifting focus to the combination of realia and citation allows for a Moscow Text of Russian literature, as opposed to a Moscow Text of Russian culture, one more level of terminology that has impeded the study of the city in Russian literature. While the distinction seems minor, since literature is inevitably a subset of culture, by limiting the types of citations one deals with one can identify the Moscow Text’s reflection specifically within the literary tradition. In this way the Moscow Text of Russian literature can be treated as the typological equivalent of the Petersburg Text of Russian literature and their differences analyzed and interpreted. The practice of insisting on a Moscow Text of Russian culture creates a false typological disparity that inhibits a clear comparison of the two meta-texts, since culture must refer to a totality and literature to a subset within that totality.
In theory, my model of the Moscow Text of Russian literature is complete. I’ve shown the roots of the Moscow Text of Russian literature in semiotics and in Russian literary criticism, identified the challenges to its identification and acceptance in the scholarly community, presented solutions to those challenges through a synthesis and reanalysis of the extant thought on the subject, and presented arguments for the increased conceptual utility and accuracy that those solutions provide. Its usefulness, however, remains to be demonstrated. What does the Moscow Text do for the student of Russian literature?

**The Lock to be Picked**

I like to think of the literary critic as a savvy thief, the secret pockets of his spotless tuxedo filled with elaborately shaped wires, vials of potion with which to read invisible ink, and latex gloves to ensure a sanitary escape, all with which to create the illusion of a crime (reading) that happened of its own accord. When presented with a particular literary lock to pick, the critic must have at his disposal the right wire. The Moscow Text is my wire, and having found it, I must confess I jammed it into many locks it did not fit. Through trial and error, I have, however, found a lock that wants picking, one that has significantly influenced the shape of the Moscow Text of Russian literature.

*Master and Margarita* is the apex of Bulgakov’s oeuvre, the culmination of his life’s work. The artistic, historical, social, political, theological and moral questions Bulgakov posed in *Belaia guardiia (The White Guard), Sobach’e serdtse (Heart of a Dog), Rokovye iaipta (The Fateful Eggs), Batum (Batum)*, and nearly every other major prose and dramatic work are refined
and answered in *Master and Margarita* with the maturity and clarity only achieved at the end of a life. In some ways, every work Bulgakov wrote was a draft for *Master and Margarita*.

work provides important, although not comprehensive, details about the realia and citations behind Bulgakov’s Moscow in Master and Margarita.

Master and Margarita reveals the peak of Bulgakov’s creativity in terms of setting. The novel is set in a complicated tripartite blend of historical Iershalaïm, contemporary Moscow of the 1920s and 1930s, and a phantasmagorical space that transcends the traditional time-space continuum. Bulgakov successfully creates a unity of these three distinct and differentiated settings, drawing from his experience in creating the historical Kiev of The White Guard, the contemporary Moscow of Heart of a Dog, and the fantastical Moscow of The Fateful Eggs.

Bulgakov’s mastery is exhibited by the fact that critics agree on the unity of the settings, but the exact nature of their unity escapes scholarly consensus. What unifies these three spaces? This is the lock to be picked, the literary puzzle to be explained without reducing the complexity of the artistry. It is the thing intuitively sensed, and, based on its seemingly inexplicable nature, the thing that expands the boundaries of our capacity to explain.

A brief summary of different approaches to the problems of setting in Master and Margarita demonstrates the complexity of the problem. The body of the novel is composed of three types of space: Iershalaïm space, phantasmagorical space, and Moscow space. The epilogue rearranges these spaces, creating a unique space of its own. While scholars tend to agree on the number of settings, three plus one, they divide them up differently. For example, Boris Sokolov emphasizes the philosophical roots of Bulgakov’s “four worlds,” Irina Belobrovtsева and Svetlana Kul’ius analyze the semiotic play in three worlds, subdividing Moscow further into two parts, and Caryl Emerson highlights the relationship of the novel’s settings to other cities, tradition, and myth.
Boris Sokolov defines the spaces of Moscow along philosophical lines, based on the works of P.A. Florenskii and N.A. Berdiaev:

В “Мастере и Маргарите” в соответствии с учением П.А. Флоренского о троичности присутствует трехмирная структура: древний иершалаимский мир, вечный потусторонний мир и современный московский. При этом, в полном согласии с идеей Булгакова, царство истины и справедливости, о котором говорит Иисус, ни в одном из этих миров не существует. Вместо него в современном мире оказывается еще один, четвертый, мнимый мир, через который нечистая сила и вступает в контакт с москвичами.42

Sokolov begins to demonstrate how the four spaces relate to religious philosophy, but, in line with the nature of his encyclopedic entry, does not provide a complete analysis.

Belobrovtseva and Kul’ius find two settings for the majority of the novel’s action: Iershalaim and Moscow. They include within Moscow the phantasmagorical settings that provide the backdrop for Margarita’s flight and the preparation for and celebration of Woland’s Ball. The third “world” in their analysis is found only at the end of the novel, a setting that reflects Bulgakov’s own concepts of the afterlife: a hierarchy descending from the “light” of Ieshua and Pilate to the “peace” of Master and Margarita to the abyss into which Woland and his retinue retire.43 Belobrovtseva and Kul’ius provide a more in-depth analysis of spatial semiotics in the novel than does Sokolov, noting Bulgakov’s use of the semiotic binary up/down in each space.44

42 B.V. Sokolov, Bulgakov: Entsiklopediia (Moscow: Algoritm, 2003), 96. “In Master and Margarita, in conformity with the teaching of P.A. Florenskii about triplicity, there is a three-world structure: the ancient world of Iershalaim, the eternal, otherworldly world, and the contemporary world of Moscow. Additionally, in complete agreement with Bulgakov’s idea, the kingdom of truth and justice about which Ieshua speaks does not exist in any of those worlds. Instead of a kingdom of truth and justice, in the contemporary world there turns out to be one more, a fourth, imaginary [мнимый] world through which unclean powers also come into contact with Muscovites.”

43 Irina Belobrovtseva and Svetlana Kul’ius, Roman M. Bulgakova: Kommentarii (Moscow: Knizhnyi klub 36.6, 2007), 58-65.

44 Belobrovtseva and Kul’ius, Roman M. Bulgakova, 63.
Belobrovtsɛva and Kul’ius interpret the epilogue of the novel in a manner that suggests yet another world, one divorced from “real” Moscow.

[Эпилог] не конец романа, а сообщение о том, что произошло в Москве после исчезновения мастера и Маргариты. Таким образом, доминирующий образ эпилога -- бесконечное кружение -- обретает социально-метафорический смысл: с его помощью создается “рассказ о мире, который погиб, сам того не ведая” (Гаспаров 1994, 55). В результате роман обретает облик “московского текста,” наделенного, так же как и “петербургский текст” русской литературы, эсхатологическим смыслом.45

The authors suggest that the Moscow Text has been imparted an eschatological meaning like the Petersburg Text. Eschatology has been an important part of Moscow, however, since at least the sixteenth century when Philotheus wrote his famous letter suggesting that there would be no new Rome after Moscow. This interpretation seems to suggest the Moscow of the epilogue as yet another of the novel’s “worlds.”

Emerson emphasizes a different aspect of setting in Master and Margarita: its relationship to what she calls the Moscow Myth. She looks outside the novel to find ways in which Bulgakov incorporates tradition and myth: “The three cities mentioned by Lotman as prime examples of the embedded, concentric city -- Jerusalem, Rome, and Moscow -- are precisely the sites, actual or implied, of this novel. But Bulgakov is a complex contributor to the Moscow Myth. He stitches in a great deal that is associated with Petersburg, most noticeably

45 Belobrovtsɛva and Kul’ius, Roman M. Bulgakova, 56. “[The epilogue] is not the end of the novel, but a message about what happened in Moscow after the disappearance of the Master and Margarita. Consequently, the dominant image of the epilogue is that of endless spinning, an image that acquires social and metaphorical meaning: with its help [Bulgakov] creates ‘a story about a world that has died but doesn’t yet realize it’ (Gasparov 1994, 55). As a result the novel acquires the guise of a ‘Moscow Text’ that has been endowed with eschatological meaning in the same measure as the ‘Petersburg Text’ of Russian literature.”
from Gogol.”46 Emerson’s vision of setting in Master and Margarita demonstrates Bulgakov’s manipulation of urban setting in general, but focuses on the eternal home, the Master’s reward, as a Moscow space divorced from Moscow historical time:

“Ethically, The Master and Margarita is a traditional humanist novel, with domestic tranquility as its final reward. Its hero and heroine, rescued by Woland from the Stalinist capital but not qualifying as martyrs who might live in the Light, end up crossing a moss-covered bridge to their new home. It is set (we are led to believe) in some quiet rural corner under blossoming cherry trees, in eternally recurring Moscow time.”47

The diversity of these approaches demonstrates the richness and complexity of Bulgakov’s setting in Master and Margarita. They set the stage for solving the problems inherent in analyzing the relationships each setting has to the others and the implications of those relationships for interpretations of the novel.

Many scholars have intuitively sensed the unity of the three settings in Master and Margarita and sought to express that unity through analysis of characterization. Sokolov’s analysis of the three settings in terms of character is perhaps the most significant. I summarize it here to exemplify the unity of setting scholars have sought through character analysis, as well as to illustrate the strong intuitive impulse critics have to explain the unity of the three settings, so strong that even the best scholars are tempted to stretch the text to fit their analysis. Olga Gurevich writes, “It is clear that Sokolov wants the three worlds to be exactly parallel and mapped perfectly onto each other. In his quest to find parallels, he sometimes stretches the


47 Emerson, Cambridge Introduction to Russian Literature, 187.
similarities between the characters. This desire to find regular structure is a natural reaction to a complicated work of literature, and many other critics have fallen prey to it." 48

Sokolov maps the similarities into eight triads, two diads, and one monad. The triads consist of a character from each of the three settings who have parallel functions. For example, the first triad in Sokolov’s structure consists of Woland, Pilate, and Dr. Stravinsky. He finds parallels among the characters ranging from physical descriptions to the amount of control they exert over the settings with which they are associated. Sokolov also points out that in early versions of the novel, Woland turns into Pilate on the streets of Moscow and that Ivan Bezdomnyi thinks that Stravinsky and Pilate look alike. 49

Sokolov argues that the Master and Ieshua form a diad, since the Master moves in both the phantasmagorical space as well as that of contemporary Moscow. Sokolov finds no parallel characters for Margarita, conceptualizing her as a monad that brings the whole novel together. 50

While it is interesting to note the parallels between these characters and their relationship to the settings that primarily define them, they cannot be a complete answer to the problems of setting in Master and Margarita. The similarities in characterization may, however, be in some ways explained were one to shift one’s methodological gaze from character to setting. Bezrodnyi describes the close relationship between the two:


49 B.V. Sokolov, Mikhail Bulgakov: Zagadki tvorchestva (Moscow: Vagrius, 2008), 237-245.

50 Sokolov, Zagadki tvorchestva, 244-245.
A setting limits and defines the characters that move within it. If one were to identify three hypostases of one city, it would make sense that parallels, though incomplete, existed among the characters within each space.

In order to address the problems posed by setting in *Master and Margarita*, I propose to analyze three of the novel’s settings that function as loci within the *topos* of Moscow by applying the theoretical approach to the Moscow Text I have outlined in this chapter. The three loci are the monument to Pushkin on Tverskoi bul’var (Tverskoi Boulevard), Margarita’s Mansion, and the bathhouse imagery of the Spring Ball of the Full Moon. Within each space one finds a “poetics of *realia* and citation” that uniquely reveals the textual dimensions of Moscow space and the textual links to other spaces in *Master and Margarita* itself. I hypothesize that the Iershalaim, Moscow, and Phantasmagorical settings are unified, not through characterization, as suggested but through their common citation of the Moscow Text of Russian literature: one Text refracted into three settings through the prism of Bulgakov’s creative genius.

In Chapter 2 I explore the relationship between the monument to Pushkin on Tverskoi bul’var (a locus) as it relates to the *topos* of Moscow. I highlight textual uses of the space of the monument as it relates to Strastnoi Monastery, Tverskoi bul’var, and other surrounding buildings. In addition to the architectural *realia*, I analyze the *realia* of the 1880, 1899, 1924, and

---

51 Mikhail Bezrodnyi, *Konets tsitaty*. (Saint Petersburg: Iz-vo Ivana Limbakha, 1996), 13-14. “Such a ‘setting’ powerfully makes its primogeniture known and decrees to a new character definite stereotypical behaviors: the ‘field of battle’ demands demonstrations of either courage or cowardice, a ‘palace’ demands intrigues, a ‘path’ requires a meeting, a ‘tavern’ requires a confession. (And a ‘father’s house’ will require leaving and returning.) Space here does not simply allow the event to happen, but in and of itself, by means of the hero, space makes the event happen.”
1937 Pushkin Celebrations and Jubilees as they relate to Bulgakov’s reproduction of the space in *Master and Margarita*. Literary citations from Pushkin’s oeuvre, along with numerous other Russian poets and authors combine with *realia* in Bulgakov’s treatment of the monument’s space to develop the theme of the Poet, in particular the Poet and Prophecy (пророчество), the Poet and Power (власть), and the Poet and Peace (покои).

In Chapter 3 I apply my model to the space of Margarita’s Mansion (a locus) within the larger *topoi* of the Arbat region and Moscow. The search for architectural and locational prototypes for Margarita’s mansion has inspired one of the largest bodies of theoretical literature about space in the novel. I analyze these prototypes (*realia*), interpret the significant level of contradiction that characterizes the conclusions of various scholars, and provide a semiotic prototype that reveals Bulgakov’s textual use of the “Muscovite labyrinth” (московская путаница) within the novel. In addition I point out one of Bulgakov’s literary sources in Andrei Belyi’s *Second Symphony*, which highlights another layer of the mansion’s interpretive significance for *Master and Margarita*.

In Chapter 4 I identify a third Muscovite locus as it relates to the spatial construction of The Spring Ball of the Full Moon: The Sandunov Bathhouses. Bathhouse (баня) imagery in *Master and Margarita* has gone largely unnoticed, in part because the imagery is specific to the Sandunov Bathhouses (built by a favorite of Catherine the Great). I uncover the *realia* of “Sanduny” in photographs of the pre-revolutionary Sandunov interiors and literature about the history and legends associated with the place. These *realia* work in connection with depictions of “Sanduny” in literature, specifically Andrei Belyi’s “Vozvrat” (“Return”), Giliarovsky’s *Moskva i moskvichi* (*Moscow and Muscovites*), and Pushkin’s *Ruslan i Liudmila* (*Ruslan and Liudmila*).
The combination of these *realia* and citations demonstrates how the space of a Roman Bathhouse adds a significant layer of meaning to the Spring Ball of the Full Moon and the widely accepted prototype of the Spring Ball Bulgakov attended in 1935 at Spaso House.

In conclusion I discuss the significance of these three loci within the Moscow of *Master and Margarita* for our understanding of the Moscow Text of Russian literature and its hermeneutic potential for the study of theme, character, and plot.
Appendix I: The Manuscripts of Master and Margarita

Unless otherwise specified, all of the references to Master and Margarita in this dissertation are taken from Losev’s 2006 edition of the collected manuscripts, Moi bednyi, bednyi master...: Polnoe sobranie redaktsii i variantov romana Master i Margarita (My Poor, Poor Master...: A Complete Collection of the Redactions and Variants of the Novel Master and Margarita). Because the nature of my analysis requires such close work with the manuscripts of the novel, Losev’s edition provides a convenient reference source for my readers. During my work with the manuscripts, however, I discovered a considerable set of discrepancies and unexplained editorial decisions in the edition. During my conversations with other Bulgakov scholars, I discovered a widely held opinion that Losev’s edition was problematic.

I decided to continue to use Losev’s edition in this dissertation because it is the best published edition of the Master and Margarita manuscripts. In the archives, I carefully scoured those places in the manuscripts that were most relevant to my research, comparing and contrasting them to Losev’s final editorial decisions in Moi bednyi, bednyi master... For the most part, I found few discrepancies that directly influenced my analysis of the text. In those places where Losev failed to comment on pertinent marginalia or the process behind his choice of a certain variant, I have supplemented Losev’s edition by citing the manuscript itself. The following tables provide an overview of the novel’s long and confusing manuscript history and correlate Losev’s edition to the manuscript holdings at NIOR RGB (Nauchno-issledovatel’skii otdel rukopisei Rossiiskoi gosudarstvennoi biblioteki).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscripts of <em>Master and Margarita</em>: Redaction 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Redaction 1:</strong> Losev pp. 23-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Черный маг: Черновики романа”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscripts of <em>Master and Margarita</em>: Redaction 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Redaction 2:</strong> Losev pp. 38-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Копыто инженера: Черновики романа”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Losev’s treatment of the third redaction requires some clarification. NIOR RGB 562.6.3 and 562.6.4 correspond to what Losev titles “Вечер страшной субботы: Черновые наброски к роману.” The first full manuscript of the novel reflects the contents of NIOR RGB 562.6.5, 562.6.6, 562.6.7, 562.6.8, and 562.7.1, what Losev titles “Великий канцлер: Полная рукописная редакция.” Losev publishes NIOR RGB 562.7.2 and 562.7.3 under the title “Фантастический роман: Главы, дописанные и переписанные.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscripts of <em>Master and Margarita</em>: Redaction 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Redaction 3:</strong> Losev pp. 63-255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIOR RGB 562.6.3: [“Мастер и Маргарита”], Наброски отдельных глав третьей редакции романа. 1931.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIOR RGB 562.6.4: [“Мастер и Маргарита”], Наброски отдельных глав третьей редакции романа. 1931.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIOR RGB 562.6.5: [“Мастер и Маргарита”], Третья редакция романа (глава 1-3, 6-7, 9 и гл. 7 новой нумерации). 1932.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Manuscripts of *Master and Margarita*: Redaction 3

| “Вечер страшной субботы: Черновые наброски к роману” | NIOR RGB 562.6.6: [“Мастер и Маргарита”], Третья редакция романа (продолжение гл. 7-гл. 9). 1933. |
| “Великий канцлер: Полная рукописная редакция” | NIOR RGB 562.6.7: [“Мастер и Маргарита”], Третья редакция романа (продолжение гл. 10 - гл. 17 ), 1933. |
| “Фантастический роман: Главы, дописанные и переписанные” | NIOR RGB 562.6.8: [“Мастер и Маргарита”], Третья редакция романа (продолжение гл. 17 - гл. 23 и начало гл. 19 в последующей редакции), 1933-1934. |
| | NIOR RGB 562.7.1: [“Мастер и Маргарита”], Третья редакция романа (продолжение гл. 23 - и десять ненумерованных глав), 1934 июнь-сентябрь. Ленинград, Москва. |
| | NIOR RGB 562.7.2: [“Мастер и Маргарита”], Третья редакция романа. Добавления и новые варианты отдельных глав. 1934 окт 30–1935, июнь. Автограф и рукою Е.С. Булгаковой. |
| | NIOR RGB 562.7.3: [“Мастер и Маргарита”], Третья редакция романа. (второй вариант последней 37 главы и окончание главы 16). 1936 июль 6. Загорянск |

### Manuscripts of *Master and Margarita*: Redaction 4

| Redaction 4: Losev pp. 256-282 | NIOR RGB 562.7.4: [“Мастер и Маргарита”], Четвертая редакция романа (гл. 1-3, 5), незаконченная. Вторая половина 1936-1937 гг? |
| “Золотое копье” | |

### Manuscripts of *Master and Margarita*: Redaction 5

<p>| Redaction 5: Losev pp. 283-364 | NIOR RGB 562.7.5: [“Мастер и Маргарита”], “Князь тьмы” -- роман. Пятая редакция романа (гл. 1-я, начало 2-й, 3-начало 8-й. 1937. |
| “Князь тьмы” | NIOR RGB 562.7.6: [“Мастер и Маргарита”], “Князь тьмы” -- роман. Пятая редакция романа, незаконченная (продолжение гл. 9-гл. 13). 1937. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redaction 6: Losev pp. 365-644</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Мастер и Маргарита: Полная рукописная редакция”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscripts of <em>Master and Margarita</em>: Redaction 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NIOR RGB 562.7.7: “Мастер и Маргарита,” Шестая редакция романа (гл. 1-7); 1937. Москва.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIOR RGB 562.7.8: “Мастер и Маргарита,” Шестая редакция романа (продолжение гл. 7-13); 1937. Москва.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIOR RGB 562.7.9: “Мастер и Маргарита,” Шестая редакция романа (гл. 14-18); 1937.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIOR RGB 562.7.10: “Мастер и Маргарита,” Шестая редакция романа (продолжение гл. 18-23); 1937-1938. Москва.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIOR RGB 562.7.11: “Мастер и Маргарита,” Шестая редакция романа (продолжение гл. 23-25); 1938.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIOR RGB 562.7.12: “Мастер и Маргарита,” Шестая редакция романа (продолжение гл. 25-30); 1938. Москва.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIOR RGB 562.8.1: “Мастер и Маргарита” -- роман. Материалы к 6-й и 7-й редакциям (планы, выписки, календарь романа, варианты имен героев, записи наблюдений над положением луны на небосклоне, зарисовки плана Ершалаима и т.п.); 1938-1939.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Losev’s “Final Redaction” (pp. 645-934, “Мастер и Маргарита: Окончательная редакция”) corresponds to the manuscript versions as reflected in the redactions listed below. In the body of the dissertation I often refer to the “last redaction.” By this I mean the synthesis of redactions 7, 8, and 9 that Losev’s “Final Redaction” reflects. I substitute “last” for “final” since my research reflects the very “un-final” state of the manuscripts, since Losev provides so little information about the reasoning behind his editorial decisions, and because my conversations with Bulgakov scholars in Moscow reflect a great deal of disagreement about Losev’s edition. Redactions 7 and 8 are virtually identical, with the exception of Bulgakov’s handwritten corrections in NIOR RGB 562.10.2. Redaction 9 is held in Popov’s archive NIOR RGB 547 and
reflects the changes made in redaction 8 and those made by Elena Sergeevna after her husband’s death.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscripts of <em>Master and Margarita</em>: Redaction 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NIOR RGB 562.9.2</strong>: “Мастер и Маргарита,” Седьмая редакция романа. Часть I и II. [1938, май 29 - июня 24].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NIOR RGB 562.9.1</strong>: Поправки к 1-й главе седьмой редакции романа и эпилог.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscripts of <em>Master and Margarita</em>: Redaction 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NIOR RGB 562.10.2</strong>: “Мастер и Маргарита,” Восьмая редакция романа, части I и II. Машинописная копия 1938 г. с авторской правкой конца 1939 -- нач. 1940 гг., рукою М.А. Булгакова и рукою Е.С. Булгаковой под его диктовку.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NIOR RGB 562.10.1</strong>: “Мастер и Маргарита,” Новые варианты отдельных страниц восьмой редакции романа. 1939, окт 4 -- [1940]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscripts of <em>Master and Margarita</em>: Redaction 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NIOR RGB 547.11.2</strong>: Булгаков, М.А. “Мастер и Маргарита” -- роман, ч. I. 1939-1940. Машиноопись. 279 ст.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NIOR RGB 547.11.3</strong>: Булгаков, М.А. “Мастер и Маргарита” -- роман, ч. II. 1939-1940. Машиноопись. 215 ст.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II: The “Text” of Moscow in 1929

Moscow in 1929. Between the Garden and Boulevard Rings, from Triumph Square south to Herzen Street.
Moscow in 1929. Between the Garden and Boulevard Rings, from Herzen Street south to Sivtsev Vrazhek.
Moscow in 1929. Between the Garden and Boulevard Rings, from Sivtsev Vrazhek south to the Kropotkinskaia Embankment, just west of Church of Christ the Savior.

The maps pictured above provide comprehensive data about the names of streets and tram routes for the Moscow in which Bulgakov lived and worked. Red lines, numbers, and circles represent tram routes and stops, blue lines, numbers, and circles represent bus routes and stops. Most of the places and events described in Moscow take place in the section of map presented above, from Triumfal’naia ploshchad’ (Triumph Square) at the top to the Moscow river at the
bottom, the Sadovoe kol’tso (Garden Ring) on the left, and the Kremlin, not included in this map, but just on the right edge, where the map cuts off.
The Monument to A.S. Pushkin on Tverskoi Boulevard: 
Space and Theme

The monument to Alexander Sergeevich Pushkin that from 1880 to 1950 marked the west end of Tverskoi bul’var (Tverskoi Boulevard) plays a definitive role in understanding Bulgakov’s textual use of Moscow space in *Master and Margarita*. The story of the monument and the space around it encode multiple layers of historical events, beginning with Pushkin’s death in 1837. The outcome of Pushkin’s duel with D’Anthès sparked controversies, dialogues, and decisions that eventually found concrete expression for the first time in the 1880 unveiling of the monument to Pushkin. These same themes are significantly reinterpreted in subsequent anniversaries of Pushkin’s life and death: the 1899 celebration of Pushkin’s birth, the one hundred twenty-fifth anniversary of Pushkin’s birth in 1924, and the 1937 Jubilee, one hundred years after Pushkin’s death. The centenary of Pushkin’s death in particular serves as a major landmark in Bulgakov’s career and creative debt to Pushkin in the writing of *Master and Margarita*. Any literary reference to the space of this monument sucks meaning out of its densely semiotic space, channeling layers of prototypical events, attitudes, and histories into the work through a “poetics of realia.”

---

Iurii Molok, *Pushkin v 1937 godu: Materialy i issledovaniia po ikonografii* (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2000), 16. “The monument to Pushkin is becoming a literary image that has organically grown into the life of Moscow; it has become its own type of exclamation mark in the text of the city and has taken root in Russian poetry and prose, in Russian art.”
In addition to the *realia* that were performed and re-performed in this space, Russian authors consistently return to this monument in their writings, citing and interpreting literary tradition in new ways. When Mayakovsky addresses the monument in his poems, he simultaneously contributes to and reinterprets the historical and literary tradition that has woven itself into the cultural fabric of the monument. The monument itself is textual in a way that few other monuments can be: Pushkin’s poem “*Exegi monumentum*” (“I have raised a monument”) wraps around the four sides of the monument’s pedestal.\(^{53}\) Thus any literary character that approaches the monument, especially if that character is a poet, approaches the text of this poem; any reference to the monument carries echoes of a reference to the poem. The poem itself refers to all of Pushkin’s oeuvre, his “monument not made by hands” (памятник нерукотворный) and in a very real sense the metallic monument with the engraved poem on the stone pedestal has come to be associated with published editions of Pushkin’s complete works: lyrics, poems, plays, prose, and history. In 1846, long before the Pushkin Celebration of 1880, Belinsky writes in his eleventh article devoted to Pushkin’s oeuvre, “Of course, the time will come when posterity will raise unto him an everlasting monument [vozdvignet emu vekovechnyi pamiatnik], but what is so peculiar for us contemporaries is that we still lack a proper edition of his works.”\(^{54}\) This quote

---

\(^{53}\) Pushkin’s “*Exegi monumentum*” is a translation of the final ode in Horace’s third book of odes. Both poets wrote their odes in contexts of significant political tension. Horace (65–8 BCE) lived through the last years of the Roman Republic and the first years of the Empire; Pushkin (1799–1837) witnessed the Decembrist revolt and the reactionary reign of Nicholas I.

from Belinsky best demonstrates the conflation of the monument with Pushkin’s collected works, a layer of dual meaning that Pushkin builds into his poem “Exegi monumentum.”

These four “texts” go together, they are mutually referential: Pushkin’s life (and especially his death), the monument, the poem, and his collected works. As a major landmark in Moscow’s built environment, this monument acts as a portal into the Pushkin Text of Russian literature. An author can bring the whole of Pushkin’s biography and oeuvre to bear on any character, just by making them walk past, think about, talk to, or reference the monument to Pushkin on Tverskoi bul’var (or, as Bulgakov ironically refers to it in “Pokhozhdeniia Chichikova” [“The Adventures of Chichikov”], “Pampush na Tverbule”). When Riukhin, Bulgakov’s caricature of a Soviet agitprop poet and Ivan Bezdomnyi’s rival, rides past the monument and speaks to it, Pushkin’s life and works provide instant contrast, a dynamic that Riukhin himself only partially realizes.

In this way the monument to Pushkin on Tverskoi bul’var interacts with the Moscow Text like the Bronze Horseman with the Petersburg Text. Because many scholars count Pushkin’s

---

55 In Appendix III at the end of this chapter (pp. 117-133) I have included copies of Pushkin’s poems that Bulgakov refers to most often in Master and Margarita. Additionally, I have provided tables that organize the major elements of the Pushkin theme in Master and Margarita as it develops in the manuscripts from 1929 to 1940.

56 “Pushkin’s name had acquired tremendous symbolic value, over and above the literary worth of his writings. Pushkin’s highly semiotic function was obvious to everyone in 1880.” Levitt, Russian Literary Politics and the Pushkin Celebration of 1880, 2. Pushkin became a vehicle for talking about other things: he is a signifier that has been attached to different signifieds by different people, but there is certainly a Pushkin Text of Russian literature and Bulgakov develops it, contributes to it in Master and Margarita.

57 This is an important concept in treatments of the Pushkin leitmotif in Master and Margarita. Scholars tend to agree on the major references to Pushkin, but each finds several additional references of their own. For example, Gasparov writes, “В связи с данной параллелью становится понятной и та большая роль, которую играют в романе произведения Пушкина: прямо или косвенно вложенными в повествование оказываются “Евгений Онегин”, “Пиковая Дама”, “Скупой рыцарь”, “Руслан и Людмила”, “Борис Годунов”, “Медный Всадник”, “Сказка о золотом петушке”, “Песнь о вещем Олеге”. Судьба Мастера, как она определена в разговоре Воланда с Левиа Матвеем, формулируется в виде скрытой цитаты из Пушкина: “Он не заслужил света, он заслужил покой” (ср. “На свете счастья нет, но есть покой и воля”).” B.M. Gasparov, “Iz nabliudenii nad motivnoi strukturoi romana M. A. Bulgakova ‘Master i Margarita,’” Slavica Hierosolymitana 3 (1978): 242. Gasparov’s list is incomplete, as are those of Milne, Barratt, and Curtis. My list is also incomplete. The point however is not a list of works that Bulgakov cites, but the way the scene at the Pushkin monument opens up the whole of Pushkin’s ouevre for the novel.
poem “Mednyi vsadnik” (“The Bronze Horseman”) to be the first great work of the Petersburg
text of Russian literature, the monument to Pushkin in Moscow includes within its sphere of
semiotic influence that monument to Peter, immortalized in Pushkin’s “monument not made by
hands.” The debate about the location for the new monument to Pushkin, commissioned for the
1937 Jubilee, highlights its connection to Falconet’s statue in the minds of Bulgakov’s
contemporaries.58

Тынянов выдвинул идею выноса памятника [the new one] на
Неву, примерно о том же говорил Каверин, предлагая подумать
о Пушкинской площади перед зданием Биржи на Стрелке
Васильевского острова. Юбилейный пушкинский комитет,
склонявшийся поначалу к скверу у Академии художеств,
решил в пользу Биржи, где и была произведена торжественная
закладка камня. Памятник должен был быть обращен к Неве,
водружен на камень, чтобы быть не ниже окружающих его
Ростральных колонн, словом, стать чем-то вроде нового
“Медного всадника.”59

The Bulgakov scholar Gasparov also sees a direct link between the monument to Pushkin on
Tverskoi and the Bronze Horseman in Senate Square in Petersburg; he points out that both
Bulgakov and Pushkin refer to the statues they describe as animate, volitional, metallic persons
(“металлический человек” and “медный всадник”).60

The monument to Peter I relies on the surrounding landscape as its setting, as part of its
“text.” Peter I extends his arm over the Neva, symbolically asserting the power of human reason

58 There was also a competition (1936) for a new monument to Gogol, the monument that would eventually replace
the one on the Boulevard ring.

59 Molok, Pushkin v 1937 godu, 31. “Тынянов proposed the idea of moving the monument [the new one] out onto
the Neva river. Kaverin spoke about nearly the same thing, suggesting Pushkin square in front of the Stock
Exchange House on the tip of Vasiльevskii Island. The Pushkin Jubilee committee, which at first had leaned towards
the square in front of the Academy of the Arts, decided in favor of the Exchange House, where a festive laying of a
corner stone took place. The monument was supposed to face the Neva, erected on stone so as to be no lower than
the Rostral Columns on either side of it, in a word, to become something of a new ‘Bronze Horseman.’”

60 Gasparov, “Iz nabliudenii,” 233.
to conquer and control nature. And yet it is this very Neva that, in Pushkin’s famous poem, roars out of its cement banks, ravages Peter’s city, kills the innocent Parasha, beloved of the poor “маленький человек” (“little man”), Evgenii. In the final scene of Pushkin’s poem, it is not the Neva that chases poor Evgenii, insane with grief, but the bronze horseman, come to life. Pushkin’s work shows how the Neva river is actually part of Falconet’s monument, it is a defining character in the monument’s “text.”

The decision to place Pushkin’s monument on Tverskoi bul’var has similar implications for the meaning of its “text.” In the 1860s the original intent was to erect the statue in the garden of the lycée Pushkin attended in Tsarskoe Selo. The initial movement to build the monument foundered and came to a nearly full stop in the early 60s. It was renewed in 1869, and with the replenished enthusiasm came the decision for a new setting. The responsible committee decided to change the place of the monument from Tsarskoe Selo to Moscow and to the central location of Tverskoi bul’var: “The eventual location of the monument in the centre of the old capital, in the heart of Russia rather than in the secluded and rarefied confines of the school at Tsarskoye Selo, may be taken as symbolic of the greater sense of importance with which society had come to view the event over the intervening period.”61 The tsar approved the change in 1871 to a place that a contemporary described as having “the same preeminent significance for Moscow as Nevsky Prospect has for Petersburg.”62

---


Tverskoi Boulevard played an important role as the setting for the monument, but perhaps an even greater role was played by the Strastnoi Monastery, located across Tverskaia ulitsa (Tversakaia Street), facing the monument.

Прописав Пушкина напротив Страстного монастыря, в самом центре Москвы, памятник приобрел черты некоего мемориального надгробия.... Поэтому и открытие памятника в 1880 году в некотором роде возмещало несостоявшиеся в 1837 году гражданские похороны Пушкина. Или -- походило на его перезахоронение. Это и позволило сохранить за скульптурным памятником роль места и роль объекта поклонения поэту, а рядом с монументом -- и возникнуть литературному мифу. \(^{63}\)

As part of the monument’s locus, Strastnoi Monastery reinforced the link between the monument and the poet’s death, a sort of monumental tombstone.

Molok’s description also indicates the importance of the larger setting: Moscow, the *topos* of the monument. In the Imperial period, the place of honor for Pushkin, the primary “temple” in honor of his “myth,” was Moscow. This allowed the opposition between Pushkin and Autocracy to develop, it reinforced the idea that Nicholas I and his Petersburg court shared part of the blame for Pushkin’s death at the hands of a foreigner. Eventually this very feature of the monument’s Moscow setting would enable the Soviets to harness the Pushkin cult for communist ideology. Had Pushkin’s monument been in Petrograd/Leningrad, the seat of tsarist power, it would not have carried the same weight among the nineteenth century intelligentsia. As it turned out, Pushkin’s place of honor existed just a few blocks away from the symbol of Communist power: the Kremlin.

\(^{63}\) Molok, *Pushkin v 1937 godu*, 12-15. “Having settled Pushkin across from the Strastnoi Monastery, in the very center of Moscow, the monument took on features of a sort of memorial headstone.... Therefore the opening of the monument in 1880 also in a sense made up for the public funeral for Pushkin that did not take place in 1837. Or rather it appeared as his re-burial. That allowed for the monument to preserve its role of place and object of the poet’s veneration, and alongside the monument, for the literary myth to arise.”
At the monument’s unveiling in 1880, some commentators interpreted the monastery’s prominent place in the setting of the monument to reflect the public funeral for the poet that never took place. The funeral-like quality of the celebration highlighted the public funeral that Pushkin never received because of Nicholas I’s fears of an uprising. This played into the hands of the liberal intelligentsia, who interpreted the 1880 Celebration as a great victory, and its place in Moscow was significant to them: Pushkin prominently displayed, and not in Imperial Petersburg.

As part of the monument’s text, however, Strastnoi Monastery was reinterpreted in the 1920s. In the communist context the monument’s meaning as a monumental tombstone and reminder of the populist funeral forbidden by Nicholas I faded. Instead the monastery became an obstacle to progress. Mayakovsky’s agitprop poem, “Shutka pokhozhaia na pravdu” (“A Joke that Looks Like the Truth”), comically captures the mood change. The monastery should be torn down so that Pushkin can make progress, out of the religious past and into the communist future. With the monastery out of the way, Mayakovsky writes, Pushkin would be able to converse with the contemporary Izvestiia building, a more suitable conversation partner for Pushkin, one that could update the Romantic poet, and, in Mayakovsky’s plans for Soviet culture, make him more useful.

---

The monument to Pushkin, lower left, faced the Strastnoi Monastery from 1880 to 1937. This photograph was taken from the top of the Nirmzee building in the 1920s (courtesy of Shchusev Museum of Architecture, КПНвф 407.85).

The Izvestiia building is one part of the textual canvas of the Pushkin monument in the 1920s and 30s, but it is not alone. The Soviet literary establishment thoroughly saturated Tverskoi bul’var at that time; on both sides of its shaded walkway were theaters, book kiosks, and of course the infamous Writers’ Union, immortalized in Bulgakov’s caricature, Griboedov House.
“Everyone to the Book Market!” This 1929 advertisement on the back cover of Krasnaia Niva (no. 22) includes a map of bookstores on Tverskoi Boulevard between the Pushkin monument and the Timiriazev monument.
Pushkin’s monument thus stood at the head of Moscow’s most literary street, but surrounded by “vulgarity” (пошлость) as evidenced in Il’f and Petrov’s Dvenadtsat’ stul’ev (The Twelve Chairs):

В ироничные 20-е годы, годы не Пушкина и не памятников, сам монумент как будто вынесен за скобки – как в знаменитом романе И. Ильфа и Е. Петрова, для героев которого памятник Пушкину существовал как адрес на карте Москвы, а “Медный всадник” – всего лишь как повод для сатирических куплетов.65

Here Molok refers to the scene from Dvenadtsat’ stul’ev where “Kisa” and Ostap Bender are on their way to the theater to see Gogol’s Zhenit’ba (Marriage). As they walk down Tverskoi bul’var they pass the Pushkin monument, which the narrator describes as a place where “young studs chase tail” (вечерний кобеляж), and they hear the opera Evgenii Onegin (Eugene Onegin) from a loud speaker at the nearby tram stop (Chapter 33 “В театре Колумба” [“In the Columbus Theater”]). By pairing the phrase “young studs chase tail” (вечерний кобеляж) with Eugene Onegin, tram stops with the Pushkin monument, Il’f and Petrov highlight the “vulgarity” of the literary establishment in the 1920s.

Strastnoi Monastery was finally torn down in 1937 in connection with the Pushkin Jubilee. The space around the monument had been thoroughly appropriated by the political interests of the Party, and Pushkin himself, his life and works, were now at their semiotic disposal. These threads of historical realia and literary citation create a rich source of imagery and meaning. In addition to direct citations of the realia and words associated with the space, however, the themes and images that it evokes have the power to evolve organically into a

65 Molok, Pushkin v 1937 godu, 19. “In the ironic years of the 1920s, years of neither Pushkin nor monuments, the monument itself was factored out, like in I. Il’f and E. Petrov’s famous novel. For the heroes of [The Twelve Chairs], the monument to Pushkin existed as an address on the map of Moscow, the “Bronze Horseman” was no more than a source of inspiration for satirical couplets.”
network of leitmotifs, as is the case in *Master and Margarita*. In this chapter I will explore Bulgakov’s textual uses of the monument’s semiotically dense space in his last novel. Bulgakov references the Pushkin monument as a text about the poet in the nineteenth century literary tradition and culture, he develops his characters against the foil of Pushkin: monument, poem, oeuvre. The textual space of the Pushkin monument in *Master and Margarita* leads the reader to reflect on three social dimensions of the poet: prophecy (пророчество), power (власть), and peace (покой). In each of these three areas, historical realia, literary citation, and leitmotif structure work together, exploiting the rich meaning of the Moscow Text to enhance the novel’s depth and power.

**The Poet in *Master and Margarita***

The theme of the poet in *Master and Margarita* requires careful definition. The novel’s two most important poets, in the literal sense of the word, are Ivan Bezdomnyi and Sasha Riukhin. The two mirror one another; they are foils. Riukhin is 32, Bezdomnyi 23. As a double, however, Riukhin’s role is limited to the first part of the novel. He appears in Griboedov House, escorts the manic Bezdomnyi to Stravinski’s clinic, and returns to Griboedov House. The climax of this characterization happens just minutes before his return to Griboedov House. Riukhin has been reflecting on the fate of poets, and the fate of Ivan and himself in particular, when the transport on which he is riding stops in front of the monument to Pushkin as it turns off Tverskaia ulitsa and onto Tverskoi bul’var. Riukhin addresses the monument with jealous rage, arrives at Griboedov House, and as dawn breaks over him, realizes that he is a terrible poet and that a hopeless future awaits him. That is the last the reader ever hears of Riukhin; he fades into
Griboedov House, Bulgakov’s generalized caricature of the Writers’ Union and its various branches, and disappears from the world of the novel.

The contrast of the Pushkin monument to Bezdomnyi and Riukhin is even more striking when one considers the history of Horace’s *Exegi monumentum* in Russian literature. While the one Pushkin crafted, the one engraved on the pedestal of the monument to him, is perhaps the most important in Russian culture, there are many other great poets who translated and/or imitated Horace’s ode: Lomonosov, Derzhavin, Briusov, and others. In light of these poets, Bezdomnyi and Riukhin’s renunciation of their poetry takes on even greater significance.

Bezdomnyi realizes that he hates his own poetry, with the help of the Master in Stravinsky’s clinic. He gives up writing poetry and, at the end of the novel, works as a professor of philosophy and history. The degree to which these disciplines perpetuated state propaganda in the makes this career a disappointing end to his discipleship under the Master. If Riukhin functions as a double for the “vulgar” poet Bezdomnyi at the beginning of the novel, at the end Bezdomnyi, now professor Ivan Nikolaevich Ponyrev, has an equally discrediting double, Nikolai Ivanovich, the bureaucrat who lives on the first floor of Margarita’s mansion. Nikolai Ivanovich’s name and patronymic mirror Ivan Nikolaevich’s, just as Riukhin’s age mirrors Bezdomnyi’s. At both of these critical moments in Ivan’s characterization, Bulgakov introduces doubles that highlight Ivan’s mental and ethical state. As a poet, Ivan has a poet double. As a professor, Ivan has a porcine, bureaucratic double. Bulgakov makes doubling an essential part of Ivan’s characterization in Stravinsky’s clinic as well, when the poet is split in two. In his development of the poet in *Master and Margarita*, Bulgakov relies heavily on the device of
doubling, rendering Riukhin’s discussion with Pushkin a vital moment in the characterization of Ivan Bezdomnyi.

The theme of the poet in Master and Margarita also raises the question of prototypes for Bezdomnyi and Riukhin. The methodology outlined in Chapter 1 allows one to approach this rather controversial topic from a slightly different angle. In the following pages I will refer to one contemporary poet that has been suggested as a prototype for Bezdomnyi and/or Riukhin, most notably Mayakovsky. My emphasis on space instead of character, however, allows me to avoid facile claims of one-to-one correspondence, focussing rather on the texts of Bulgakov’s poetic contemporaries and their participation in and production of the realia of Soviet culture.

The Master’s comments about Ivan’s poetry in Chapter 13 provide a rather cynical view of Soviet poetry, one that finds echos in Bulgakov’s own sentiments about the topic. Bulgakov is well known for not having liked poetry; he is equally well known for his phrase, “Pushkin isn’t poetry!” (Пушкин не стихи!). The doubling of Bezdomnyi and Bulgakov’s statements about poetry and Pushkin lead to the conclusion that the theme of the poet in Master and Margarita also functions according to the device of the double. The “poets” Bezdomnyi and Riukhin can not rise to the level of Pushkin, he is above them. Pushkin actually has more in common with Ieshua and the Master, as Gasparov has argued. The theme of the poet in this higher sense, in the sense that reveals Bezdomnyi and Riukhin for the “vulgar” poets they are, develops within the context of the textual dimensions of the monument to Pushkin on Tverskoi bul’var.

---


Пампуш на Твербуле (“Pampush na Tverbule”)

As with other important themes and images in *Master and Margarita*, Bulgakov first incorporated the monument to Pushkin into other previous works. In some of Bulgakov’s first Moscow works, “Moskva krasnokamennaia” (“Red-stoned Moscow”) and “Chasha zhizni” (“Cup of Life”) (1922), Pushkin observes NEP with “ironic detachment”; in “Pokhozhdeniia Chichikova” (1925), the hero of the title exploits the Pushkin monument for material gain.68 The theme of “ironic detachment” thus reaches from Bulgakov’s earliest impressions of the monument (1922) to his latest in *Master and Margarita* (1940). In all of these works Bulgakov uses the text of the monument in basic ways. Through Pushkin’s monument, Bulgakov expresses his own view of NEP in the 20s and of literature in the 30s. Because Pushkin is indifferent, Bulgakov is able to express his own criticism of the unique styles of self-importance and “vulgarity” that characterize the decades of his Moscow life.

The Pushkin monument on Tverskoi bul’var was not the first monument to attract Bulgakov’s attention. Bulgakov wrote about the monument to Vladimir the Baptist in *Belaia gvardiia* (*White Guard*); he asked his brother N.A. Bulgakov, living in Paris at the time, to send him a description of the monument to Molière, “Molière’s Fountain,” specifically the “material and color of the monument,” “the women at the base,” and whether or not water still ran in “the lions’ heads at the bottom.”69 His brother responded with detail and included a picture of the


monument for which Bulgakov was deeply grateful. Bulgakov intuitively felt the inherent potential of monuments to layer thematic elements in literary texts.

In the third redaction of Master and Margarita, well before including Riukhin’s conversation with the Pushkin monument, Bulgakov wrote about a monument dedicated to the contemporary writer Aleksandr Zhitomirskii. The moldering Zhitomirskii stands in the garden of Griboedov House, presumably in a position similar to the one where the monument to Herzen now stands. In these early episodes, however, none of the writers talk to Zhitomirskii’s monument. Conversations pass him by without paying his decaying and impotent figure any attention. The monument to Zhitomirskii reflects the narrator’s disdain for the Writers’ Union, but also his reverence for monuments. In contrast to the dilapidated Zhitomirskii, Bulgakov

70 Letter to N.A. Bulgakov (8 March 1933). Bulgakov, Dnevnik, Pis’ma, 1914-1940, 287. Translation in Curtis, Manuscripts Don’t Burn, 158. In this letter Bulgakov hints at the significance he personally placed on the relationship between writers and monuments to writers: “Если судьба тебя занесет на угол улиц Ришелье и Мольера, вспомни меня! Жану-Батисту де Мольеру от меня привет!”

71 Several scholars conclude that Bulgakov’s contemporary, the poet Bezymenskii, served as the prototype for this monument since Zhitomir was his city of origin. Irina Belobrovtsева and Svetlana Kul’ius, Roman M. Bulgakova: Kommentarii (Moscow: Knizhnyi klub 36.6, 2007), 289; M.A. Bulgakov, “Moi bednyi, bednyi master…”: Polnoe sobranie redaktseii i variantov romana ‘Master i Margarita’, ed. V.I. Losev (Moscow: Vagrius, 2006), 949n66.
describes hiding under Gogol’s iron overcoat. Bulgakov had a keen sense for the monuments in the cities in which he lived and their potential textual resonance in his literary creations.

In the third redaction, the Griboedov House scene begins with the monument to Zhitomirskii and ends with Riukhin’s envy directed at Pushkin. The silence of the garden and the refrain of “ад” link these two moments textually. After describing Zhitomirskii, the narrator declaims, “Здесь был ад” (66).73 Just before the narrator describes Riukhin’s “jealous rage” (злоба) towards Pushkin, he declares, “Сад [Zhitomirskii] молчал, и ад молчал” (76).74 Chudakova writes,

“В этой главе появляется поэт Рюхин с его размышлениями о своей судьбе, навеянными посещением “дома скорби и ужаса” и обвинениями Иванушки ... и с темной завистью к Пушкину; возникла новая для романа тема завистника, неясный мотив поэтической славы, первые очертания проблемы “правильной” и “неправильной” литературной судьбы.”75

72 Curtis quotes at length Bulgakov’s letter to P.S. Popov (25 January-24 February 1932) and then writes: “Here Bulgakov appeals to Gogol for protection, like Pushkin, through the image of his statue in Moscow; he envisages him as some kind of benign spirit who will defend him from the gossips who remind him of the inhabitants of the town of N. in Dead Souls. Where he had earlier referred to Molière as his master and Pushkin as his commander, he now addresses Gogol in turn as his ‘great teacher.’” Curtis, Bulgakov’s Last Decade, 111. One might argue, however, that this image makes more sense as an inversion of Pushkin’s The Bronze Horseman. Bulgakov does not run to the statue, the statue runs to him. Instead of a statue chasing Bulgakov around the city, real people pursue him. The monument moves, comes to life, and protects him from the people who torment him.

The excerpt from the letter follows:

“It all ended with a very familiar figure with a sharp nose and the crazed eyes of a sick man running in to see me one night. ‘What does it mean?’ he exclaimed.

‘What it means’, I replied, ‘is that these citizens, and above all these literary men, are acting out the ninth chapter of your novel, which I, great teacher, adapted in your honour. You yourself said: “…in their heads there was commotion, hubbub and contradiction, there was disorder in their thoughts ... they revealed their mistrustful and lazy natures, full of unceasing doubt and eternal fearfulness”.

Cover me up with your cast-iron greatcoat!’

And he covered me up.” Bulgakov, Dnevnik, Pis’ma, 1914-1940, 261; translation in Curtis, Bulgakov’s Last Decade, 111.

73 “This was hell.”

74 “The garden [Zhitomirskii] was silent, and hell was silent.”

75 M.O. Chudakova, “Arkhiv M.A. Bulgakova: Materialy dlia tvorcheskoj biografii pisатelia,” Zapiski otdela rukopisei 37, ed. N.N. Soloveva (Moscow: Kniga, 1976), 96. “In this chapter the poet Riukhin appears with his thoughts about his own fate, spurred by his visit to the ‘house of grief and horror’ and the accusations of Ivanushka ... and with a dark envy of Pushkin; a new theme arose in the novel, that of the envious person, the opaque motif of a poet’s glory, and the first drafts of the problem of a ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ literary fate.”
Even in this early draft (1931-32), a monument to a poet plays an important role in Riukhin’s thoughts about a poet’s fate. Significantly, the connection between monument, poet, and fate appears in the manuscripts for Master and Margarita after Mayakovsky publishes poems speaking to a monument, “Jubileinoe” (“Jubilee”) (1924) and “Shutka pokhozhaia na pravdu” (1928), and very soon after his tragic death (1930).

The fifth redaction provides a more detailed account of Riukhin’s thoughts. The monument to Zhitomirskii disappears and, instead of randomly thinking up Pushkin while sitting in Griboedov House, Riukhin exits a tram at the statue and speaks to the poet’s monument: “Тебе хорошо” (321).76

The sixth redaction adds in associative links from Pushkin’s poetry, but removes the monument altogether. The lines “как ужасно лишиться разума”77 and “мне не везет, нет мне счастья, не та звезда у меня”78 recall Pushkin’s poems “Ne dai mne bog soiti s uma” (“God forbid that I should lose my mind”), “Pora, moi drug, pora!” (“It’s time, my friend, It’s time!”) and “K Chedaevu” (“To Chedaev”) (412).79 This redaction also makes the parallels between Riukhin and Ivan Bezdomnyi more obvious. For the first time they take on mirrored ages (32, 23), and Riukhin’s name at this point in the manuscript is Ponyrev, which is Ivan’s family name in the last redaction. Riukhin is a sort of proxy for everything that Ivan would have been, had the Master and Woland not interfered.

76 “It’s all fine for you.”
77 “How horrible to lose one’s reason.”
78 “I am not lucky, there is no happiness for me, I have the wrong star.”
79 Citations from Pushkin’s works are taken from the sixteen volume edition of Pushkin’s complete works. A.S. Pushkin, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, 1837-1937, eds. V. Tomashevskii et al. (Moscow: Izd-vo AN SSSR, 1937-1959). In this edition the editors chose to preserve Pushkin’s spelling, “Chedaev.”
In the later redactions Bulgakov supplies another detail that deserves commentary: Riukhin is unable to identify what is bothering him. He phrases these questions in Pushkinian themes. He quotes lines from Pushkin’s poetry (about happiness and insanity), but does not seem to know that he is quoting Pushkin’s poetry. Riukhin is at least acquainted with “Буря мглою...” (A storm by darkness...), and yet he misunderstands the significance of those lines as well. Riukhin’s knowledge of Pushkin’s verse, coupled with his basic misunderstanding of its meaning, recalls the last scene of Bulgakov’s play Poslednie dni (The Last Days). The informer Bitkov reads Pushkin’s lines, but the viewer is left with the distinct impression that they will never sink in. Like Bitkov, Riukhin does not understand Pushkin; that is the source of his “jealous rage,” that is what bothers him so much, and why his confession that he writes bad poetry predicts only a miserable future. If he were able to turn to Pushkin as a master, there might be some redeemable poet left in him. But all he has for Pushkin is “jealous rage.” If he knew the rest of the line, “На свете счастья нет, но есть покой и воля,” then there might be hope for him. But all Riukhin knows is that there is no happiness.

Finally, in the last redaction, the two poems, “Pora, moi drug, pora!” and “Ne dai mne bog soiti s uma” have been collapsed into one very interesting sentence: “худшего несчастья, чем лишение разума, нет на свете” (696). Right after a sentence in which he quotes two of Pushkin’s famous poems, Riukhin dismisses his own remarkably referential sentence as a common idea, completely ignoring the brilliance of Pushkin’s art and its influence on Riukhin’s own speech. Without Pushkin’s creative use of language, Riukhin would never have been able to articulate this “common” thought. What makes such irony, such dense citation possible, is that

80 “There is no happiness in the world, but there is peace and freedom.”
81 “There is no worse unhapiness in the world than losing ones mind.”
these very brief citations (only a few words out of two substantial poems) take on much more weight because of the space in which Riukhin thinks them. Were Riukhin to be thinking about these things somewhere else, his words would have to be much more directly referential; Bulgakov would not be able to evoke Pushkin’s poetry with such faint strokes of his narrative brush.

Riukhin’s thoughts reflect another famous intersection of realia and literature: Pushkin’s visit to the “insane” Chaadaev. Miagkov points out that Riukhin’s thoughts on madness recall the poem Pushkin wrote after the visit.\(^{82}\) However, in addition to the poem “Ne dai mne bog soiti s uma,” Riukhin’s rage at Pushkin recalls another poem in which Pushkin reflected on the fate of Russia’s first modern philosopher: “K Chedaevu.” This poem played a central role in the 1937 celebration. The slogan of the 1937 competition to design a new monument to Pushkin was Pushkin’s verse, “Товарищ, верь: взойдет она, звезда пленительного счастья...”\(^{83}\) During preparations for the 1937 Pushkin Jubilee the last lines of “K Chedaevu” were displayed under an image of Pushkin that hung from the buildings on Strastnaia ploshchad’ (Passion Square): “Товарищ, верь: взойдет она, Звезда пленительного счастья, Россия вспрянет ото сна, И на обломках самовластья Напишут наши имена!”\(^{84}\) There was a direct link between this poem and the monument in 1936-37; the lines from the poem formed part of the verbal environment along with the lines from “Exegi monumentum” engraved on the pedestal.\(^{85}\)

\(^{82}\) Boris Miagkov, Bulgakov na Patriarshikh (Moscow: Algoritm, 2008), 188.

\(^{83}\) Molok, Pushkin v 1937 godu, 31. “Comrade, believe! It will arise, our star of captivating happiness...”

\(^{84}\) “Comrade, believe! It will arise, Our star of captivating happiness, Russia will awake from her slumber, And on the wreckage of autocracy, Will be written our names!”

\(^{85}\) Karl Schlögel, Terror und Traum: Moskau 1937 (Munich: Carl Hanser Verlag, 2008), 202.
The 1937 competition finds expression in this scene as well. Official propaganda claimed Soviet citizenry was dissatisfied with the sculpture. Dissatisfaction with Opekushin’s Pushkin was at least part of the impetus for a new monument and Riukhin’s resentment of Pushkin echoes the official position that the people did not like the monument.

One last element of the verbal environment surrounding the Pushkin monument deserves commentary: the poem “Exegi monumentum” itself. The lines of this poem are also hard at work in some of Bulgakov’s earlier prose. In Vladikavkaz, 1920, Bulgakov spoke in defense of Pushkin and his art, an experience he later described in Zapiski na manzhetakh (Notes on Shirt-Cuffs). When a young futurist poet suggests throwing Pushkin into the stove, the narrator

---

smiles, an act for which he is called upon to provide a counter argument about the worth of Pushkin’s oeuvre. Lesley Milne writes,

The enigma behind this smile is not analyzed in the Notes [on Shirt-Cuffs], but in The Master and Margarita the crudity of mentality and vocabulary displayed by the Vladikavkaz Futurists of 1920-1 is caricatured in the figure of the poet Ryukhin, shaking his fist in jealous rage at the statue of Pushkin in Moscow, cast-iron evidence of the poet’s immortality.87

The line from “Exegi monumentum” referenced in this description of the evening is “accept slander with indifference” (“клевету приемли равнодушно”). The autobiographical narrator in Zapiski na manzhetakh fails to take Pushkin’s advice and suffers for his indiscretion. The parallel scene in Master and Margarita is when Riukhin slanders Pushkin by saying, “you got lucky, when they killed you” (696). Pushkin ignores the slander, indifferently (равнодушно) continuing to look down at the street. Bulgakov uses real Moscow space to rewrite his own experience of defending Pushkin in Vladikavkaz, coming to the final conclusion that Pushkin needs no defense. In fact, Pushkin already spoke in his own defense. His silence condemns Riukhin’s bitter slander because of the last line of “Exegi monumentum,” the part Bulgakov does not quote in Zapiski na manzhetakh: “не оспоривай глупца.” The complete line reads: “Хвалу и клевету приемли равнодушно И не оспоривай глупца.”88 Pushkin’s indifference to Riukhin’s rage seals the contemporary poet’s fate as a fool (глупец).89


88 “Accept praise and slander indifferently, And do not argue with a fool.”

89 In a similar way, Mozart has the final say after Salieri poisons him in Pushkin’s “little tragedy,” Mozart and Salieri. Mozart leaves the scene and the reader understands that he goes to his death, but Salieri is left repeating Mozart’s words, “Гений и злодейство две вещи несовместные” (“Genius and villainy are incompatible things”). A.S. Pushkin, Pushkin A.S. Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, 1837-1937, eds. V. Tomashevskii et al. (Moscow: Izd-vo AN SSSR, 1937-1959), 7:133-4. Just as Pushkin’s words on the monument show Riukhin to be a fool, Mozart’s words show Salieri to be a “villain,” and cast significant doubt on his claim to “genius.”
The image of “Pampush na Tverbule” is an important text in many of Bulgakov’s works. Specifically within *Master and Margarita*, the monument-text finds its fullest development, a locus genii for several of the novel’s major themes. In the next three sections I examine Bulgakov’s use of the monument’s *realia* and literary incarnations to develop three themes connected to the concept of “Poet” as defined earlier in this chapter: the Poet and Prophecy, the Poet and Power, the Poet and Peace.

**The Poet and Prophecy**

The prophetic aura of the Pushkin monument on Tverskoi bul’var appeared during the very first moments of the monument’s birth into Russian Culture: Pushkin as prophet was central to the 1880 celebration. During the first “apotheosis” of the monument, representatives of various groups laid wreaths around it, accompanied by Meyerbeer’s march, “Prorok” (“The Prophet”), inspired by Pushkin’s eponymous poem.90

Dostoevsky continued the theme in his famous speech of the third day of the Celebration: he repeatedly described Pushkin as a prophet. Dostoevsky began his speech with the words of Gogol, “Пушкин есть явление чрезвычайное и, может быть, единственное явление русского духа,” but then went on to describe why he thought “prophetic” should be added to Gogol’s description:

Прибавлю от себя: пророческое. Да, в появлении его заключается для всех нас, русских, нечто бесспорно пророческое. Пушкин как раз приходит в самом начале правильного самосознания нашего, едва лишь начавшегося и зародившегося в обществе нашем после целого столетия с петровской реформы, и появление его сильно способствует

Dostoevsky’s use of the word “prophetic” (пророческое) in his speech carried over into the audience response. In a letter to his wife the night after the speech (June 8, 1880), Dostoevsky recalls the hysterical reaction of the crowd to his speech. People of all sorts congratulated him, but one interaction stood out in his mind in particular. “... вдруг, например, останавливает меня два незнакомые старики: ‘Мы были врагами друг друга 20 лет, не говорили друг с другом, а теперь мы обнялись и помирились. Это вы нас помирили, Вы наш святой, вы наш пророк’. ‘Пророк, пророк!’ -- кричали в толпе.”

Ivan Aksakov followed Dostoevsky’s June 8th speech. He claimed that Dostoevsky had settled the debate about Pushkin as Russia’s national poet.

“F.M. Dostoevsky’s prophetic words, like lightening, have cut through the waves of fog, and ended all wrangling and doubt.

91 F.M. Dostoevsky, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v tridsati tomakh*, ed. V.G. Bazanov (Leningrad: Nauka, 1984), 26: 136-7 and 148-9. “Pushkin is an extraordinary, and perhaps a unique, phenomenon of the Russian spirit,” said Gogol. For my own part, I will add: and a prophetic one. Yes, in his appearance, to all us Russians, there is something indisputably prophetic. Pushkin appeared precisely at the very inception of our true self-consciousness, which was then just coming into being and which originated in our society after a whole century following Peter’s reform; and his appearance greatly helped to illuminate our obscure path with a new guiding light. It is in this sense that Pushkin is a prophecy and a revelation. ... Had Pushkin lived longer, perhaps there would have been among us, too, less strife and misunderstanding. But God willed differently: Pushkin died in the full bloom of his creative power, and no doubt he carried with him into his grave some great secret. And now we, with him no longer among us, are endeavoring to solve it.” Translation in Marc Raeff, *Russian Intellectual History: An Anthology* (Amherst, NY: Humanity Books, 1999), 289 and 300.

92 F.M. Dostoevsky, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v tridsati tomakh*, ed. B.G. Bazanov, vol. 30, bk. 1 (Leningrad: Nauka, 1988), 184. “... suddenly, for example, two elderly gentlemen with whom I was unacquainted stopped me: ‘We have been enemies for twenty years, we haven’t spoken to each other, but now we have embraced, we have been reconciled. It is you who have reconciled us, you are our saint, you are our prophet.’ The crowd shouted, ‘Prophet, prophet!’”
There is no more to say about it!" The excitement carried over into the evening’s literary-musical presentation, which brought the celebration to a close. Dostoevsky replaced Turgenev as favorite and was called out for several encores, at which he recited Pushkin’s poem, “The Prophet” twice by heart. The evening again concluded with an “apotheosis” of Pushkin, only this time Turgenev ceded to Dostoevsky the honor of crowning Pushkin’s bust.

Within a few days, however, Dostoevsky’s critics tore apart his inexplicably successful speech.

The “prophet” was quickly “crucified” in the press.

Nonetheless, the aura of prophecy remained connected to the monument, finding expression in other works, like in A.A. Fet’s 1880 poem dedicated to Pushkin’s monument: “Исполнилось твое пророческое слово; Наш старый стыд взглянул на бронзовый твой лики...” “Exegi monumentum” itself provides the prophetic tone to the whole of the space around the monument. The metallic monument seems to be a fulfillment of the prophetic line “И долго буду тем любезен я народу.” This relatively small, but centrally located square in Moscow took on a hugely semiotic function for Russia: by 1880, Pushkin and the “monument” he foresaw in “Exegi monumentum” had become a profound signifier of prophecy in Moscow’s semiosphere.

The 1937 Jubilee also capitalized on the prophetic semiosis of the space around Pushkin’s monument, although it emphasized a political, revolutionary prophecy instead of a literary,

---

93 As cited in Levitt, Russian Literary Politics and the Pushkin Celebration of 1880, 126. Levitt provides the following citation for Aksakov’s words: “Pushkinskie dni v Moskve, Rech’ Dostoevskogo,” Novoe vremia, no. 1538 (June 11, 1880), 2.

94 Levitt, Russian Literary Politics and the Pushkin Celebration of 1880, 127.

95 A.A. Fet, Polnoe sobranie stikhotvorenii, (Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel’, 1959), 364. “Your prophetic word has been fulfilled; Our old shame has looked upon your bronze face....”

96 “And long will I be the favorite of the people.”
cultural one. When Mayakovsky agitated for the demolition of Strastnoi Monastery in 1928, his famous line about throwing Pushkin off the ship of modernity (1917) had not completely faded from public attention: Pushkin’s place in Soviet literature was still unclear. By 1937, however, Mayakovsky was dead and both he and Pushkin had been thoroughly appropriated by the Soviet cultural establishment. A banner with Pushkin’s poem “К Чедаеву” hung on the newly named Pushkin square, “Товарищ, верь: взойдет она, Звезда пленительного счастья, Россия вспрянет от сна, И на обломках самовластья Напишут наши имена!” According to the hermeneutic of the day, Pushkin’s words came to pass quite literally: the communist star had arisen, the revolution had come, Russia had woken from her slumber. Pushkin’s words and his name, along with Chaadaev’s, had been literally written on the wreckage of Strastnoi Monastery.

Given the close association between autocracy and Orthodoxy in Pushkin’s era, the destruction of the monastery contributed to the prophetic tone of the Soviet government’s use of Pushkin’s poem.

By 1937 Mayakovsky’s life and work had leaked into the prophetic aura surrounding the Pushkin monument: he had after all, predicted the destruction of Strastnoi Monastery and the proletarianization of Pushkin. Decades later this same aura of prophecy was been extended to some lines from Mayakovsky’s poem “Iubileinoe” (1924), in which he declares to Pushkin that they will someday stand near one another (“После смерти нам стоять почти что рядом: вы на

---

97 The debate about Pushkin’s role in Russian literature began long before the 1920s. Mayakovsky here inherits the position of Pisarev in the 1860s and the Populists after him. In fact, in the second half of the nineteenth century, both nihilists like Pisarev and their political antipodes, promoters of “official nationality,” expressed aversion for Pushkin. Attitudes towards the monument were polarized from the 1860s well into the 1930s: imagery revolved around “dethroning or enthroning Pushkin, bowing down to the poet’s effigy or spitting on his grave.” Levitt, *Russian Literary Politics and the Pushkin Celebration of 1880*, 8. The rejection of Pushkin by writers like Pisarev and Mayakovsky made the Soviet cultural establishment’s acceptance of Pushkin all the more ironic.

98 See footnote 84 for translation.
Although Mayakovsky’s monument on Triumph Square, just down the street from the Pushkin monument, did not appear until 1958, its appearance rendered his jocular rhyme prophetic.

Bulgakov witnessed the extensive reliance on the semiotic power of the Pushkin monument as a signifier of prophecy during the writing of *Master and Margarita*. He could not have missed the developments as he was writing a play about Pushkin’s death, intended to premiere during the Jubilee. He was a student of the *realia* surrounding Pushkin’s death, he was close friends with a leading Pushkin scholar, he witnessed the *realia* of the 1937 Jubilee, a “corrective” to the 1880 Celebration. As he observed the preparations for the Jubilee, Bulgakov had already had numerous occasions to think about Mayakovsky. Not only had he read Mayakovsky’s plays and poems, argued with him about the value of literary tradition and Pushkin, he had also observed the events surrounding Mayakovsky’s death, which deeply disturbed him and had played a large role in the earlier third redaction of the novel. Bulgakov began composing a poem about a funeral for which Mayakovsky was a significant source of inspiration, the unfinished lines are in his notebook. All of these facts point to the conclusion

---

99 “After death we will stand almost next to one another: you at ‘P,’ and myself at ‘M.’ Mayakovsky’s poem and the scene with Riukhin also share a temporal commonality: they both take place “на рассвет” (“at dawn”). G. Lesskis and K. Atarova, *Putevoditel’ po romanu Mikhaila Bulgakova Master i Margarita* (Moscow: Izd-vo “Raduga,” 2007), 270.


that Bulgakov had to be acutely aware of the prophetic potential of the Pushkin monument for
the fate of a poet.\textsuperscript{102}

Bulgakov masterfully incorporates this poetics of \textit{realia} and citation into the scene of
Riukhin’s conversation with the Pushkin monument. In regards to prophecy, this poetics of \textit{realia}
and citation most clearly comes through in Riukhin’s comments about the opening phrase of
Bulgakov’s personal favorite from among Pushkin’s lyric poems, “Zimnii vecher” (“Winter
Evening”), which begins with the words “A storm with darkness...” (“Буря мглою...”) (696).

“Zimnii vecher” had special significance for Bulgakov, as evidenced in the significant
roles it plays in several of his works:

In \textit{The Days of the Turbins}, for example, the junkers sing the
refrain from Pushkin’s poem \textit{Zimnii vecher (Winter Evening)},
which also figures in \textit{The Master and Margarita}; the poem
provides the epigraph for the story \textit{V’yuga (The Snowstorm)} as
well, before going on to be used most extensively as the leitmotif
for \textit{The Last Days} itself.\textsuperscript{104}

Thus the poem connects many of Bulgakov’s works, and when Riukhin questions the importance
of the lines, he automatically criticizes many of Bulgakov’s works that rely heavily on it.

\textsuperscript{102} Both Mayakovsky and Bulgakov refer to Pushkin as “the Cast-Iron one” (“Чугунный”). “Mayakovskiy had in
1928-9, just as Bulgakov’s plays were being removed from the repertory, written two plays: \textit{Klop (The Bed-Bug)} and
\textit{Bania (The Bath-House)}. The Futurist was, moreover, being hailed as a classic, and compared not only to Molière
but also to Pushkin,” Milne, \textit{Mikhail Bulgakov: A Critical Biography}, 185. The coincidence of Maykovsky’s fame
and “Iubileinoe” could not have been lost on Bulgakov. Mayakovskiy’s poetry and fate were of intense interest to
Bulgakov throughout the 1920s and 30s, as evidenced by the image of Mayakovskiy in Bulgakov’s archive from
1922 (NIOR RGB 562.27.4, “Вырезки из газет и журналов [“Зрелища,” “Накануне,” “Вечерняя Москва”]
1920-е годы”), the incomplete poem he wrote with allusions to Mayakovskiy’s death, and the Mayakovskiy
references in \textit{Master and Margarita} at the end of his life.

\textsuperscript{103} There are several words for storm in Russian. ‘Буря’ implies wind that may carry rain as well as snow.

\textsuperscript{104} Curtis, \textit{Bulgakov’s Last Decade}, 75.
In *Master and Margarita* Pushkin’s storm from “Zimnii vecher” links Moscow and Iershalaim, a fact that has been well documented. But the storm does more than just link the two cities. It functions as a spatial leitmotif, but it does more than just “link” the characters, plots, and settings of Moscow and Iershalaim through parallel meteorological phenomena.

Through the semiotic agency of the monument to Pushkin, the storm leitmotif contributes to the theme of Poet as Prophet. This does not happen until the last redaction, however. In the sixth redaction, Bulgakov has already employed the storm as a leitmotif, but it has no connection to Pushkin or to a prophecy theme. The phrase “A storm with darkness...” (Буря мглою) itself does not appear until the later redactions of the novel, that is, after the writing of *Poslednie dni* and after the 1937 Jubilee.

In the sixth redaction, the theme of the storm first appears as Varenukha is leaving the Varieté Theater. The wind from the approaching storm blows dust into Varenukha’s eyes, as if warning him to turn around and go back (442). Then as Azazello and Begemot attack the unsuspecting Varenukha, thunder coincides with their blows to his head (443). The downpour that follows washes everything off of the Sadovoe kol’tso (Garden Ring) as the two drag Varenukha to Apartment 50, ensuring that no one can intervene and try to rescue the administrator (444). This same storm serves as the narrative link between the end of Chapter 10 and the beginning of Chapter 11, where it frightens Ivan in his room at Stravinsky’s clinic, as he sits on his bed crying softly (445). After the doctor administers a shot in Ivan’s hand, the storm recedes and a rainbow appears (446).

---

The storm makes its second appearance during the execution scene in Iershalaim (Chapter 16). Just before the executioner pierces Ieshua’s heart with his spear, the wind begins to blow. Thunder accompanies the deaths of the first two prisoners, just as it accompanies the blows to Varenukha’s head (494). The subsequent downpour masks Levii Matvei as he steals Ieshua’s body (495).

In Chapter 25, the storm links the second and third Iershalaim chapters. This time, however, instead of Bald Mountain, the scene is set in Pilate’s residence, linking those two loci within the *topos* of Iershalaim. The city disappears “in the boiling darkness” (в кипящей мгле) (591). As the calvary ala returns from Golgotha, the storm starts to recede and Pilate is able to hear the steps of the approaching Afranius (592).

A storm figures in the novel for a fourth time as Master and Margarita fly off on horses with Azazello. The two awaken after drinking Azazello’s wine and he says, “нам пора. Уже громит гроза, вы слышите?” (637). After this, however, the storm disappears. The only hint of this last storm in Moscow is one line as Master looks over the city from the roof of the Pashkov Mansion: “Небо было чисто, радуга исчезла” (640).

In the last redaction, however, the storm leitmotif changes in two significant ways. First, for the first time in any of the manuscripts, Riukhin poses the question about “Буря мглою...” as he addresses the Pushkin Monument on Tverskoi bul’var (696). All of the other “storm” episodes (Variété/Apartment 50/Stravinsky’s clinic, Bald Mountain/Herod’s Palace) remain more or less unchanged except for the last “storm” scene in the novel, which Bulgakov substantively lengthens. The second significant change is this enhanced, final storm. Woland predicts the storm

106 “It is time for us. The storm already thunders, do you hear it?”

107 “The sky was clear, the rainbow had disappeared.”
from the top of the Pashkov Mansion before the scene in the Master’s basement, something he
does not do in the sixth redaction. Then the narrator describes the darkness that descends over
Moscow using the words from the last chapter of the Master’s novel: “Тьма, пришедшая со Средиземного моря, накрыла ненавидимый прокуратором город” (862); 108 “Эта тьма, пришедшая с запада, накрыла громадный город” (909). 109 Woland disappears in the
“darkness” (мгла).

In the next chapter, after the Master and Margarita revive from Azazello’s fateful wine, they fly off into the storm on black horses (916). On their way to Sparrow Hills, however, they stop by Stravinsky’s clinic and visit Ivan: “Шум грозы прорезал дальний свист. -- Вы слышите? -- спросил мастер. -- Шумит гроза... -- Нет, это меня зовут, мне пора” (917). 110 After the Master and Margarita depart, Ivan hears noise coming from his neighbor’s (the Master’s) room and calls for his nurse. She comes, thinking that Ivan is again frightened by the storm. However, in a reversal of the earlier scene, the storm no longer frightens the young poet, who has renounced his verses and promised never to write again (917). Ivan’s reaction to the storm closes Chapter 30, and Chapter 31 opens with the recession of the storm: “Грозу унесло без следа, и, аркой перекинувшись через всю Москву, стояла в небе разноцветная радуга, пила воду из Москвы-реки” (918). 111 Taken together these two developments of the storm leitmotif introduce the theme of the Poet and Prophecy.

108 “The darkness, arriving from the Mediterranean Sea, covered the city hated by the procurator.”

109 “This darkness, arriving from the west, covered the huge city.”

110 “A distant whistle knifed through the noise of the storm. ‘You heart that?’ asked the Master. ‘The storm is loud...’ [said Ivan.] ‘No, that is them calling me, it is time for me.’”

111 “The storm disappeared without a trace, and, arcing across all of Moscow, a multi-colored rainbow hung in the sky and drank water from the Moscow river.”
The two changes (Pushkin’s “Буря мглою” and Woland’s prophecy of the extended storm at the end of the novel) also increase the layers of referential meaning between Pushkin’s poetry and other spaces in the novel. First, Woland predicts the coming storm just as Pushkin’s poetry on the ignorant lips of Riukhin predicts the storm. Not only does Woland know the Master’s novel about Pilate, he seems to know Pushkin’s “A storm by darkness,” and, in contrast to Riukhin, Woland understands its significance. Second, as does Pushkin in “Zimnii vecher,” Bulgakov attunes his storms to the emotional plight of his characters: Varenukha’s beating, Ivan’s mental collapse, Ieshua’s death, Pilate’s guilt. Master and Margarita find comfort in the storm after drinking wine, just as the lyrical “I” of Pushkin’s poem finds comfort in wine: “Выпьем с горя, где же кружка? Сердцу будет веселей.”

Master and Margarita drink to escape and fly off into the raging storm.

Perhaps the most important aspect of these additions, however, is how Bulgakov uses them spatially to remark on the theme of the poet through Ivan and his double Riukhin. Riukhin does not understand the poetry of the words “A storm by darkness...” (Буря мглою). Whereas Riukhin disappears entirely, significantly after Ivan splits in two, Ivan plays a most important role at the end of the novel. Riukhin fails to understand the prophetic poetry in Pushkin’s words, and as a poet remains irredeemable. Ivan, at first frightened by the storm, but coming to

---

112 “We’ll drink from grief, where is the mug? Our heart will be cheered.”

113 One excerpt from V. Yakovlev’s critical article in Sovetskoe iskusstvo (17 March 1936) about the text of Poslednie dni sheds light on Bulgakov’s decision to characterize Riukhin’s inability to comprehend Pushkin specifically with the lines “Буря мглою...”. Bulgakov cut out the article and preserved it in his “Альбом постановки Последних дней (А.С. Пушкин)” (Pushkinskii Dom, F. 369, ed. khr. 244).

“Pushkin himself is not brought into the play. The authors give no explanation at all of this fact. But maybe Pushkin is spoken about so much and so well in the play that his presence on the stage would be superfluous? Alas, this cannot be said. All that is shown in the text is that Pushkin is the author of “The storm with darkness veils the sky...”. And that’s it. The authors don’t even hint at the existence of other works by Pushkin. We need scarcely ask about the image of the poet, the social roots of his tragedy, or any reflection of the era in the story of his life and death.” As cited in Curtis, Bulgakov’s Last Decade, 89.

Riukhin echoes the ideas of Yakovlev with Bulgakov’s characteristic satirical wit.
understand more about art through his time with the Master, overcomes his fear and even finds comfort and a bit of joy in the storm, or at least despite it. Even the pitiable Bosoi makes an appearance in the Epilogue, where the reader learns about his lasting hatred of Pushkin and Kurolesov (930), but Riukhin fades into oblivion. Despite Riukhin’s jealousy of Pushkin’s fame, at the end of the novel no one remembers Riukhin, not even as a bad poet. Pushkin’s storm plays a large role in the novel: Ivan learns from it, but Riukhin misses it, a prophetic condemnation of his life as a poet.

Another citation from literary circles of early Soviet Moscow further illuminates the theme of the poet and prophecy in *Master and Margarita*. In Khodasevich’s 1921 speech, “Koleblemyi trenozhnik” (“The Unsteady Tripod”), one can sense the intelligentsia’s attitude towards Pushkin.114

Pushkin will arise in gigantic stature. National pride in him will flow into indestructible bronze forms—but that spontaneous closeness, that heart-felt tenderness with which we loved Pushkin will never be known to coming generations. ... They will never see the face of Pushkin as we have seen it. This mysterious face, the face of a demigod, will change, in the very manner that it sometimes seems the bronze face of a statue changes. ... The heightened interest in the words of the poet which was felt by many people during the past several years arose, perhaps, from a premonition, from an insistent need: partly to decipher Pushkin while it is not yet too late, while the tie with his time is not yet lost forever; and partly, it seems to me, it was suggested by the same premonition: we are agreeing to what call we should answer, how we should communicate with each other in the oncoming darkness.115

---

114 The speech was published in *Vestnik literatury* in 1921 and as a pamphlet in 1922, the first years of Bulgakov’s life in Moscow.

Khodasevich’s speech foresees something of the monumentalism of Pushkin in the later decades of Soviet life, but it also captures the prophetic tone of Bulgakov’s use of “Буря мглою” in Master and Margarita. The “coming darkness” Khodasevich refers to is the same darkness depicted by the apocalyptic storm at the end of Master and Margarita. Bulgakov likely knew of this speech and its subsequent publication from his research for Poslednie dni; in any event he intuited some of the same things. The Pushkin monument and the references to Pushkin’s oeuvre that its presence makes possible reflects Bulgakov’s agreement “to what call we should answer, how we should communicate with each other in the coming darkness.”

Riukhin’s “jealous rage” for Pushkin and his ignorant denigration of Pushkin’s poetry is thus dually rebuffed: first by Pushkin’s unwillingness to “argue with a fool” (оспоривать глупца), and second by the prophetic role “Буря мглою” plays in the stormy darknesses that characterize the rest of the novel, a role that Riukhin misses entirely.

And yet Pushkin and Woland are not the only two characters in the novel who have unexpected knowledge of past and future events. The storms that the Master writes into his novel are prophetic like Pushkin’s “Буря мглою”: they predict the Moscow storms with which they merge. The Master affirms the prophetic function of his writing when he first appears to Ivan Bezdomnyi in Stravinsky’s clinic: “О, как я угадал! О, как я все угадал!” (741). Woland’s intimate knowledge of his text does not surprise Master in the least; he is happy to learn that his creative intuition proved correct in the end.

In all of these cases, Pushkin’s verse about his monument, about autocracy, about a storm, and the Master’s prose about Iershalaim, art predicts life, art gives life shape and meaning.

---

116 “Oh, how I guessed it! Oh, how I guessed it all!”
Yesterday’s art interprets today’s life. By the power of their words, Pushkin and Master both reach into the future and shape it, staking their claim on events that will come to pass. Like the prophet of Pushkin’s eponymous poem, an artist’s inspiration violently deforms the artist, crushing their human frailty. On top of this, such a remarkable ability to shape life in a prophetic manner invites the rage and envy of the Riukhins, Latunskiis, and Mogarychs of the world.

Ieshua shares the fate of Pushkin and Master in certain ways. He is a genius in his own right, and has a certain gift for foresight that allows him to see beyond the autocracy and Orthodoxy, the Stalinism and Marxist-Leninism of first-century Palestine: Caesarism and Judaism. Ieshua was brought before Pilate because he spoke of the ruin of the Temple and the construction of a new temple of truth. Witnesses accused Ieshua of prophesying the destruction of the Temple, a prophesy that was revolutionary enough to have him brought before Pilate. Ieshua also foresaw the demise of Caesar’s power, a prophesy that cost him his life and rendered Pilate unable to save him (657-664). Thus Ieshua died, and yet both of the prophesies he died for were fulfilled. The Temple was destroyed, Rome fell. Of course they were only replaced by other Temples and other Romes. His hopeful, naive, idealistic prophesies were only fulfilled in part.

Pilate, on the other hand, turns out to be something of a prophet himself, albeit of a darker, more cynical nature. Pilate did not foresee storms or darkness, the end of Autocracy, or a new Temple of truth, but the murder of Iuda of Kerioth. He mysteriously obtained intelligence of the young man’s danger: his prophetic intuition that the young man would die that very evening took Afranius by surprise, he had not heard of such a thing. And yet Pilate insists, “Такова моя должностя, а пуще всего я обязан верить своему предчувствию, ибо никогда еще оно меня
Pilate’s “intuition” proves correct, and Afranius returns and asks to be judged harshly for having not “prevented” the death of Judas. Pilate rewards him, however, one of the clues that, far from preventing Iuda’s murder, he orchestrated Iuda’s execution. Ironically, Pilate’s position of power allows him to conceal directives for the murder of Iuda in the semantics of intuition and foresight. His cynical ability to couch an order to murder someone in the language of “prophetic” intuition contradicts the spirit of Ieshua’s prophecy, the root conflict about which they disagree for eternity.

The Poet and Power

Pilate’s foreknowledge of Iuda’s death leads to the second theme for which the space of the monument to Pushkin acts in a textual manner: Power. The theme of Power (властъ) is central to the relationship between Pilate and Ieshua. It frames Pilate’s guilt, his actions, his reward. Pilate’s power does not save Ieshua from death, but it does murder Ieshua’s betrayer and prevent Ieshua from having a public funeral. The theme of Poet and Power is also central to the monument to Pushkin on Tverskoi Boulevard, in terms of Pushkin’s oeuvre as well as the realia surrounding the monument’s history.

Pushkin potentially provided at least part of the artistic inspiration for the Master’s novel. Pushkin planned a story about Jesus and Pilate that paralleled other, similar world events and, by extension, the events of his contemporary Russia. Pushkin’s work seems to have hinged on three “feasts” before execution: Cleopatra (35 BCE), Christ, and Petronius (66 CE).

---

117 “Such is my duty, and what is more, I am obligated to believe my own intuition, for it has never yet deceived me.”

Наконец, общим для всех эпизодов было столкновение идущих на добровольную смерть героев с властью. Само понятие “власть” в каждом случае выступает в новом обличье, одновременно и меняясь, и сохраняя свою сущность. Клеопатра — царица любви, но она и просто царица, и это в рассказе о ней многократно подчеркивается .... Паре “любовники — Клеопатра” соответствует пара “Петроний — Нерон”. Здесь власть выступает в обличье неприкрытого деспотизма, капризной и подозрительной тирании. Эпизод с Христом также требовал соответствующего антагониста. Им мог стать только Понтий Пилат. Если в двух первых случаях речь шла об экцессах власти развратной и деспотической, хорошо знакомых Пушкину по русской истории, то в Понтий Пилате на сцену выходила не личность, а принцип кесарства, не экцесс, а идея государственности. Рассуждение о том, что следует отдать кесарю, а что — Богу, сцены разговора Иисуса с Пилатом давали исключительные идеальные и драматические возможности контрастов между эпохами, культурами и характерами. Вряд ли Пушкин думал их обойти.119

The parallel plot structures and themes that Lotman proposes for Pushkin’s unfinished work in this quote closely parallel those in Master and Margarita, particularly in their united theme of power and death.120

Other works from Pushkin’s oeuvre, like “Mednyi vsadnik,” Boris Godunov, and others, provide a rich source for literary citation, allusion, and reference for authors who treat the same

119 Lotman, “Opyt rekonstruktsii pushkinskogo siuzheta ob Iisuse,” 290. “Finally, common to each of the episodes was the encounter of the heros going to a voluntary death with power. The concept of ‘power’ itself in each case appears in a new countenance, simultaneously both changing and preserving its essence. Cleopatra is the queen of love, but she is also just a queen, a fact that is emphasized numerous times in the tale about her.... To the pairing of “lovers and Cleopatra” corresponds the pairing of “Petronius and Nero.” Here power appears in the countenance of bare-faced despotism, of capricious and suspicious tyranny. The episode with Christ also demanded a corresponding antagonist. Only Pontius Pilate could become such an antagonist. If in the first two cases the theme was the excesses of licentious and despotic power, familiar to Pushkin from Russian history, then with Pontius Pilate there appeared on the stage the principle of Caesarism, not a personality, the idea of government, not excess. The discourse about what to give to Caesar and what to give to God, the scenes of a conversation between Jesus and Pilate provided exceptionally ideal and dramatic opportunities for contrasting epochs, cultures, and characters. It is unlikely that Pushkin intended to pass them by.”

120 The idea of the Master having “guessed it all” (я все угадал), also links Pushkin’s unfinished manuscript to the theme of prophecy: perhaps the master divined Pushkin’s manuscript about Ieshua, or perhaps Pushkin prophetically foresaw the Master’s work, just as Woland’s intimate knowledge of it seems to indicate a supernatural quality about the text.
theme. The monument to Pushkin contains within its very textual space the ideas that those in Power evoke madness in those they destroy, Power disfigures art into “vulgarity,” and Power distorts art through censorship and propaganda. In Master and Margarita Bulgakov makes full use of this particular thematic dimension of the Pushkin monument.

The events surrounding Pushkin’s death, burial, and the movement to erect the monument exemplify the tension between the poet and power. The Power dimension in the text of the Pushkin monument begins with the death of Pushkin in 1837. The government of Nicholas I acted swiftly upon news of the poet’s death to stem any sort of popular expression in favor of the poet: “Benkendorf and Uvarov [Pushkin’s enemies], whose ministry controlled the censorship, also moved to suppress all other forms of public reaction. Portraits of the poet which had been printed to mourn his passing were collected and burned; a new production of Pushkin’s “The Covetous Knight” was banned; and any mention in print of how Pushkin died or of the funeral and the circumstances surrounding it was strictly forbidden.”

In some ways, Pushkin’s funeral corresponds to the disappearances described in Master and Margarita. His body was whisked away under police escort and no family and only a few friends were allowed to attend.

Zhukovsky broached the idea of a monument to Pushkin to Nicholas I the day after Pushkin’s death. He urged the Tsar to cover Pushkin’s unpaid debts and to care for the poet’s family, to publish a collected volume of the Pushkin’s works, and to commission a monument in

---

121 Power and madness have a long history. Since classical Greek literature the idea that “those whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad” has frequently recurred as a theme in world literature.

122 Levitt, Russian Literary Politics and the Pushkin Celebration of 1880, 20.

123 Levitt, Russian Literary Politics and the Pushkin Celebration of 1880, 20.

124 Levitt, Russian Literary Politics and the Pushkin Celebration of 1880, 18.
the poet’s memory. Nicholas I agreed to the first two suggestions, but forbade the monument.125

Significantly, the monument only appeared during Alexander II’s reforms, just months before his assassination. The Russian autocracy was wary of honoring Pushkin in such a way, given his ties to the Decembrist revolt and some of his political poetry. In addition to the monument, immediately after Pushkin’s death Zhukovsky did much to shape the tone of the event for the public. Zhukovsky “made Pushkin’s death a nationally shared, symbolic tragedy,” he demonstrated “how a writer can maneuver around the dangers of writing about Pushkin’s death: words that mourn become an occasion for celebrating the generous tsar who permits such mourning.”126

Even before his death Pushkin occupied a difficult position in relation to Nicholas I. Emasculated as a political thinker due to his role as one of Nicholas I’s gentlemen of the chamber, humiliated on account of Nicholas I’s attentions to Natalia Goncharova, Pushkin endured devastating repression at the court, including Nicholas I’s personal censorship of his art. Because of this relationship with Nicholas I, Pushkin personified the poet’s relationship to power for artists of Bulgakov’s generation. In 1937 “the Pushkin discourse ... was a distanced, cryptic conversation held by the writers about themselves, an encoded discourse that was concerned with all the old questions of the Russian intelligentsia: about the role of the poet, the writer, and the intellectual; about their relationship to the people and to power [Macht, Власть]; and about social responsibility.”127

125 Levitt, Russian Literary Politics and the Pushkin Celebration of 1880, 19.


127 Schlögel, Terror und Traum, 209.
Like the writers whom Schlögel describes, Bulgakov found in Pushkin a personal model for artistic integrity in a repressive regime. In a 1931 draft of a letter to Stalin, Bulgakov asked the communist leader to be his “first reader,” “a reference to the role assumed by Nicholas I concerning Pushkin.” Thus, as early as 1931 Bulgakov found in Pushkin a model for artistic integrity as he faced increasing censorship. Bulgakov’s interest in the theme first developed while writing his play about Molière. The play about Pushkin, Poslednie dni, came later, but both plays depicted artists and their struggle with autocracy, both plays implicitly invited comparison of the Soviet State to the autocracies of Louis XIV and Nicholas I. On 19 March, 1932 Bulgakov described Pushkin as his model for artistic integrity in a repressive society in a letter to Pavel Popov, comparing his own fate to Pushkin’s: “When they shot the knight commander of our order of Russian writers [Pushkin] a hundred years ago, they found a deep pistol wound on his body. When a hundred years later they come to undress one of his descendants before dispatching him on his distant journey, they’ll find a number of scars from Finnish knives. And they’ll all be on his back. Only the weapons change!”

In 1931 the attitude of the state towards Pushkin was still unclear, however, and it seems unlikely that Bulgakov could have known that the state would finally choose Pushkin as a major model for the revolutionary poet. Bulgakov must have been confounded at the illogical turn of events in the build up to the 1937 Jubilee. He had adopted Pushkin as a model for a poet who

---

128 Gasparov, “Iz nabliudenii,” 242; Milne, Mikhail Bulgakov: A Critical Biography, 190; Bulgakov, Dnevnik, Pis’ma, 1914-1940, 240; translation in Curtis, Manuscripts Don’t Burn, 125.

129 “In August of 1934 Bulgakov began to sketch out plans for a more substantial work. He wanted to write another biographical play about a writer, but this time the subject was to be Russia’s national poet, Pushkin. The centenary of Pushkin’s death was to fall in 1937 and would certainly be celebrated by a number of theatres: this project, at least, surely could not backfire?” Curtis, Manuscripts Don’t Burn, 151.

130 Bulgakov, Dnevnik, Pis’ma, 1914-1940, 266; translation in Curtis, Manuscripts Don’t Burn, 140.
endured state censorship with integrity, and the very state that censored him concurrently adopted Pushkin as a model for the revolutionary poet, the inspiration of the Decembrists, the author of “K Chedaevu.”

In particular this theme of censorship represents another textual dimension of the Pushkin monument itself, and its function in Master and Margarita. Censorship was an important theme even in the 1880 celebration. V.A. Zhukovsky, editor of the posthumous edition of Pushkin’s complete collected works (1838-1841), changed one stanza of “Exegi monumentum” in order to pass the censors, and this version of the poem was engraved into the monument’s pedestal. In 1880, the poem on the monument read “И долго буду тем народу я любезен, Что чувства добрый я лирой пробуждал, Что прелестью живой стихов я был полезен И милость к падшим призывал.” In this sense, the monument to Pushkin is a monument to State censorship. However, Pushkin’s original version,

И долго буду тем любезен я народу
Что чувства добрый я лирой пробуждал
Что в мой жестокий век восславил я
Свободу И милость к падшим призывал

was read aloud at the 1880 Celebration, which indicates it was an important theme to the members of the intelligentsia who dominated the event.132

The theme surfaced again in the 1937 Jubilee, when the Communist Party of the Soviet Union restored Pushkin’s original verse to the monument’s base.133 The monument itself thus bears the marks of censorship by both the autocratic, tsarist government and the totalitarian

131 “And long will I be a favorite of the people, Because I awoke kind feelings with my lyre, Because I provided the benefit of poetry’s living charm, And called forth mercy for the fallen.”

132 “And long will I be a favorite of the people, Because I awoke kind feelings with my lyre, Because I glorified Freedom in my harsh age, And called forth mercy for the fallen.”

133 Schlögel, Terror und Traum, 203; Levitt, Russian Literary Politics and the Pushkin Celebration of 1880, 24.
Stalinist regime: it is a text about texts censored by Power. Even as the Communist Party worked to undo the monumentalized censorship of Autocracy in the Pushkin monument, Bulgakov experienced the height of the censorship of his own works, most specifically, a work about Pushkin designed for the 1937 Jubilee.

And yet as the Pushkin Jubilee approached, Bulgakov was fated for more disappointment. On the 24th of March, 1937, Bulgakov wrote to his trusted friend Pavel Popov:

> Amongst other things, I am going to court on 2 April -- some sharks from a theatre in Kharkov are making an attempt to extract money from me by playing on my misfortune over Pushkin. Nowadays I cannot hear the word “Pushkin” without a shudder, and hourly I curse myself for having had the ill-fated thought of writing a play about him. Some of my well-wishers have adopted a rather strange way of consoling me. More than once I have heard their suspiciously unctuous voices: “Never mind, it will all get printed after your death!” I am very grateful to them, of course!\textsuperscript{134}

Already in the face of the Jubilee Bulgakov was dealing with the consequences of the failure of “Poslednie dni.”\textsuperscript{135} Pushkin’s “Exegi monumentum,” engraved in stone on the monument that honored his death, finally escaped censorship a hundred years after his death; Bulgakov could not help but notice the irony of comments about his works being published after his death.

Riukhin’s comment “You got lucky” (Тебе повезло) takes on more layers of meaning here than just outright jealousy, although that is also an important layer. For Riukhin, Pushkin was “lucky” to have been censored because of the glory it brought him when at last the lapidary censorship of “Exegi monumentum” had been undone, reversed on his monument.

\textsuperscript{134} Bulgakov, Dnevnik, Pis’ma, 1914-1940, 435; translation in Curtis, Manuscripts Don’t Burn, 248.

\textsuperscript{135} One reason the play did not pass the censor is that critics viewed the presentation of Pushkin as a resistance to official adulation of Pushkin in the build up to the 1937 Jubilee. Curtis, Bulgakov’s Last Decade, 89.
Riukhin’s paradoxical thoughts on censorship were a defining feature of the 1937 Jubilee. At the height of Stalinist Terror the nation was celebrating and feasting, not unlike scenes from Pushkin’s translation of John Wilson’s “The City of the Plague,” “Pir vo vremia chumy.” In fact, the phrase “feast in time of plague” came to be associated with the 1937 Jubilee.¹³⁶

В 1937 г., когда террор достиг, казалось, апогея, с необыкновенной пышностью и размахом были организованы торжества по поводу, вообще-то говоря, траурной даты -- столетия со дня гибели Пушкина. Пушкин, которого до того официально оценивали как “идеолога капитализирующегося среднепоместного дворянства,” ... теперь был официально объявлен “народным русским поэтом.” Празднества слились с кровавыми разправами, и Булгаков передал эту черту времени, оформив камеру пыток в сцене допроса валютчиков под пушкинский спектакль.¹³⁷

As Lesskis and Atarova point out, it was a time of great paradox. In particular, however, the paradox of the censorship aspect of the monument’s text are echoed in Bosoi’s dream, where authorities use Pushkin’s texts to coerce citizens to surrender the foreign currency they are withholding. Like Riukhin at the monument, Bosoi demonstrates a negative and “vulgar” attitude towards the great poet. Bosoi’s ignorance, however, and the circumstances of his first exposure to Pushkin’s art, go far to explain his reaction.

Significantly, the development of the Pushkin references in Bosoi’s dream reflect the same general trend of the increased role Pushkin and the text of his monument play in the novel. In the third redaction, the first version of what eventually will become Bosoi’s dream, “Zamok


¹³⁷ Lesskis and Atarova, Putevoditel’, 336. “In 1937, when the Terror reached, it would seem, its apogee, the celebrations of what was, generally speaking, a day of mourning on the one hundredth anniversary of Pushkin’s death, were organized with unusual sumptuousness and magnitude. Pushkin, whom up to this point about been officially evaluated as an ‘ideologue of the capital-owning middle manorial nobility,’ ... now was officially announced as ‘Russia’s poet of the people.’ The festivities merged with bloody reprisals, and Bulgakov communicated this feature of the time, formulating a torture chamber in the scene of the interrogation of those caught with foreign currency during a performance of one of Pushkin’s plays.”
chudes” (“Castle of Miracles”), makes no reference to Pushkin. In the fourth redaction Bulgakov adds in a reference to Pushkin’s *Skupoi rytsar’* (*The Covetous Knight*) (written 1830, published 1836). Another act in that version features an Orthodox priest, Father Arkadii, who attempts to convince members of the audience to give up their currency. In the sixth redaction, however, Bulgakov streamlines the propagandistic acts, making them exclusively Pushkinian references. He does away with Father Arkadii and adds in Tchaikovsky’s opera based on Pushkin’s story “Pikovaia dama” (“The Queen of Spades”). Furthermore, the reference is reinforced by Bosoi’s words upon arrival at Stravinsky’s clinic, reported to Ivan by the Master: “Пушкина ругает на чем свет стоит и все время кричит: ‘Куролесов, бис, бис!’” (741).138

Bulgakov’s use of Pushkin’s *Skupoi rytsar’* in Bosoi’s dream functions on several levels. First, it is a sort of inverse parody of the theater episode at the Varieté. There, false currency is given to the audience as if it were real, and they greedily grab as much as they can. In Bosoi’s dream, representatives of the Party use almost magical methods in their attempts to elicit real currency from the audience, who seem unwilling to cooperate.139 This inversion establishes the theme of currency to the Moscow chapters and to the theme of the blood money Iuda received for betraying Ieshua. Second, Bosoi’s dream parallels Riukhin’s conversation with the monument on Tverskoi Boulevard. Riukhin seems ignorant that he is using Pushkin’s language even as he ridicules the poet’s genius by calling him lucky; Bosoi has never read *Skupoi rytsar’*, and yet it appears in his dream. Furthermore, just as Bosoi uses Pushkin’s name in vernacular ways without

138 “He’s cursing Pushkin up one side and down the other and yells all the time, ‘Kurolesov, encore, encore!’”

knowing that Pushkin is a poet, so Riukhin’s commentary on Pushkin’s art reveals his absolute ignorance of poetry and the poet’s function in society.

A third function of Bosoi’s dream relates directly to the theme of Poet and Power. *Skupoi rytsar’* was taken off the stage in 1836; it was a censored text, just like “*Exegi monumentum.*” The irony here is that the play is not only staged but used as propaganda, another form of state censorship. Censorship means forbidding a writer to say what artistic integrity would require. Turning literature into propaganda is an even more violent means of censorship. Using Pushkin’s art as propaganda robs Pushkin and his reader of the original creation’s integrity by forcing Pushkin to say whatever the State needs him to say. The Soviet government did not correct the censored lines on the monument to Pushkin because they cared about free speech or had a more highly developed sense of the ethical role of art in society: it was a propagandistic move to claim Pushkin’s heritage for themselves. The use of *Skupoi rytsar’* to elicit currency from people like Bosoi reflects a similarly propagandistic use of Pushkin’s art.

Perhaps the knowledge of Pushkin revealed in Bosoi’s dream is really supernatural, appearing in his dream without his prior knowledge of the text. Or perhaps he never realized that he had known about the works of Pushkin all along, simply because they pervade so many aspects of Russian culture. In either case the emphasis is the same; neither Riukhin nor Bosoi really know Pushkin’s works. Whereas this lack is unforgivable in Riukhin, a poet who should know and understand the Poet, the narrator seems to pity Bosoi for his simple lack of culture. The ignorance of both figures, however, reproaches the standard of culture in the museum city of world communism. Their ignorance of Pushkin’s influence on their own language, their ignorance of the distortions made by tsarist censor and Soviet propaganda, works to complete
their characterization as caricatures of the “vulgarity” of Soviet society. Like Il’f and Petrov in the scene from Dvenadtat’ stul’ev that collocates the Pushkin monument, a tram stop, Evgenii Onegin played over a loudspeaker, and “young studs chasing tail,” Bulgakov contrasts the monument to Pushkin with the “vulgarity” of the certain members of Soviet society.

Bulgakov reinforces the propaganda theme by citing Tchaikovsky’s opera, Pikovaia dama. In the operatic version, German goes insane and Liza drowns herself in Petersburg. The Soviet cultural establishment in Bosoi’s dream exploits the tragedy of Pushkin’s art to communicate a base morality lesson. For the men, it is the knight’s death; for the women, it is Liza’s death and her disappointment in loving a man who has dishonestly acquired wealth. In both references to Pushkin, Skupoi rytsar’ and Pikovaia dama, the currency investigation distorts Pushkin by using his texts as propaganda, just as the Soviet government used the text of his monument as propaganda. The ideas of censorship, propaganda, and “vulgarity” thus connect Bosoi’s dream directly to the conflict between Poet and Power inherent in the monument to Pushkin.

The Communist Party’s use of Pushkin had a significant antecedent in the government of Nicholas II. During the centennial celebration of Pushkin’s birth in 1899,

Many intelligentsia commentators noted with distress the emergence of a new kind of “official nationality,” which used Pushkin as its banner. The state adopted the reactionaries’ simplistic image of Pushkin as staunch supporter of tsarism and favorite son of Nicholas I, and took steps to promote and defend “its” Pushkin. Unlike in 1880, the leading Russian writers took no part in the 1899 centennial, and many specifically distanced themselves from the official celebration and vulgarization of Pushkin.  

---

140 Levitt, Russian Literary Politics and the Pushkin Celebration of 1880, 159-60.
Bulgakov’s response to the 1937 Pushkin Jubilee continues in this vein, as does his depiction of it in *Master and Margarita*. Pushkin was subjected to various types of “vulgarity” or “vulgarization” in this period, as evidenced by Bosoi and Riukhin.

The 125th anniversary of Pushkin’s birth in 1924 marks an important point in the process of Pushkin’s vulgarization between 1899 and the 1937 Jubilee. The debate between those who idolized Pushkin and those who would have Russian society completely disregard him continued to develop. Esenin’s poem of May 26, 1924, “Pushkinu” (“To Pushkin”), treats the embarrassingly poor quality of contemporary poetry and the fate of the poet. The last two stanzas capture the spirit of the poem:

А я стою, как пред причастием,
И говорю в ответ тебе:
Я умер бы сейчас от счастья,
Сподобленный такой судьбе.
Но, обреченный на гоненье,
Еще я долго буду петь...
Чтоб и мое степное пенье
Сумело бронзой прозвенеть.141

In contrast to Riukhin’s attitude and Riukhin’s poetry, Esenin’s lines dedicated to Pushkin’s monument reflect humility, and a willingness to suffer for one’s art. Esenin accepts his fate, accepts the “persecution” (гоненье) of a poet in a repressive society and looks to Pushkin for a model. By 1937 the State encouraged the sort of worship espoused by Esenin, but with the agitprop goals of Mayakovsky. And yet the tension between these entrenched, binary positions towards Pushkin the poet remain in Bulgakov’s use of the monument in *Master and Margarita*.

Riukhin continues to despise Pushkin, perhaps because of the official endorsement of him by the

---

141 S.A. Esenin, “Pushinu,” in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii: V 7 t.*, ed. Iu.L. Prokushev *et al*., vol. 5 (Moscow: Nauka, 1995), 203-4. “But I stand, as before communion, And say in answer to you: I would die right now from happiness, To have had the honor of such a fate. But, fated for persecution, For years to come I will keep singing... So that my song of the steppe Might also ring of bronze.”
Communist Party. As a poet, he is motivated by nothing more than material considerations, pure jealousy, and lust for fame.

The literary elite were the primary consumers of the public feud between Esenin and Mayakovsky in the 1924 celebration of Pushkin’s birth. By 1937, however, the debate was concluded on the all-Union level. Pushkin had finally been endorsed as a great poet (the dream of Russia’s nineteenth century liberal intelligentsia), but with the strictly utilitarian goals of Russia’s nineteenth century radical intelligentsia.

The predominant Soviet view, especially during the Stalin era, when the literary holiday and adulation of Pushkin reached truly incredible proportions, has been to belittle the 1880 celebration as a class-bound holiday of the liberal Russian intelligentsia (as opposed to Soviet celebrations that represent “the masses”).... Like the nineteenth-century radicals, orthodox Marxist-Leninists do not accept the idea of a possible ‘reconciliation’ of social, cultural, political, and class interests which the Pushkin Celebration promoted.142

There was a very real sense during the 1937 Jubilee that they were redoing the 1880 celebration, reinterpreting it, doing it right this time. “The new unveiling, on February 10, 1937, declared Pravda, ‘was like a second opening of the monument to the poet,’ that is, an infinitely superior one.”143

Along with this second birth of the monument came rewritings of various other types.

In 1937 the prerevolutionary monuments to Alexander Pushkin and Nikolai Gogol went on fantastic night journeys around Stalinist Moscow; Pushkin turned around in order to face the new Gorky Street thoroughfare, looking away from the Passion Monastery, a “counterrevolutionary stronghold of religion.” A statue to Gogol deemed too mystical and gloomy for cheerful Socialist Realist

142 Levitt, Russian Literary Politics and the Pushkin Celebration of 1880, 14.
143 Levitt, Russian Literary Politics and the Pushkin Celebration of 1880, 165.
Soviet life went into internal exile in the courtyard of the writer’s former house. At the same time, living writers, as well as millions of other Soviet citizens, began to disappear into the Gulag. When larger-than-life monuments to the leaders started to crop up like mushrooms after the rain in the mid-1930s, the importance of individual human life shrank proportionally.\footnoteref{boym}

Strastnaia ploshchad’ was renamed in honor of Pushkin, the museum of fine arts was named after him, he became a landmark in Moscow’s topography in a whole new way, and, ironically, the Communist Party increasingly denied to its citizens the “Freedom” that they had restored to the pedestal of Pushkin’s monument.

That theme of censorship and propaganda that the 1937 Jubilee reinforces in the text of the Pushkin monument leads to another major variation on the theme of Poet and Power in *Master and Margarita*: madness and conflict with power. Bulgakov explicitly builds this theme into his characterization of Pilate and Ieshua, whom Pilate calls “madman” (безумец) (866). He literally speaks truth to Pilate, and, although it haunts Pilate for eternity, Pilate still orders the execution of the crazy and powerless philosopher. The pairing of Ieshua and Pilate recalls many other iconic moments of conflict between a subject and a representative of Power in Russian literary: Pushkin and Nicholas I, Chaadaev and Nicholas I, Mozart and Salieri (the Viennese court composer), Bulgakov and Stalin, Evgenii and Peter I, Nikolka and Boris Godunov, Ivanushka and Ivan IV, Master and his critics, Akakii Akakievich and the self-important bureaucrats of Petersburg; the list could go on.

In one episode from a very early manuscript, the theme of the poet and power begins to emerge in Bulgakov’s plans (59-60). The poet Ivanushka momentarily plays the role of holy fool

\footnotetext{Svetlana Boym, “Moscow, the Russian Rome,” in *The Future of Nostalgia* (New York: Basic Books, 2001), 88.}
in a scene modeled on a similar scene in Pushkin’s *Boris Godunov*. Edythe Haber has translated the scene, and describes it:

“Shameful are thy deeds, tsar,” said Ivanushka sternly, “well, give me half a kopeck, tsar Ivanushka—... I’ll be sure to say a prayer for thee.” “Here’s half a kopeck for thee, Ivanushka the fettered.” This episode is undoubtedly intended as an ironic reversal of the relations between tsar and *iurodivyi* in Pushkin’s *Boris Godunov*. There Boris, after ordering the *iurodivyi* be given alms, entreats him: “‘Pray for me poor Nikolka.’” Nikolka, however, refuses: “No, no! It is forbidden to pray for King Herod....” In Bulgakov’s version, in contrast, the man of God, by selling his prayer for a pittance, compromises his moral position.\(^{145}\)

The Soviet poet Ivanushka resembles a “holy fool” (юродивый) in that he wanders through the streets of Moscow with an icon and candle in his underwear, but he lacks the holiness: instead of speaking truth to power like the holy fool Nikolka, Ivanushka simply accepts money from the state and prays for the oppressive tsar. One can sense the importance of place for this connection.\(^{146}\) St. Basil’s church is the primary connection between the two episodes. Bulgakov writes about Ivan Groznyi, Pushkin about Boris Godunov. Bulgakov’s poet is named Ivanushka, Pushkin’s holy fool is named Nikolka. There are no offending children in Bulgakov’s version, and no reference to King Herod. The only common elements are the location and the theme of speaking truth to power.

Ivan’s spell of madness reflects a different Pushkin reference in later versions of the novel, however. He no longer acts like a medieval holy fool, but his madness remains central to

---


\(^{146}\) The fact that Ivanushka says these lines at St. Basil’s Cathedral makes his identity as a “*iurodivyi*” more significant than the other possible interpretation, that of the folkloric Ivanushka “durachok.”
his characterization and that of his double, Riukhin. Gasparov develops this idea in contrast to
Mayakovskv’s poem “Iubileinoe.”

“Между прочим, ассоциация памятника Пушкину с Медным
Всадником неожиданно всплывает в ... стихотворении
Маяковского “Юбилейное”: поэт разговаривает с ожившей
статуей Пушкина. Но если Маяковский обращается к
памятнику в фамильярно-доброжелательном тоне, то Рюхин
разговаривает с памятником со злобой, в припадке
неврастении -- в точном соответствии с поведением “безумца
бедного” -- Евгения в поезме Пушкина.”

Madness and conversations with monuments go together.

This juxtaposition of the Bronze Horseman and the Pushkin monument on Tverskoi
bul’var invites reflection. In the poem, the statue of Peter chases Evgenii, a “little
man” (маленький человек) around the city: the power narrative in the monument is obvious.
But the Pushkin monument in Moscow also tells a story about power, seemingly elevating the
poet as one who may speak to Power on behalf of the oppressed “little man.” The theme carried

147 Gasparov, “Iz nabliudenii,” 233. “By the way, the association of the monument to Pushkin with the Bronze
Horseman unexpectedly surfaces in ... Mayakovskv’s poem “Jubilee”: the poet converses with the animated Pushkin
statue. But if Mayakovskv addresses the monument in a familiar, good-natured tone, Riukhin converses with the
monument in rage, in an attack of neurasthenia, in exact correlation to the behavior of “the poor crazy man” Eugene
in Pushkin’s poem.”

148 The reference to the operatic version of Evgenii Onegin during the initial stages of Ivan’s insane pursuit of
Woland through Moscow plays a minor but important role in the theme of madness. In earlier manuscripts, Ivan had
a different musical experience at this point in his “chase”: balalaikas and harmonicas. That instrumentation
eventually turns into guitars, but with no greater thematic significance. At the same time that Bulgakov develops the
insanity reference at the Pushkin monument, however, he adds in the reference to Evgenii Onegin. As with the
“Queen of Spades” reference, Pushkin’s text is represented in the medium of opera. Thus the Pushkin reference
elevates a part of the narrative that had previously only played a minor part in the narrative.
This reading of the Evgenii Onegin reference answers a question raised by J.A.E. Curtis: “In its guise as an
opera, Eugene Onegin reappears in The Master and Margarita as a feature of Ivan’s nightmare pursuit of Woland
through Moscow.... While it is difficult to construct a coherent justification out of these examples for viewing
Bulgakov’s unusual response to Eugene Onegin as a significant theme in his writing, there is nevertheless an
interesting paradox in his interpretation of Onegin as a diabolical figure, particularly in the light of his less-than-
satanic Mephistophelean characters.” Curtis, Bulgakov’s Last Decade, 76. In my reading, the reference to Evgenii
Onegin itself is not significant. It only reinforces the theme of madness and its connection to the themes introduced
by the scene with Riukhin in the spatial text of the Pushkin monument. The scene from Dvenadtsat’ stul’ev as
discussed earlier in this chapter has the same “audio sound track,” providing additional evidence for my claim that
this reference foreshadows the insanity theme at the monument.
considerable significance for Bulgakov in 1937; he was writing *Poslednie dni* and *Master and Margarita* during the very years the Soviet power structure co-opted Pushkin as the poet for the “masses,” another word for the collective “little humanity” (маленькое человечество). Both of these monuments are central to literary art in Moscow and Petersburg. The difference between Pushkin and Peter, however is great. Pushkin is a poet, Peter an autocrat. Pushkin does not chase after the “little man” that questions him, Peter does. Pushkin is in Moscow, Peter in Petersburg. These differences allow the Soviet government to use Pushkin as a proxy for their ideology, which in 1937 made the two statues represent the same phenomena. Bulgakov depicts this irony by linking the theme of madness to the Pushkin monument via Riukhin’s thoughts about his visit to Stravinsky’s clinic. Bulgakov’s portrayal of both *Skupoi rytar’* and *Pikovaia dama* reinforces the theme of insanity and power. State propaganda employs the mental instability of Pushkin’s hero and heroine to manipulate the audience. The “moral lesson” is that resisting State power leads to insanity.

Within the context of madness and the Bronze Horseman, Riukhin’s thoughts about insanity formulated as a reference to “Ne dai mne bog soiti s uma” at the Pushkin monument lend the poem additional significance as an interpretive text for *Master and Margarita*. Pushkin’s verse explores the social stigma and psychological misery of being institutionalized as insane. Additionally, Pushkin develops several elements of setting in the poem: the prison-like ironwork (решетка), dark forest (темный лес), the screams and cursing of patients and wards (да крик товарищей моих, да брань смотрителей ночных). These motifs also appear in Ivan’s experience of insanity as a patient of Stravinsky. Ivan accuses himself of being a fool (дурак) (728). The Master enters his room through an iron-work grate (решетка) and describes his
reaction to “... людский крик, будь то крик страдания [товарищей моих], ярости [смотрителей ночных] или какой-нибудь иной крик” (740). A dark forest lies just outside the windows of Ivan and Master, and Ivan gets lost in his thoughts about Ieshua and Pilate during his stay, “... в чаду нестройных, чудных грез.” Ivan hears Bosoi scream about Pushkin; he hears the Master’s death in the neighboring room, although instead of frightening him it brings him peace. Finally, some social stigma remains from Ivan’s bout with insanity. At the end of the novel he resorts to powerful pharmaceuticals to deal with the remaining symptoms, and he bears some of the social stigma described in Pushkin’s poem in the pity his wife feels for him.

Ivan’s insanity and Riukhin’s thoughts about the topic cooperate to develop the theme of Poet and Power. In an officially atheist society, Ivan is considered insane for having seen and conversed with the devil. The ideology of the State puts him in Stravinsky’s clinic. The context for Pushkin’s poem suggests a similar situation. To return to the Chaadaev theme, Chaadaev was considered insane when his first philosophical letter was published. Sakharov comments on the Chaadaev theme and its link to madness in Master and Margarita:

“... Самый осторожный человек не может всякую минуту защититься от кирпича, падающего с соседнего дома,” -- сказано в романе Достоевского “Идиот”. Кто же этим кирпичом ведает и управляет? Дьявол? Нет, он тут же честно отрицает за собой такую власть над мировым порядком и судьбой отдельного человека. Но кто тогда? Вот что говорит по этому поводу наш знаменитый философ и страдалец Chaadaev: “Меня часто называли безумцем, и я никогда не отрекался от этого звания и на этот раз говорю -- аминь, -- как

---

149 “... human cries, whether that is the cries of suffering [my comrades], anger [the night shift workers], or some other kind of cry.”

150 “... in the intoxication of disorderly, lovely reveries.”
Pushkin visited the philosopher during his confinement, and scholars suggest that “Ne dai mne bog soiti s uma” reflects Pushkin’s experience of the place. Insanity has long provided a convenient way for those in Power to dispose of ideological opponents.

**The Poet and Peace**

The theme of peace (покой) in *Master and Margarita* is complex. The thesis of this chapter requires me to limit my discussion to the influence the monument to Pushkin has on the development of the theme, but that is also no simple task. In part the difficulty stems from the polysemy of the Russian word itself, and the specific connotations created in Pushkin’s poem about peace (покой), “Pora, moi drug, pora!” The meaning of the word “peace” has rich connotations. The word means peace and rest, but a word with the same Russian root, ‘departed’ (покойник), demonstrates its connection to death that English expresses in the phrase, “rest in peace” and the words of the Roman Catholic and Russian Orthodox masses for the dead.

---

151 V.I. Sakharov, *Mikhail Bulgakov: Pisatel’ i vlast’: Po sekretnym arkhivam TsK KPSS i KGB* (Moscow: “OLMA-PRESS,” 2000), 249-50. “... Even the most careful person can not defend himself from a brick falling from the building next to him every moment of every day,” is a line in Dostoevsky’s novel *The Idiot*. Who really does know of and control that brick? The Devil? No, in this same passage he honestly denies himself that kind of power over the world order and the fate of an individual human. But then who? Here is what our famous philosopher and martyr Chaadaev has to say about it: ‘I have often been called crazy, and I have never denied this appellation and this time I say, “Amen,” as I always do, when a brick falls on my head, since every brick falls from the sky.’”

152 Miagkov, *Bulgakov na Patriarshikh*, 188.

153 In a discussion about the “poet and peace” at the monument to Pushkin, where the polysemy of peace ‘покой’ includes the concept of death, one poem about Pushkin’s death looms larger than most in the history of Russian literature: Lermontov’s “Death of a Poet.” The poem is rich in intertextual allusion for the theme of the poet’s relationship to power and peace. I mention it here because it is one of the textual dimensions of the monument to Pushkin that Bulgakov accesses in *Master and Margarita*, and yet a full discussion of it would lead away from my main thesis. I think of Lermontov’s poem as one dimension of the monument to Pushkin that my approach allows Bulgakov scholars to access, but one that cannot be fully addressed within this dissertation.
'requiem aeternum,' "вечный покой," "eternal peace."" Bulgakov yearned for this peace, a desire he jokingly expresses to the co-writer of his play Posledni dni on 2 October 1936, after the news that it was banned: “May Pushkin rest in peace, and may we do the same!” (Мир праху Пушкина и мир нам). 

The scene between Riukhin and the Pushkin monument introduces this theme in the novel. First, Riukhin refers to Pushkin’s death in the duel with D’Anthès. It is only natural that Pushkin’s death would be on Riukhin’s mind, the 1937 Jubilee honored the one hundredth anniversary of Pushkin’s mortal wound and subsequent death. Second, Riukhin’s thoughts indirectly quote Pushkin’s unfinished poem, “Pora, moi drug, pora!” (1834, potentially 1836), in which peace is a central theme. Riukhin’s thoughts, “... худшего несчастья, чем лишение разума, нет на свете,” misinterpret and twist Pushkin’s poetry, but they have a strong resonance with the line, “На свете счастья нет, но есть покой и воля.” Third, Riukhin’s jealousy for the dead genius Pushkin recalls Mozart and Salieri (written 1826-1830). In Pushkin’s “little tragedy,” Salieri contemplates his jealousy of Mozart, invites him to dinner where they discuss Mozart’s Requiem, and then poisons him. Riukhin’s indirect quote of “Pora, moi drug, pora!,” along with his jealousy of Pushkin’s fame, death, and immortality, is the first complex reference to the theme of the poet and peace, which at the end of the novel becomes a major leitmotif.

154 Belobrovtsena and Kul’ius find a reference to War and Peace in Bulgakov’s conflation of pokoi, svet, and smert’. The concepts of nagrada ‘reward’ and uspokoenie ‘peace’ are linked in Pierre’s induction into masonry in Tolstoy’s War and Peace, which Bulgakov adapted for the stage in the 30s. In the episode of Pierre’s induction he must learn the seven virtues of Freemasonry. The seventh is love for death. “In the seventh place, try, by the frequent thought of death, to bring yourself to regard it not as a dreaded foe, but as a friend that frees the soul grown weary in the labors of virtue from this distressful life, and leads it to its place of recompense (nagrada) and peace (uspokoenie).” War and Peace, Book 5, part 2; see also Belobrovtsena and Kul’ius, Roman M. Bulgakova: Kommentarii, 118-119. Pierre forgets this particular virtue and is unable to recall it.

155 Bulgakov, Dnevnik, Pis’ma, 1914-1940, 413; translation in Curtis, Manuscripts Don’t Burn, 240.

156 “… there is no worse unhappiness in the world than losing one’s reason.” “There is no happiness in the world, but there is peace and freedom.”
One can observe a similar device at work in the sixth redaction of the novel. The themes of fate and happiness come together in a slightly different way. Instead of citing “Pora, moi drug, pora” and “Ne dai mne bog soiti s uma” he juxtaposes “Pora, moi drug, pora” with “K Chedaevu” in Riukhin’s line, “А мне не везет, нет мне счастья, не та звезда у меня.” This version of the Riukhin scene was written in 1937: Bulgakov did not need to include the monument in this redaction because of the intensity with which these citations would resonate in his readers’ minds. Riukhin would have seen the poem “K Chedaevu” hanging in the square. The space is unmistakeable, even without the reference to Pushkin. Just after Riukhin thinks these thoughts the truck is already zooming down the Boulevard and he arrives at Griboedov House momentarily.

Specifically in regard to “Pora, moi drug, pora!,” the citation appears again in more direct form at the end of the novel when Levii Matvei delivers instructions to Woland concerning the Master’s fate (судьба). Gasparov writes, “Судьба Мастера...формулируется в виде скрытой цитаты из Пушкина: ‘Он не заслужил света, он заслужил покой’ (ср. ‘На свете счастья нет, но есть покой и воля’).” Gasparov also argues that Pushkin’s fate is associated with that of Ieshua and Master:

Судьба самого Пушкина включена в один ассоциативный ряд с судьбой Иешуа и Мастера: гибель и бессмертие (“Стрелял, стрелял в него этот белогвардеец и раздробил бедро и обеспечил бессмертие”). Но его памятник в Москве, рядом с

---

157 Riukhin: “I am not lucky, there is no happiness for me, I have the wrong star.” Pushkin: “На свете счастья нет, но есть покой и воля”; “Товаришь, верь, взойдет она, звезда пленительного счастья, Россия вспрянет ото сна, и на обломках самовласты напишут наши имена.” “There is no happiness in the world, but there is peace and freedom”; “Comrade, believe! It will arise, Our star of captivating happiness, Russia will awake from her slumber, And on the wreckage of autocracy, Will be written our names!”

158 Gasparov, “Iz nabliudenii,” 242. “The fate of the Master ... is formulated in a hidden citation from Pushkin: ‘He did not earn light, he earned peace’ (compare to ‘There is no happiness in the world, but there is peace and freedom’).”
Грибоедовым, превращен в “идол.” Пушкин оказывается средством, при помощи которого добывает валюту “симпатичный молодой человек”: прослушав “Скупого рыцаря,” совестливый Иван Канавкин тут же сдал золото, в женском отделении аналогичное действие оказывается рассказ о горестной судьбе Лизы и Германа. Пушкин, таким образом, оказывается таким же средством добывания денег, каким был Иешуа -- для Иуды. В этой трактовке темы Пушкина неосмнено сказались обстановка пушкинского юбилея (1937 год).159

Chudakova provides a slightly different view of the scene with Levii Matvei:

Одновременно с эпилогом была продиктована та страница романа, где появлялся Левий Матвей с окончательным решением судьбы Мастера: “Он не заслужил света, он заслужил покой” .... Эти слова иначе осветили и уже написанные прежде последние страницы романа, прощение Мастера с городом. “Его волнение перешло, как ему показалось, в чувство глубокой и кровной обиды. Но та была нестойкой, пропала и почему-то сменилась горделивым равнодушием, а оно -- предчувствием постоянного покоя.”160

Chudakova ties the scene with Levii Matvei’s pronouncement of the Master’s fate to the scene of the Master’s farewell to Moscow because of the word “peace” (покой).161

159 Gasparov, “Iz nabliudenii,” 232-3. “The fate of Pushkin himself is included in one associative link with the fate of Ieshua and the Master: death and immortality (‘That white guard officer shot him and shattered his thigh and ensured his immortality’). But his monument in Moscow, next to Griboedov House, is transformed into an ‘idol.’ Pushkin turns out to be a means, with whose help “a nice young man” gets foreign currency. Having heard The Covetous Knight, the conscientious Ivan Kanavkin right away gave up his gold; in the women’s theater the story about the sad fate of Liza and Herman produces an analogous result. Pushkin, in this manner, turns out to be a means of getting money, just like Ieshua was for Iuda. This treatment of the Pushkin theme undoubtedly reflects the conditions of the 1937 Pushkin Jubilee.”

160 Chudakov, Zhizneopisanie, 632. “The epilogue was dictated simultaneously with the page of the novel where Levii Matvei appears with the final decision about the Master’s fate: ‘He did not earn light, he earned peace’ .... These words shed a different light on the last pages of the novel written earlier, where the Master says farewell to the city. ‘His agitation receded, as it seemed to him, into a sense of deep, profound offense. But that was only a fleeting feeling, and it went away and for some reason was replaced with a proud sense of indifference, which was replaced with a presentiment of continual peace.’”

161 Chudakova’s argument that the Master’s fate draws on Dante’s Divine Comedy does not contradict Gasparov’s reading of the line as a quote from Pushkin. The two references work together in harmony.
Bulgakov’s juxtaposition of “peace” and “light” must also be considered in light of references to Pushkin’s *Mozart and Salieri*. In the play Mozart tells Salieri of his work on *Requiem* just before he dies. Given Bulgakov’s extensive use of musical themes throughout the novel, he must have known of Mozart’s unfinished masterpiece, which is based on the Catholic mass that in Russian translation references both “eternal peace” (вечный покой, *requiem aeternum*) and “eternal light” (вечный свет, *lux perpetua*). Bulgakov’s theme of the artist and peace has many profound allusions to Pushkin’s oeuvre, but fate in the form of peace or light exhibits a clear reference to Mozart’s *Requiem* and his offstage death in Pushkin’s “little tragedy.”

The foretaste of peace that the Master senses upon his farewell refers to the “eternal refuge” (вечный приют), the “eternal home” (вечный дом) he will share with Margarita. The phrase “eternal home” itself has the ring of the grave in Russia: it is a euphemism for the tomb. Bulgakov specifically links the theme of peace, rest, and abode in Pushkin’s poem to the opening lines: “Pora, moi drug, pora!” After officially confirming the Sanhedrin’s request for Ieshua’s death, Pilate solemnly pronounces “It’s time!” (Пора!) (671)

162 When the Master leaves Ivan after their first meeting, which is the last time Ivan sees the Master alive, the Master says, “It’s time for me” (Мне пора), a phrase he will repeat during their second meeting, after the Master has already died (753, 917). Margarita repeats the Master’s words in her note to her husband, the last words he will ever receive from her before her death: “It’s time for me” (Мне пора) (812).

Azazello uses the phrase when he calls Margarita to initiate her flight to the Witches’ Sabbath on

---

162 In a significant parallel to this scene Salieri says the word “пора!” when he finalizes his decision to kill Mozart, whom he previously referred to as a “безумец.” A.S. Pushkin, *Mozart i Sal’eri* in *Pushkin, A.S. Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, 1837-1937: V 16 t.*, edited by V. Tomashevskii *et al.*, vol. 7, (Moscow: Izd-vo AN SSSR, 1948), 129, 125.
Bald Mountain (813). Woland uses the phrase when it is time to begin the ball (833). After the ball, Margarita begins to suspect that her service has been in vain and pronounces the phrase twice as contemplates drowning herself in a river: “It’s time for me. Yes, it’s time” (Мне пора. Да, пора) (848). In preparation for their last flight, the phrase “it’s time” (пора) is repeated with greater frequency. It begins in apartment 50 when the NKVD agents try to catch Begemot. Korov’ev informs Woland that it is Saturday, that the sun is setting, and that it is time for them to go, “It’s time for us” (Нам пора). Begemot parrots the phrase before igniting the apartment with his primus stove (896). The most significant repetition of the leitmotif is its position as title of the chapter in which Master and Margarita die (Chapter 30, 910). When the Master asks Azazello what their death means, Azazello responds laconically with “it’s time for us” (нам пора) (915). Woland repeats the phrase when he tells the Master to say farewell to Moscow and after the Master has finished his last farewell (918, 920). Finally, Woland repeats the phrase for the last time as Master and Margarita head off to their “eternal refuge” (924). The phrase “it’s time” thus foreshadows the Master’s final flight (полет, compare with Pushkin’s “побег”) with Margarita to “a distant abode” (в обитель дальнюю), where the Master may work and enjoy chaste delights (трудов и чистых нег). For Master and Margarita this means a quiet, rural setting where they may enjoy solitude and peace and take pleasure in culture (Schubert, et al.).

Bulgakov treats the poem “Pora, moi drug, pora!” as a refrain throughout the novel; the first strains are hinted at in the Riukhin scene at the Pushkin monument, and fully expounded in the hero and heroine’s flight to their Eternal Home. The setting of this last, eternal peace is open to various interpretations. Caryl Emerson presents one possible variant, describing the setting as
a rural space “in eternally recurring Moscow time.” However, this interpretation fails to explain the similarity of the setting in the epilogue to the bleak dreamscape in which Margarita first receives a premonition of her imminent reunion with the Master.

The setting of Margarita’s dream provides her only clues as to the Master’s fate. Scholars differ on their interpretation of this setting although they agree on its significance as a citation. Boris Gasparov connects the hopeless, despondent, overcast sky of early spring, the hellish place for a living person, with the provincial landscape in Gogol’s *Mertvye dushi* (*Dead Souls*).

Chudakova, on the other hand, sees the setting as reminiscent of Raskol’nikov’s last conversation with Svidrigailov, a Petersburg setting. It is interesting that neither scholar sees a Moscow setting for the dream: one finds a provincial prototype, the other a Petersburg prototype.

Margarita’s dream, even more than exhibiting a Petersburg or provincial Russian landscape, contains folkloric motifs (the dead, dreaming of the dead) and a foreshadowing of her final refuge with the Master. The fact that it is dramatically different than the Moscow setting in which Margarita finds herself is the most pertinent aspect of the setting of her dream. It seems hellish to Margarita because, in accordance with the folkloric commonplace, it is a vision of the world of the dead. Once she and the Master cross over into that world, the setting, still recognizable as the one in her dream because of the stream, the bridge, and the cottage, takes on a much more pleasant character, very similar to a generalized dacha belonging to a member of the intelligentsia. In the events leading up to her first flight (полет), Margarita sees the destination of her final flight (побег в обитель дальнюю), an abode very much outside the

---


164 Belobrov'eva and Kul’ius, *Roman M. Bulgakova: Kommentarii*, 344. “...приснилась неизвестная Маргарите местность... -- Б. Гаспаров связывает пейзаж сна с “Мертвыми душами” (Гаспаров 1994: 74), М. Чудакова -- со сценой разговора Раскольникова и Свидригайлова (Чудакова 1984: 140-141).”
The death of a poet, his “peace,” raises another theme addressed by Riukhin at the monument to Pushkin: immortality. The poem “Exegi monumentum” speaks of Pushkin’s legacy, his fame: “Long will I be the favorite of the people” (долго буду тем, любезен я народу). But the people who refer to Pushkin in Bulgakov’s depiction of Soviet society do so either with jealousy, disdain, and frustration (Riukhin), or ignorance (Bosoi). Pushkin’s poetry is reduced to the level of didactic tale (Skupoi rytsar’ and Pikovaia dama) and his monument to a propagandistic text. Pushkin however, remains indifferent. No one disturbs his peace because he is gone, unable to witness the bastardization of his texts.165

Bulgakov’s treatment of immortality in Master and Margarita parallels his characterization of Pushkin in Poslednie dni: Bulgakov leaves Pushkin offstage.166 Bulgakov used Pushkin’s verse to defend the poet in both Poslednie dni and in Master and Margarita. Pushkin never speaks, only his verse speaks. Pushkin is never present, only his texts, which are immortal. In the play, Pushkin is carried across stage on a stretcher after his wound. For the rest of the play he only appears in the words of his poetry, spoken by others. The same theme surfaces with Behemoth’s famous quote about Dostoevsky’s immortality. Korov’ev asserts that to verify Dostoevsky’s status as a writer, one only has to read his texts (902).

165 The theme of the poet’s words twisted by someone else for ideological purposes inimical to their original intent also finds expression in the Master’s novel about Pilate. Before his death, Ieshua comments on the way in which Levii Matvei twists his words, which causes him great concern.

166 In the 1943 staging of The Last Days at MKhAT, Pushkin’s absence was transformed into presence by projecting a silhouette of Opekushin’s monument (Molok 2000, 20; Smelianskii 1986, 345).
In *Master and Margarita*, Pushkin appears only as a monument, one closely associated with his death. After his death in 1837, different groups had used Pushkin and his monument for different ideological purposes. The liberal intelligentsia did it first in 1880. Tolstoy refused to attend the 1880 Celebration because he recognized their manipulation of the poet.\(^{167}\) Nicholas II’s turn came in 1899, Stalin’s in 1937. *Master and Margarita* reads like a litany of Pushkin’s oeuvre: *Boris Godunov*, *Evgenii Onegin*, “Exegi monumentum,” “Pora, moi drug, pora!,” “Ne dai mne bog soiti s uma,” “Zimnii vecher,” “K Chedaevu,” “Prorok,” “Mednyi vsadnik,” *Skupoi rytsar’, Pikovaia dama*, “Poslanie Del’vigui,” “Pir vo vremia chumy,” *Motsart i Sal’ieri*, and Pushkin’s plans for a narrative about Jesus. Bulgakov leaves Pushkin out of it; he makes Pushkin’s poetry do the talking, but leaves the poet in peace.

The two poets in the novel, Ivan Bezdomnyi and Sasha Riukhin, do not find peace or a will to freedom (воля). Ivan’s peace is drug-induced, his freedom, as a philosopher and historian in Soviet society, is severely curtailed. Riukhin inversely formulates the line from “Pora, moi drug, pora!”; instead of “happiness” (счастье) he speaks of “unhappiness” (несчастье) and that is indeed his fate (судьба). Provocatively, the reader never learns of either of these poets’ deaths.

Ieshua, Master, and Pushkin, however, all die; and each, in accordance with their life, receives a reward. Ieshua’s “will” (воля) is intact. He may continue to converse with Pilate as they walk into the light, his narrative link with Pilate lives on. The temporal unity between Iershalaim and Moscow, however is severed. “Эпилог романа -- это место действия, покинутое не только Воландом и его свитой и не только Мастером. В нем утрачена и параллельность тех двух временных планов человеческой жизни, связь между которыми

\(^{167}\) Levitt, *Russian Literary Politics and the Pushkin Celebration of 1880*, 96.
осуществлялась творческой волей Мастера. The Master is granted peace, but not fame, not immortality. When the Master was attacked, he withdrew to the asylum, he exchanged freedom (волю) for peace (покой). Only Ivan Nikolaevich remembers the Master’s text, and then only once a year, only in his drug-induced sleep. Pushkin, however, achieved immortality through his art. His life, his monument, and his verse shape *Master and Margarita* in fundamental ways. He rises above the censorship and propaganda of Tsarist and Soviet systems, he gazes down on Moscow, accepting praise and slander indifferently, not deigning to argue with fools (“Хвалу и клевету приемли равнодушно, и не оспоривай глупца”).

The theme of death, immortality, and peace raises another interesting reference to Pushkin’s poetry on this theme. In “Poslanie Del’vigu” (“Epistle to Del’vig”), Pushkin acquired the skull of one of Delvig’s Riga ancestors, as a gift for his friend. The last stanza of the poem deserves close comparison to the scene at Woland’s Spring Ball of the Full Moon where he drinks from Berlioz’s skull. Pushkin suggests making it into a drinking bowl, not unlike the goblet Woland creates out of Berlioz’s skull, and from which he drinks to immortality.  

The irony of Bulgakov’s posthumous publications also deserves comment in connection with this theme. As indicated by his letter to Popov, the idea of death and the publication of his own works certainly animated his thoughts on the poet and peace. There is a sense in which Bulgakov comes to peace with his inability to publish during his lifetime by writing Master’s

---

168 Chudakova, Zhizneopisanie, 630-1. “The epilogue of the novel is a setting that has been abandoned not only by Woland and his retinue and not only by the Master. The epilogue has also lost the parallelism of the two time dimensions of human life, the connection between which was sustained by the creative will of the Master.”

169 Byron wrote a poem (1808) about drinking wine from a skull, which Pushkin references in “Poslanie Del’vigu.” Byron is the “певец Корсара” (see the original text in the Appendix III, p. 119).

fate. Master’s novel does not get published before his death, and yet the possibility still exists; “manuscripts don’t burn.” It lives on in the mind of Bezdomnyi, and perhaps someday it will get published after his death, after Ivan’s death, just like Pushkin’s “Pora, moi drug, pora!,” just like Master and Margarita.

Conclusion

The theme of the poet and peace (покой) can also lead us back to the themes of power and prophecy. In Pushkin’s “Prorok” (“Prophet”), the lyric “I” is dismembered by the six-winged seraphim of inspiration, and he lies in the desert like a corpse (“Как труп в пустыне я лежал”). True art demands the life of the artist; a true prophet surrenders his life to a higher calling, forfeiting his health, material gain, even his life, to speak truth to power. Stalin’s censorship literally tore Bulgakov’s tongue from his mouth, but in the place of a human tongue Bulgakov received something else: immortality, that treasured but ironic life that comes only after death.

The greatest challenge to interpreting the Pushkin leitmotif in Master and Margarita is that there are so many overlapping layers; the three themes treated in this chapter are so closely connected that it is hard not to be repetitive, yet impossible to be exhaustive. Each theme sheds light on the others, each blends into the others with a subtlety that complicates the urge to delineate beginnings and endings. This difficulty underscores the utility of a theoretical model for analyzing the textual dimensions of space. The space of the monument to Pushkin organizes these themes for the whole novel. Only because the space has so many historical and literary dimensions, can Bulgakov layer his treatment of Pushkin in so subtle a manner. Because of the long history and the rich literary tradition that surrounds the monument, its spatial elements
organize the theme of the poet in *Master and Margarita*. The monument is one semiotically charged locus in Moscow, a chapter in the city’s complicated text.
Appendix III: The Development of Pushkin References in the Manuscripts of Master and Margarita


КЧЕДАЕВУ (1818?, vol. 2, bk. 1, p. 72)
Любви, надежды, тихой славы
Недолго нежил нас обман,
Исчезли юные забавы,
Как сон, как утренний туман;
Но в нас горит еще желанье,
Под гнетом власти роковой
Нетерпеливою душой
Отчизны внемлем призыванье.
Мы ждем с томленьем упованья
Минуты вольности святой,
Как ждет любовник молодой
Минуты верного свиданья.
Пока свободою горим,
Пока сердца для чести живы,
Мой друг, отчизне посвятим
Души прекрасные порывы!
Товарищ, верь: взойдет она,
Звезда пленительного счастья,
Россия вспрянет ото сна,
И на обломках самовластья
Напишут наши имена!

Буя мглою небо кроет,
Вихри снежные крутя;
То, как зверь, она завоет,
То заплачет, как дитя,
То по кровле обветшалой
Вдруг соломой зашумит,
То, как путник запоздалый,
К нам в окошко застучит.

Наша ветхая лачужка
И печальна и темна.
Что же ты, моя старушка,
Приумолкла у окна?
Или бури завываньем
Ты, мой друг, утомлена,
Или дремлешь под жужжаньем
Своего веретена?

Выпьем, добрая подружка
Бедной юности моей,
Выпьем с горя; где же кружка?
Сердцу будет веселей.
Спой мне песню, как синица
Тихо за морем жила;
Спой мне песню, как девица
За водой поутру шла.

Буря мглою небо кроет,
Вихри снежные крутя;
То, как зверь, она завоет,
То заплачет, как дитя.
Выпьем, добрая подружка
Бедной юности моей,
Выпьем с горя; где же кружка?
Сердцу будет веселей.

“ПРОРОК” (1826, vol. 3, bk. 1, pp. 30-1)
Духовной жаждою томим,
В пустыне мрачной я влакился, —
И шестикрылый серафим
На перепутье мне явился.
Перстами легкими как сон
Моих зениц коснулся он.
Отверзлись вещие зеницы,
Как у испуганной орлицы.
Моих ушей коснулся он, —
И их наполнил шум и звон:
И внял я неба содроганье,
И горний ангелов полет,
И гад морских подводный ход,
И дольней лозы прозябанье.
И он к устам моим приник,
И вырвал грешный мой язык,
И празднословный, и лукавый,
И жало мудрыя змеи
В уста замершие мои
Вложил десницею кровавой.
И он мне грудь рассек мечом,
И сердце трепетное вынул
И угль, пылающий огнем,
Во грудь отверстую водвинул.
Как труп в пустыне я лежал,
И бога глас ко мне воззвал:

“Восстань, пророк, и виждь, и внемли,
Исполнись волею моей,
И, обходя моря и земли,
Глаголом жги сердца людей”.

**LAST STANZA OF “ПОСЛАНИЕ ДЕЛЬВИГУ”** (1827, vol. 3, bk. 1, pp. 68-72)

Прими ж сей череп, Дельвиг, он
Принадлежит тебе по праву.
Обделай ты его, барон,
В благопристойную оправу.
Иделье гроба преврати
В увеселительную чашу,
Вином кипящим освяти,
Да запивай уху да кашу.
Певцу Корсара подражай
И скандинавов рай воинской
В пирах домашних воскрешай,
Или, как Гамлет-Баратынской,
Над ним задумчиво мечтай:
О жизни мертвый проповедник,
Вином ли полный, иль пустой,
Для мудреца, как собеседник,
Он стоит головы живой.

**“НЕ ДАЙ МНЕ БОГ СОЙТИ С УМА”** (1833, vol. 3, bk. 1, pp. 322-323)

Не дай мне бог сойти с ума.
Нет, легче посох и сумма;
Нет, легче труд и глад.
Не то, чтоб разумом моим
Я дорожил; не то, чтоб с ним
Расстаться был не рад:

Когда б оставили меня
На воле, как бы резво я
Пустился в темный лес!
Я пел бы в пламенном бреду,
Я забывался бы в чаду
Нестройных, чудных грез.

И я б заслушивался волн,
И я глядел бы, счастья полн,
В пустые небеса;
И силен, волен был бы я,
Как вихорь, роющий поля,
Ломающий леса.

Да вот беда: сойди с ума,
И страшен будешь как чума,
Как раз тебя запрут,
Посадят на цепь дурака
И сквозь решетку как зверка
Дразнить тебя придут.

А ночью слышать буду я
Не голос яркий соловья,
Не шум глухой дубров —
А крик товарищей моих,
Да брань смотрителей ночных,
Да визг, да звон оков.

ПОРА, МОЙ ДРУГ, ПОРА! (1834, unfinished, vol. 3, bk. 1, p. 330)
Пора, мой друг, пора! [покоя] сердце просит —
Летят за днями дни, и каждый час уносят
Частицу бытия, а мы с тобой вдвоем
Предполагаем жить, и глядь — как раз — умрем.
На свете счастья нет, но есть покой и воля.
Давно завидная мечтается мне доля —
Давно, усталый раб, замыслил я побег
В обитель дальнюю трудов и чистых нег.

EXEGI MONUMENTUM (1836, vol. 3, bk. 1, p. 424)
Я памятник себе воздвиг нерукотворный,
К нему не заростет народная тропа,
Вознесь выше он главою непокорной
Александрийского столпа.

Нет, весь я не умру — душа в заветной лире
Мой прах переживет и тленья убежит —
И славен буду я, доколь в подлунном мире
Жив будет хоть один пить.

Слух обо мне пройдет по всей Руси великой,
И назовет меня всякий сущий в ней язык,
И гордый внук славян, и финн, и ныне дикой
Тунгуз, и друг степей калмык.

И долго буду тем любезен я народу,
Что чувства добрые я лирой пробуждал,
Что в мой жестокой век восславил я Свободу
И милость к падшим призывал.

Веленью божию, о муза, будь послушна,
Обиды не страшась, не требуя венца,
Хвалу и клевету приемли равнодушно,
И не оспоривай глупца.

---

**Pushkin in Master and Margarita: “Pampush”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft of Third Redaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“За столиками пошел говорок. Пыльная пудреная зелень сада молчала, и молчал гипсовый поэт Александр Иванович Житомирский, во весь рост стоящий под ветвями с книгой в одной руке и обломком меча в другой. За три года поэт покрылся зелеными пятнами и от меча осталась лишь рукоять. Тем, кому не хватило места под тентом, приходилось спускаться вниз, располагаться под сводами за скатертями с желтыми пятнами у стен, отделанных под мрамор, похожий на зеленую чешую. Здесь был ад” (66).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Сад молчал, и ад молчал. Рюхин сел и больным голосом спросил малый графинчик... Он пил водку и чем больше пил, тем становился трезвей и тем больше</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
темной злобы на Пушкина и на судьбу рождалось в душе...” (76).

**Fifth Redaction**

“Рюхин прекратил расспросы, неуклюже раскланялся. Через несколько минут он был на шоссе, ведущем в Москву. Светало. Небывало дурное расположение духа овладела Рюхиным. Он ехал в пустом ночном троллейбусе, съежившись, уставившись, как мышь на крупу. Многое терзало его с одной стороны, жаль было Понырева и страшно было вспомнить про дом скорби. А с другой, терзали его оскорбления, нанесённые ему помешанным. Хуже всего было то, что в словах бедного Понырева было то, что сам от себя скрывал Рюхин, что отгонял от себя даже ночью, когда не спалось. В этих словах была правда. Мысль о собственных стихах до того терзалась Рюхина в троллейбусе, что он, скорчившись, морщился как от боли и даже раз проронил что-то. Рюхин сейчас только и как-то особенно отчетливо вспомнил, что ему уже тридцать четыре года и что, по сути дела, будущее его совершенно темно. Да, он будет писать по несколько стихотворений в год, стихотворений, как он теперь признался сам себе, ничуть не радующих его. “Он правду говорит, -- глубоко-глубоко в себе, так, чтобы никто не мог подслушать его, подумал Рюхин... -- Я не верю в то, что пишу, я -- лгун, терзал сам себя Рюхин, как палач. -- Лгун, лгун. И за это буду страшно наказан. В самом деле, что дальше? Я пишу эти стихотворения, кое-как поддерживаю свое существование. Одна комната, и надежд на то, что будет когда-нибудь квартира, очень мало. Вечные авансы, вечные компромиссы, боязнь и дурные, дурные стихи! И старость! Старость бедная, безрадостная, одинокая. Уважение? Кой черт! Кто будет меня...
уважать, если я сам, сам себя не уважаю.
Было совсем светло, когда больной и постаревший Рюхин вышел из троллейбуса и оказался у подножия Пушкина. С бульвара тянуло свежестью, к утру стало легче. Злобными и горькими глазами Рюхин поглядел на Пушкина и почему-то подумал так: “Тебе хорошо!” (321).

**Sixth Redaction**

“Через несколько минут грузовик нес его в Москву. Светало, но на шоссе еще горели фонари. Шофер злился на то, что пропала ночь, гнал машину изо всех сил, ее заносило на поворотах.

Понырев сидел на каком-то обрубке на платформе, вцепившись рукой в борт. Ресторанные полотенца, оставленные в грузовике Пантелеем, раньше уехавшим с милиционером в троллейбусе, ездили по платформе. Понырев, которого подбрасывало на обрубке, хотел было собрать их в кучу, но потом пробормотал: “Да ну их к черту!.. Что я, в самом деле, как дурак верчусь...”

Настроение духа Понырева было ужасно. Душа его ныла, как от зубной боли. Посещение дом скорби оставило в нем тяжкий след. Понырев старался понять, что терзает его. Страшные ли действия помешанного, попытка ли его выброситься из окна... коридор со слабыми синими огнями? Мысль ли о том, как ужасно лишиться разума? Да это... Но что-то еще... Что? Да, да, слова Ивана Николаевича. Обидные, едкие, брошенные в лицо слова... Горе не в том, что они обидны, а в том, что в них -- правда.

Лес, в котором стояла клиника, улетел назад. Мимо Понырева пролетали обнаженные в рассвете огни на высоких мачтах на новостройках, с какими-то катушками на них. Поэт, уставившись в
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Monument</th>
<th>Pushkin in <em>Master and Margarita</em>: “Pampush”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>грязный настил платформы, что-то бормотал, мучился, ныл. Да, стихи. Тридцать два года. Да, ведь будущее его темно? В самом деле, он будет писать и дальше по нескольку стихотворений в год. Ну а дальше-то что, спрашивается? То же самое. Вечные авансы, вечные компромиссы... Да, компромиссы. “Он правду сказал, -- шептал сейчас Поньрев себе то, что никому и ни за что не решил бы шепнуть, -- не верю я ни во что из того, что пишу, и оттого стихи мои дурны, да, дурные стихи. В имя чего же все это? Хотя бы квартира была, а то и ее нету, одна комната, и нет никакой надежды, что будет другая. Двубратский? Да, стихи его еще хуже, вся Москва знает, что он пишет черт знает что. Но ему везет. У него есть машина. Как он ухитрился достать ее? Он ловок, нагл, бесприципинен. Он удачлив! А мне не везет, нет мне счастья, не та звезда у меня. Во имя чего я бьюсь? Уважение? Смешно говорить! Кто станет меня уважать, если я сам себя не уважаю. Вот трясусь на грузовике, несет меня черт куда-то... глупо, одиноко. Светает. А старость? Подумать страшно...” Мучения поэта стали нестерпимыми, но грузовик уже летел по бульвару и остановился у грибоедовской решетки” (412).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Last Redaction | “Через несколько минут грузовик уносил Рюхина в Москву. Светало, и свет еще не погашенных на шоссе фонарей был уже не нужен и неприятен. Шофер злился на то, что пропала ночь, гнал машину что есть сил, и ее заносило на поворотах. Вот и лес отвалился, остался где-то сзади, и река ушла куда-то в сторону, навстречу грузовику сыпалась разная разность: какие-то |
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Заборы с караульными будками и штабеля дров, высо́ченные столбы и какие-то мачты, а на мачтах нанизанные катушки, груды щебня, земля, исполосованная каналами, -- словом, чувствовалось, что вот-вот она, Москва, тут же, вон за поворотом, и сейчас навалится и охватит.

Рюхина трясло и швыряло, какой-то обрубок, на котором он поместился, то и дело пытался высользнуть из-под него.

Ресторанные полотенца, подброшенные уехавшими ранее в троллейбусе милиционером и Пантеем, ездили по всей платформе. Рюхин пытался их собрать, но, прошипев почему-то со злобой:

“Да ну их к черту! Что я, в самом деле, как дурак, верчуся?..” -- отшвырнул их ногой и перестал на них глядеть.

Настроение духа у едущего было ужасно. Становилось ясным, что посещение дома скорби оставило в нем тяжелейший след. Рюхин старался понять, что его терзает. Коридор с синими лампами, прилипший к памяти? Мысль о том, что худшего несчастья, чем лишение разума, нет на свете? Да, да, конечно, и это. Но это -- так ведь, общая мысль. А вот есть что-то еще. Что же это? Обида, вот что. Да, да, обидные слова, брошенные Бездомным прямо в лицо. И горе не в том, что они обидные, а в том, что в них заключается правда.

Поэт не глядел уже по сторонам, а, уставившись в грызный трясущийся пол, стал что-то бормотать, ныть, глодая самого себя.

Да, стихи... Ему -- тридцать два года! В самом деле, что же дальше? -- И дальше он будет сочинять по нескольку стихотворений в год. -- До старости? -- Да, до старости. -- Что же принесут ему эти
Pushkin in *Master and Margarita*: “Pampush”

стихотворения? Славу? “Какой вздор! Не обманывай-то хоть сам себя. Никогда слава не придет к тому, кто сочиняет дурные стихи. Отчего они дурны? Правду, правду сказал! -- безжалостно обращался к самому себе Рюхин. -- Не верю я ни во что из того, что пишу!..”

Отравленный взрывом неврастении, поэт покачнулся, пол под ним перестал трястись. Рюхин поднял голову и увидел, что он давно уже в Москве и, более того, что над Москвой рассвет, что облако подсвечено золотом, что грузовик его стоит, застрявши в колонне других машин у поворота на бульвар, и что близехонько от него стоит на постаменте металлический человек, чуть наклонив голову, и безразлично смотрит на бульвар.

Какие-то странные мысли хлынули в голову заболевшему поэту. “Вот пример настоящей удачливости... -- Тут Рюхин встал во весь рост на платформе грузовика и руку поднял, нападая зачем-то на никого не трогающего чугунного человека. -- Какой бы шаг он ни сделал в жизни, что бы ни случилось с ним, все шло ему на пользу, все обращалось к его славе! Но что он сделал? Я не постигаю... Что-нибудь особенное есть в этих словах: “Буря мглою...”? Не понимаю!.. Повезло, повезло! -- вдруг ядовито заключил Рюхин и почувствовал, что грузовик под ним шевельнулся. -- Стрелял, стрелял в него этот белогвардеец и раздробил бедро и обеспечил бессмертие...”

Колонна тронулась. Совершенно больной и даже постаревший поэт не более чем через две минуты входил на веранду Грибоедова” (695-696).
### Pushkin in Master and Margarita: Evgenii Onegin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redaction</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Redaction</strong></td>
<td>“В Москве в это время во всех переулках играли балалайки и гармоники, изредка свистали в свистки, окна были раскрыты и в них горели оранжевые обажуры... --Готов, -- сказал чей-то бас” (61).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Redaction</strong></td>
<td>“В подворотнях играли на гитарах и на гармониях, и грузовики ездили с сумасшедшей скоростью” (96).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sixth Redaction</strong></td>
<td>“В это время во всех окнах тяжелым мощным басом пел генерал Гремин о том, как он любит Татьяну” (400).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Redaction</strong></td>
<td>“И на всем его трудном пути невыразимо почему-то его мучил вездесущий оркестр, под аккомпанемент которого тяжелый бас пел о своей любви к Татьяне” (682).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pushkin in Master and Margarita: Boris Godunov

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redaction</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Second Redaction (Master and Margarita)** | “Мне бы у Василия Блаженного на паперти сидеть...  
И точно, учинился Иванушка на паперти. И сидел Иванушка, погромыхивая веригами, а из храма выходил срамный грешный человек: исполу -- царь, исполу -- монах. В трясущейся руке держал посох, острым концом его раздирал плиты. Били колокола. Таяло.  
-- Судные дела твои, царь, -- сурово сказал ему Иванушка, -- лют и бесчеловечен, пьешь губительные обещанные диаволом чаши, вселукавый мних. Ну а дай мне денегку, царь Иванушка, помоглося
**Pushkin in Master and Margarita: Boris Godunov**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boris Godunov</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ужо за тебя.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Отвечал ему царь, заплакавши:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Почто пужаешь царя, Иванушка. На тебе денежку, Иванушка-верижник, Божий человек, помолись за меня!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>И звякнули медяки в деревянной чашке.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Завертелось все в голове у Иванушки, и ушел под землю Василий Блаженный” (59-60).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Boris Godunov (written 1824-25, vol. 7, p. 78)**

(Some boys steal a kopeck from the holy fool Nikolka.)

Ю р о д и вьй. Борис, Борис! Николку дети обижают.

Ц а рь. Подать ему милостыню. О чем он плачет?

Ю р о д и вьй. Николку маленькие дети обижают... Вели их зарезать, как зарезал ты маленького царевича.

Б о я р е. Поди прочь, дурак! схватите дурака!

Ц а рь. Оставьте его. Молись за меня, бедный Николка. (Уходит.)

Ю р о д и вьй (ему вслед). Нет, нет! нельзя молиться за царя Ирода — богородица не велит.

---

**Pushkin in Master and Margarita: Bosoi’s Dream**

* (Skupoi rytser’ and Pikovaia dama)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Third redaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This redaction does not mention Pushkin or Skupoi rytser’. The title is “Zamok chudes” and it is primarily a scene in which Bosoi is taken to prison.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fourth Redaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Вышедший из бархата молодой человек звучно объявил, что</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
известный артист Прюнин исполнит отрывки из сочинения Пушкина “Скупой рыцарь”. Босой хорошо знал фамилию сочинителя Пушкина, ибо очень часто слышал, да и сам говорил: “А за квартиру Пушкин платить будет?” -- и поэтому с любопытством уставился на сцену.

А на ней появился весьма пожилой бритой человек во фраке, тотчас скроил мрачное лицо и, глядя в угол, заговорил нараспев:

-- Счастливый день!..

Фрачник рассказал далее, что сокровища его растут, и делал это столь выразительно, что притихшей публике показалось, будто действительно на сцене стоят сундуки с золотом, принадлежащим фрачнику. Сам о себе фрачный человек рассказал много нехорошего. Босой, очень помрачнев, слышал, что какая-то несчастная вдова под дождем на коленях стояла, но не тронула черствого сердца артиста. Затем фрачник стал обращаться к кому-то, кого на сцене не было, и за этого отсутствующего сам же себе отвечал, причем у Босого все спуталось, потому что артист называл себя то государем, то бароном, то отцом, то сыном, то на “вы”, то на “ты”. И понял Босой только одно, что артист умер злою смертью, выкинув: “Ключи” Ключи мои!” и повалившись после этого на колени, хрипя и срывая с себя галстук. Умерев, он встал, отряхнул пыль с фрачных коленей, улыбаясь поклонился и при жидких аплодисментах удалился.

Молодой человек вышел из бархата и заговорил так:

-- Ну-с, вы слышали, граждане, сейчас, как знаменитый артист Потап Петрович со свойственным ему мастерством прочитал вам
“Скупого рыцаря”. Рыцарь говорил, что резвые нимфы сбегутся к нему и прочее. Предупреждаю вас, дорогие граждане, что ничего этого с вами не будет. Никакие нимфы к вам не сбегутся, и музы ему дань не принесут, и чертогов он никаких не воздвигнет, и вообще он говорил чепуху. Кончилось со скупым рыцарем очень худо -- он помер от удара, так и не увидев ни нимф, ни муз, и с вами будет тоже очень нехорошо, если валюты не сдадите.

Поэзия Пушкина, видимо, произвела сильнейшее впечатление на зрителей” (245-6).

**Sixth Redaction**

“Итак, кто сдает? Нет желающих? В таком случае следующим номером нашей программы известный артист драмы Бурдасов Илья Потапович исполнит отрывки из “Скупого рыцаря” поэта Пушкина!

Обещанный Бурдасов не замедлил появиться на сцене и оказался пожилым, бритым, во фраке и белом галстуке.

Без всяких предисловий он скроил мрачное лицо, сдвинул брови и заговорил ненатуральным голосом, глядя на золотой колокольчик:

-- Как молодой повеса ждет свидания с какой-нибудь развратницей лукавой...

Далее Бурдасов рассказал о себе много нехорошего. Никанор Иванович, очень помрачнев, слышал как Бурдасов признавался в том, что какая-то несчастная вдова, воя, стояла перед ним на коленях под дождем, но не тронула черствого сердца артиста. Никанор Иванович совсем не знал до этого случая поэта Пушкина, хоть и произносил, и нередко, фразу: “А за квартиру Пушкин платить будет?” и теперь,
Познакомившись с его произведением, сразу как-то загрустил, задумался и представил себе женщину с детьми на коленях и невольно подумал: “Сволочь этот Бурдасов!” А тот, все повысив голос, шел дальше и окончательно запутал Никанора Ивановича, потому что вдруг стал обращаться к кому-то, кого на сцене не было, и за этого отсутствующего сам же себе отвечал, причем называл себя то “государем”, то “бароном”, то “отцом”, то “сыном”, то на “вы”, а то на “ты”.

Поняв Никанор Иванович только одно, что помер артист злою смертью, прокричав: “Ключи! Ключи мои!”, повалившись после этого на пол, хрипя и срывая с себя галстук.

Умерев, он встал, отряхнул пыль с фракных коленей, поклонился, улыбнувшись фальшивой улыбкой, и при жидких аплодисменатах удалился, а конферансье заговорил так:

-- Ну-с, дорогие валютчики, вы прослушали в замечательном исполнении Ильи Владимировича Акулинова “Скупого рыцаря”.

Рыцарь этот надеялся, что резвые нимфы сбегутся к нему и произойдет еще многое приятное в этом же роде. Но, как видите, ничего этого не случилось, нимф никаких не было, и музы ему дань не принесли, и чертогов он никаких не воздвиг, а, наоборот, кончил он очень скверно, помер от удара на своих сундуках с валютой.

Предупреждаю вас еще раз, что и с вами будет так же плохо, а может быть, и еще хуже, если вы не сдадите валюты!”

This passage also ends with someone giving up their forbidden currency (483-484).
“Лампы погасли, некоторое время была тьма, и во тьме нервный тенор пел в рупоре:

“Там груды золота лежат, и мне они принадлежат...” Откуда-то издалека донесся палодисмент.

-- В женском театре дамочка какая-то сдает, -- пояснил огненно-бородый Никанору Ивановичу и, вздохнув, прибавил: -- Эх, кабы не гуси мои!.. У меня, мил человек, гуси бойцовые. Подохнут они, боюсь, без меня. Птица боевая, нежная, требует ухода... Эх, кабы не гуси! Пушкиным-то меня не удивишь... -- И он опять завздыхал” (486).

**Last Redaction**

The last redaction is very similar to the first two, with three exceptions. Bulgakov changes the name of the actor again (Куролесов, Савва Потапович) and he adds in more examples of Nikanor Ivanovich’s acquaintance with Pushkin: “Никанор Иванович до своего сна совершенно не знал произведений поэта Пушкина, но самого его знал прекрасно и ежедневно по несколько раз произносил фразы вроде: “А за квартиру Пушкин платить будет?” или “Лампочки не лестнице, стало быть, Пушкин вывинтил?”, “Нефть, стало быть, Пушкин покупать будет?” (765). Additionally, he adds in a reference to Pushkin where there was none in the sixth redaction. When the Master visits Ivan, he tells of the new addition in room 119, who “Пушкина ругает на чем свет стоит и все время кричит: “Куролесов, бис, бис!” (741).

The Epilogue in the last redaction also returns to the Pushkin theme. The
| Pushkin in *Master and Margarita*: Bosoi’s Dream  
*Skupoi rytsar’* and *Pikovaia dama* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>narrator mentions Pushkin and the actor Kurolesov (930).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 3
Margarita’s Mansion and the “Path” (Путь) Trope: Space and Character

The monument to Pushkin on Tverskoi bul’var is one of Moscow’s most identifiable loci. As such, it accrues an almost infinite number of textual dimensions by the way it references Pushkin’s life, death, oeuvre, and the historical and architectural realia surrounding the monument. Another Moscow structure, Margarita’s mansion, expresses the textual dimensions of urban space in a very different way. In contrast to the concrete physical location and direct referentiality of the textual features inscribed into the monument to Pushkin, Bulgakov creates an intentional gap between Margarita’s Moscow mansion and historical Moscow’s built, natural, and verbal environments. There is no one-to-one correspondence between Margarita’s mansion and any one of the several “Muscovite moderne” mansions of the Arbat. And yet Margarita’s mansion interacts with the textual dimensions of Moscow’s urban space in ways no less important for the novel’s aesthetic structure than the monument to Pushkin.

Bulgakov uses the spaces of Pushkin Square to develop the theme of the poet in Soviet culture; he uses Margarita’s mansion to structure the “path” (quest) trope that plays a central role in the characterizations of Margarita and Ivan Nikolaevich Ponyrev, “Bezdomnyi.” Bulgakov leads Margarita and Ivan along similar paths through Moscow, paths that overlap most significantly at Margarita’s gothic mansion. The primary feature of the mansion, a three-paned bay window in a tower-like architectural embellishment, defines their similar but separate paths. To intensify the contrast between Margarita and Ivan, Bulgakov creates Margarita’s mansion to reflect one of the defining semiotic principles of the built, natural, and verbal environments of Moscow and, more specifically, the Arbat region, commonly referred to as “labyrinthine
Moscow” (московская путаница). With this poetics of realia Bulgakov combines a poetics of citation, drawing on the home of Skazka in Bely’s Second Symphony to emphasize the very different destinations at which they arrive: Margarita at a moonlit eternity and Ivan at an inauthentic peace. Thus Margarita’s mansion creates the most important urban setting in Master and Margarita for Bulgakov’s opposition of labyrinth (путаница) to path (путь) in the characterizations of Ivan and Margarita.

Ivan’s “Chase” and Margarita’s “Flight”: Characterization by Path

Bulgakov employs the metaphorical potential of space as path as a primary device to create character in Master and Margarita. Lotman first observed the search for a home (поиски дома) as a defining trope in the Master’s path (путь). In a similar way, the paths leading away from and to Margarita’s “anti-home” (антидом) characterize Margarita and Ivan; the two characters travel a nearly identical path, but in opposite directions.

Ivan “chases” Woland and his retinue to report them to the authorities, but never escapes from the “labyrinth” of the Arbat’s lanes and alleys (таинственная сеть арбатских переулок) (682). Margarita lives in the same “mysterious network,” and her mansion represents the metaphorical labyrinth of the privileged intelligentsia under Stalinism. During the darkest days of the housing shortage, Margarita does not work, employs a maid, and enjoys five rooms for

---

171 I borrow the phrase “labyrinthine Moscow” (московская путаница) from an article by I.S. Veselova, “‘Logika moskovskoi putanitsy,’ (na materiale moskovskoi ‘neskazchnoi’ prozy kontsa XVIII -- nachala XX v.),” in Moskva i moskovskii tekst russkoi kul'tury, ed. G.S. Knabe (Moscow: RGGU, 1998), 98-119. Using material from urban folklore, Veselova analyzes the way in which non-Muscovites perceive confusing aspects of Moscow space and demonstrates how native Muscovites orient themselves. While her article provides the best scholarly definition for the principle of “labyrinthine Moscow,” the same concept appears in literary texts as well; with regards to Margarita’s mansion a quote from Belyi’s Moskva provides a relevant literary description of “labyrinthine Moscow” (cited in this dissertation on p. 149).

only her and her highly placed engineer husband in one of the most beautiful buildings in central Moscow. Often, especially during the 1930s, such privilege came at a high price. Margarita responds to Woland’s invitation and finds a path from the privileged but perilous captivity of her mansion to the Master and moonlight.

The parallel characterizations of Ivan and Margarita begin in their patronymics: Ivan Nikolaevich and Margarita Nikolaevna. Both characters unexpectedly encounter Woland and his retinue on a park bench in central Moscow, the beginning of their respective paths. Ivan begins his “chase” from Patriarch’s Ponds, a Christianized name for what was once called “Goat’s Swamp” (козье болото). Margarita flies away from her mansion on Malyi Vlas’evskii pereulok (Malyi Vlas’evskii Lane), named for the Church of St. Vlasii “on Goat’s Swamp” (что на козьем болоте). The most important event at these meetings is the oral recitation of part of the Master’s novel about Pilate by Woland and Azazello, respectively. For both Ivan and Margarita, the artistic truth of the Master’s novel spurs them on their journey: Ivan to catch Woland and Margarita to rescue the Master.

The death of Berlioz also plays a central role in the paths of Ivan and Margarita: Ivan witnesses the event at Patriarch’s Ponds, Margarita witnesses the funeral from her bench in the Aleksandrovskii sad (Alexander Garden). Ivan participates in the beginning of Woland’s debate with Berlioz about atheism, the devil, fate, and death; Margarita participates in the end of Woland’s debate with Berlioz, where his severed head turns into a bejeweled chalice out of which Woland and Margarita drink to existence while Berlioz recedes into oblivion.

---

173 See a detailed discussion of the Arbat’s verbal environment and Margarita’s address at “Goat’s Swamp” on pp. 171-3, infra.
Bulgakov dedicates an entire chapter to the paths of hero and heroine through Moscow’s Arbat region, the parallel titles of which highlight the device of doubling: “Chase” (Погоня) and “Flight” (Полет). Bulgakov evokes their similar paths using similar language:

...после Никитских ворот Иван Николаевич был ослеплен огнями на Арбатской площади. Еще несколько секунд, и вот какой-то темный переулок с покосившимся тротуарами, где Иван грохнулся и разбил колено. Опять освещенная магистраль — улица Кропоткина, потом переулок, потом Остоженка, и еще переулок, унылый, гадкий и скучно освещенный. ... Иван Николаевич ... вдруг сообразил, что профессор непременно должен оказаться в доме № 13 и обязательно в квартире 47” (680).174

Пролетев по своему переулку, Маргарита попала в другой, пересекавший первый под прямым углом. Этот заплатанный, заштопанный переулок с покосившейся дверью нефтелавки, где кружками продают керосин и жидкость от паразитов во флаконах, она перерезала в одно мгновение и тут усвоила, что, даже будучи совершенно свободной и невидимой, все же и в наслаждении нужно быть хоть немного благоразумной. Только каким-то чудом затормозившись, она не разбилась на смерть покосившийся фонарь на углу. Третий переулок вел прямо к Арбату (814).175

The words in bold highlight some of the linguistic parallels Bulgakov creates in these descriptions, but there are other spatial parallels. Ivan startles a woman in the bathroom of one of Moscow’s communal apartments; Margarita startles several women in the kitchen of a different

174 “... after the Nikitskie Gates Ivan Nikolaevich was blinded by the lights on Arbat Square. Several seconds later there was some dark alley with a broken, sagging sidewalk, where Ivan tripped and dashed his knee against the ground. Again an illuminated thoroughfare, Kropotkin Street, then an alley, then Ostozhenka, again another alley, this time a cheerless, repulsive, and poorly lit one. ... Ivan Nikolaevich ... suddenly realized that the professor without fail must turn up in building 13 and without a doubt it would be in apartment 47.”

175 Having flown the length of her own alley, Margarita turned up in a different one, which intersected the first at a right angle. In one moment, Margarita cut across this patched-up, poorly repaired, crooked, and long alley, identifiable by the sagging door of the kerosine kiosk where they sold kerosine by the mug-full and parasite repellant in flasks; immediately she figured out that, even if she was completely free and invisible, all the same she needed to be at least a little reasonable in her enjoyment. Only by a sort of miracle did she manage to stop and avoid dashing herself to death against an old sagging lantern at the corner. The third alley led straight to the Arbat.”
communal apartment. Ivan is “baptized” in the blackish, oily waters between the Church of Christ the Savior and the “House on the Embankment”; Margarita is “baptized” in the clear, clean water of a rural river on her way to the witches’ sabbath and Spring Ball of the Full Moon. Ivan dives into the zigzags of the embankment lanterns’ imperfectly reflected light in the Moscow River, one more stop on Ivan’s way to Stravinsky’s prison-like clinic. Margarita dives into a perfect reflection of the moon in a still, rural river, and it leads her to another dimension of existence, away from the prison of her Moscow mansion. Ivan crashes a hellish party at Griboedov House that resonates with the witches’ sabbath that Margarita attends.

The paths of Ivan and Margarita also parallel one another in relation to the Master’s novel. The reader reads the first chapter of the Master’s novel just before Ivan’s “chase.” The second chapter is read as Ivan’s dream in Stravinsky’s clinic, at the end of his “chase.” When Margarita reads the remnants of the Master’s burnt novel before her flight, the reader rereads part of the novel: the last two chapters of the Master’s novel are read with Margarita, when the goal of her “flight” has been achieved. Ivan meets the Master in Stravinsky’s clinic and promises to write a continuation of the Pilate narrative; Margarita rescues the Master from Stravinsky’s clinic, and as a result he “finishes” the novel, “freeing” Pilate to ascend a path of moonlight while conversing with Ieshua. Ivan finds a sort of peace, but remains trapped in Moscow space; Margarita achieves peace with the Master, but it would also seem that she achieves “light,” at least in Ivan’s dream (933-4). Ivan correctly intuits Margarita’s death from his room in Stravinsky’s clinic, so perhaps he also correctly intuits Margarita’s ascension on the moonlit path, the same path upon which Pilate and Ieshua ascend in the Master’s final version of his novel.
Finally, the two routes intersect in real Moscow space in important ways. Ivan’s route leads from Patriarch’s Ponds to Margarita’s mansion; Margarita’s route leads from her mansion to Apartment 50, very close to Patriarch’s Ponds. Ivan tries to avoid the embassy mansions that dot the Arbat’s streets during his “chase,” but he returns to Margarita’s mansion every year after that; Margarita lives in a mansion that closely resembles the ambassadorial mansions that Ivan tries to avoid during the “chase,” but to which he returns every year.

Margarita’s mansion is the most important locus in the characterizations of Ivan and Margarita. It is Margarita’s point of departure, Ivan’s recurring destination; Margarita’s prison but Ivan’s confused glimpse of freedom; it symbolizes Margarita’s boredom and triggers the climax of Ivan’s mania; it manifests the labyrinth that traps Ivan, but from which Margarita escapes. Ivan directly interacts with the mansion for the first time in the novel’s epilogue. Every year, after re-living Woland’s visit to Patriarch’s Ponds, Ivan winds his way to the mansion where, under the springtime full moon, he observes the longing of his double, Nikolai Ivanovich, who unwillingly attended the Spring Ball of the Full Moon with Natasha and forever regrets his cowardly request to return home to his former life. Ivan’s path ends at the mansion, the source of so much of Margarita’s miserable existence in the implied Moscow of the perilous 1930s; he goes home to dream of Margarita, Pilate, and his fellow patient from Stravinsky’s clinic.

For Margarita, however, the mansion marks the beginning of her escape: the light from its “lantern” illuminates a path to the Master and moonlight. In this mansion Margarita experiences the prophetic dream (вещий сон) from which she wakes with a presentiment of seeing the Master very soon. From this mansion she sets out for the Spring Ball of the Full Moon. In this mansion her dead body is discovered (an event Ivan intuits from room 119 of Stravinsky’s
The mansion projects the shell of unhappiness (in this sense, mansion is metaphor for body) from which she departs for the Ball, peace, and finally, “light.” In sum, Margarita’s mansion is the most important locus where Ivan’s and Margarita’s paths intersect and plays a major role in the characterization of both characters.

The Path from Mansion to Moonlight

One subset of images dominates the mansion’s role in these paths. Viewed from the outside, a three-paned bay window (erker) in a tower-like architectural feature makes Margarita’s mansion unique among other examples of “Muscovite moderne” architecture. Viewed on the interior, a three-paned mirror creates a figurative double for the three-paned window. Bulgakov complicates the image by describing the whole as a “lantern” (фонарь) and consistently concentrating large amounts of natural moonlight and electrical light on the window and mirror, not unlike a lighthouse. Light is reflected out of the mirror, light shines out of the window.

By crafting Margarita’s window and mirror to create a “lantern,” Bulgakov patterns the image according to archetypal ideas of light and path. Moonlight literally creates the path by which Margarita flies out of the window of her mansion for the last time. The mirror is a figurative window; the moonlight, so closely associated with the window imagery of Margarita’s mansion, is a figurative path. Just as light goes forth from a street lantern, a path goes forth from a window.

176 The translation for this particular feature is problematic. The Russian “окно в фонаре” translates roughly as “bay window.” The German “erker” comes closer to the Russian original than the English “bay window,” although its uses in Master and Margarita suggest that Bulgakov employs the phrase to do more than just describe an ordinary architectural feature. The image is very complex and specific, combining the concepts of a bay window, three angled panes or sections, and a two-storied tower, all in one architectural feature. The number (at least six) of proposed prototypes for this image demonstrates its ambiguity in the mind of readers. I will use the phrase “lantern window” to refer to the image as it highlights Bulgakov’s light motif.
Margarita repeatedly travels along paths of light from her mansion, through the streets of Moscow, to the witches’ sabbath and the Spring Ball of the Full Moon. At the end of the novel in Ivan’s dream, she and the Master ascend the same moonlight path that Pilate and Ieshua ascend (933). Ivan Bezdomnyi takes a different path, through the dark labyrinth of Moscow’s alleys and lanes, illuminated only by the poor light of the dusty candle he stole from a forgotten “red corner” in a Soviet communal apartment. He avoids mansions like Margarita’s. While the older Ivan Ponyrev may dream of the Master and Margarita ascending a path of moonlight, he himself is condemned every year to wander the labyrinthine alleys of the Arbat region, ending his yearly journey at the moonlit, lighthouse-like bay window that Margarita left behind long ago. What was a cage for Margarita, preventing her from pursuing the Master’s artistic truth, becomes the mysterious destination for Ivan, inevitably calling him, but revealing neither artistic truth, nor a path out of his individual Soviet dilemma.

Margarita’s flight to Bald Mountain demonstrates the importance of the moonlight path in her characterization. All the way from mansion to witches’ sabbath, light and mirror imagery illuminate Margarita’s path and emphasize her otherworldly trajectory. Margarita’s first moonlight path leads away from her three-paneled mirror and out of her bedroom in the three-paneled lantern window. From below Nikolai Ivanovich sees Margarita, illuminated by a moonbeam, as he walks along the brick pathway leading up to the mansion. Then, after Margarita’s phone call from Azazello, the reader once again shares Nikolai Ivanovich’s perspective on the window of the “illuminated bedroom of the [mansion’s] upper residents” (освещенная спальня верхних жильцов) (814). Light streams out of the window,
and along with it comes the witch Margarita, who follows this light-path out through the garden, directly above the literal brick path occupied by the stunned Nikolai Ivanovich.

After flying through the streets around the Arbat, Margarita once again enters a space defined by mirrors, reflections, and light. Before Margarita vandalizes the critic Latunskii’s apartment, she must enter the apartment building twice. First she enters through the mirrored doors on the street level, but then she exits the building to enter the apartment through its windows, along a “narrow, silvery path of moonlight”:

Измученный долгим бездельем за зеркальными дверями подъезда, швейцар... (818). Маргарита поднялась в воздухе и через несколько секунд сквозь открытое окно входила в неосвещенную комнату, в которой серебрилась только узенькая дорожка от луны. По ней пробежала Маргарита... (816).177

Another mirror awaits Margarita in the apartment itself, which she promptly shatters in anticipation of all the windows she soon thereafter breaks with a hammer: “Потом, разломав молотком двери шкафа в этом же кабинете, бросилась в спальню. Разбив зеркальный шкаф...” (817). These broken reflecting surfaces, including the mirrored doors that she “breaks” to enter the building, foreshadow Margarita’s entrance into the reflection of the moon in the river at the end of her flight.

Margarita soon tires of her vandalism and leaves the apartment building and Moscow itself. Bulgakov continues to structure this part of her flight by doubling moonlight with path and mirror with window. As Margarita leaves Moscow, she rises upwards towards the moon.

Instantly the reader experiences the disorientation of a mirror image. Margarita seems to be

177 “The doorman, tortured by long hours of doing nothing but standing behind the mirrored doors of the entrance....” “Margarita rose through the air and in a matter of seconds entered the open went into a dark room, in which the only contrast was a delicately narrow path of silvery moonlight. Margarita ran the length of the path...”
racing away from Moscow; the roofs of the Arbat region fall away beneath her until they become like a fiery lake (another image of Moscow as hell). Then, suddenly, Margarita realizes that the luminary lake is above her and the moon below her. The round, shining, fiery lake from above and the round, shining moon from below, are mirror images, and Margarita is poised to begin her fantastical flight in between their reflections of one another.

Margarita leaves Moscow behind, although the moon continues to behave rather strangely as she flies: it seems to be moving back towards its mirror image (Moscow) while at the same time appearing to stand still above the quickly moving witch (819). As she flies, she notices many other lakes of fiery lights, smaller cities, as they pass by beneath her.

Margarita’s pace slows, she descends, and a pond, a real body of water and an important reflecting surface, replaces the fiery lakes of cities (820). From the beginning of her flight to the end, Margarita flies between the moon and mirror images of it, almost as if she is flying along the surface of a mirror. Eventually the time comes for Margarita to pass out of this liminal space

---

178 "...the entire aggregate of roofs dropped away through the earth, and in its place appeared below her a lake of shimmering electric lights, and this lake suddenly rose up vertically, and then appeared above Margarita’s head, while below her feet the moon sparkled. Realizing that had she turned upside down, Margarita returned to a normal position and, turning to look back, Margarita saw that the lake had already disappeared and that behind her only the pink sunset on the horizon remained.”

179 "...летящая любовалась тем, что луна несется над ней, как сумасшедшая, обратно в Москву и в то же время странным образом стоит на месте...” (819). “...the flying witch admired how the moon was flying along above her, as if it had lost its mind, back towards Moscow, while simultaneously, strangely staying in one place....”
into the phantasmagorical space of the witches’ sabbath at Bald Mountain and the Spring Ball of the Full Moon after that. To do so she dives into the reflection of the moon in the pond: “... она ... кинулась в воду вниз головой. Легкое ее тело, как стрела, вонзилось в воду, и столб воды выбросило почти до самой луны” (822).  

This last image completes the doubling of window and mirror, moonlight and path. All along the way the moon has enveloped Margarita, illuminating her in the silvery clarity of intense moonlight. At the end of her flight she dives into the reflection of this light in the river, and the watery reflection is united with its source, the moon, by an enormous column of water. The force of Margarita’s entry into the phantasmagorical space of the novel could not have been depicted more beautifully: reflection united with the object of reflection, mirrored moon with real moon.  

Two more paths of light guide Margarita: into Woland’s bed chamber in Apartment 50 before and after the ball (827-8, 844).

Having observed the significance of the moonlight path and its dependence on the doubling of windows and mirrors, one can sense more clearly the significance of these elements in the description of Margarita’s mansion. Margarita begins her flight in her bedroom, flooded by natural lunar light and synthetic electric light, in between a spatially doubled mirror and window

---

180 “... she ... dove into the water head first. Her light body, like an arrow, pierced the water, and a pillar of water splashed up almost to the moon itself.”

181 The moon adds another layer of mirror imagery. The moon’s light is after all only the reflected light of the sun: the moon itself is a mirror.
that would have mutually reflected one another, creating endless space. She ends her flight by passing through a reflecting surface, on the same moonlit path that led her from her bedroom.\textsuperscript{182}

For Ivan, however, the moonlight does not create a path, but only further confuses him in the “labyrinthine Moscow” that disrupts his “chase” and results in his commitment to Stravinsky’s clinic. When Ivan dives into the black water of the Moscow river, he begins swimming “between the broken zigzags of light reflected from the lanterns (фонаря) on the embankment” (“Иван Николаевич начал плавать в пахнущей нефтью черной воде меж изломанных зигзагов береговых фонарей”) (681). After this “baptism” in the polluted waters of the Moscow river, Ivan pursues his hallucinations through “labyrinthine Moscow” (similar to Bulgakov’s language, “mysterious network” of the Arbat’s alleys), carefully avoiding the “spectacular doors of embassy-mansions” (шикарных дверей посольских особняков) (682).\textsuperscript{183}

Under subsequent vernal moons, however, Ivan’s yearly bout with mental collapse climaxes during his contemplation of the moonlit three-paned lantern window in the tower-like feature of Margarita’s mansion.

\textsuperscript{182} This analysis suggests the possibility of interpreting the entirety of Margarita’s flight as a play on mirrored space. If Margarita’s three-paned mirror did indeed stand in her bedroom across from the three-paned window, then the window would have been reflected in the mirror. Margarita could have flown out through the reflection of the window in the mirror, thus never really leaving the physical, “real” space of her gothic, five-roomed home. It would explain how Margarita’s body is found back in her gothic mansion after being poisoned by Azazello (914). After spending the evening in mirror space, Margarita’s body was simply ejected from the mirror into which it had disappeared, just in time to die, leaving her soul free in the mirror world of her fantasy.

\textsuperscript{183} The image of these “embassy mansions” has a complicated textual history. In the earliest versions of Ivan’s chase it does not exist. In fact, no one actually notices Ivan’s strange attire as he heads towards Griboedov House (third redaction, 96). In the sixth redaction, the one in which Margarita’s mansion takes on more substance and significance, Ivan does try to avoid the embassy mansions, but primarily because of the policemen who guard them: “избегая перекрестков со светофорами, зданий посольств, у которых дежурили милиционеры” (400). The entire image disappears then, throughout several typescripts of the novel. Manuscripts 8.2 and 10.2 read exactly the same: “ прячась в подъездах, избегая перекрестков со светофорами” (page 67 in both documents). The embassy image reappears only in the manuscript corrected by Elena Sergeevna after Bulgakov’s death (NIOR RGB 547.11.2), although it is expressed in a different adjective for embassy, never before used by Bulgakov, “полномочных” (i.e., полномочные представители): “…избегая перекрестков со светофорами, шикарных дверей полпредовских особняков” (68).
Understanding the complexity of the lantern window requires analysis of its textual history. Absent in the third redaction, Bulgakov first discovers, develops, and refines the image in the sixth redaction.\footnote{Rarely does Bulgakov edit spatial descriptions within one of his manuscripts. Most of his editorial changes occur between manuscripts, not in them. When Bulgakov left behind any manuscript at all for any of his works they were surprisingly clean. He seems to have revised in his head. One revision Bulgakov makes in the window suggests its complexity (see Appendix IV, “Features of Margarita’s Mansion: Three-paned Window,” p. 188).} In the last redaction Bulgakov accentuates the complex description by referring to it not as a window, but as a lantern (фонарь).

... в своей спальне, выходящей фонарем в башню особняка (802).
Трехстворчатое окно в фонаре (810).
... окрашенный луною с того боку, где выступает фонарь с трехстворчатым окном, и темный с другого -- готический особняк (932).\footnote{“... in her bedroom, protruding as a lantern into the tower of the mansion.” “Three-paned window in a lantern [erker, bay window].” “... a gothic mansion, decorated by moonlight from the side where a lantern with a three-paned window protrudes, and dark on the other side.”}

In addition to the architectural meaning for “lantern” (фонарь), Bulgakov relies on its more literal meaning of street lantern to provide the light imagery that creates the path along which Margarita will travel from mansion to peace.

The complicated description of the mansion’s most distinct feature points to Bulgakov’s development of a complementary interior image for the exterior bay window: the three-paned mirror.\footnote{See Appendix IV, “Features of Margarita’s Mansion: Three-paned Mirror,” at the end of this chapter (p. 190).} The third redaction demonstrates Bulgakov’s interest in connecting the mirror and window in Margarita’s mansion at a very early date. The exact language used for the window is repeated for the mirror in somewhat unexpected syntax usage: “окно открылось настежь. ... В раскрытом настежь трехстворчатом зеркале” (165).\footnote{“The window opened wide. ... In the three-paned mirror that was opened wide.”} Significantly, the window in this
redaction is not a three-paned “lantern” window; instead a three-pronged candelabra accompanies the three-paned mirror.

In the sixth redaction the repetition of triplcity intensifies. In addition to the three-paned mirror already described, Bulgakov adds the word “triptych” (триптих), more lights, and an additional mirror on the wardrobe.\textsuperscript{188} The last redaction shows Bulgakov self-consciously refining the image. He makes one word change the first time the mirror is mentioned, calling it a triple mirror. The only major difference between the sentences in the third and last redactions is that Bulgakov adds the adjective “triple” (тройный) before “mirror” (зеркалом). Then he uses an exact replica of the three-paned window language that describes the mansion’s exterior.

Another image contributes to the mirror-window link. In the sixth redaction of the novel, as Margarita flies away from her mansion, she turns back to look at it one last time and she sees the distorted face of her servant Natasha in the illuminated window: “Маргарита обернулась, чтобы в последний раз глянуть на особняк, и увидела в освещенном окне искаженное лицо Наташи” (536).\textsuperscript{189} Since Natasha acts as a double for Margarita in certain ways, the new witch sees her maidservant double when she looks at Natasha in the lighted window, just as she sees a younger version of herself when she looks into the mirror in her bedroom after rubbing the cream into her skin: “На тридцатилетнюю Маргариту из зеркала глядела от природы кудрявая, черноволосая женщина лет двадцати” (533).\textsuperscript{190} The last redaction shows little change (811). Bulgakov alters Margarita’s last view of Natasha in the window only slightly: “Маргарита

\textsuperscript{188} See Appendix IV, “Features of Margarita’s Mansion: Three-paned Window,” at the end of this chapter (p. 188).

\textsuperscript{189} “Margarita looked back to get a last glimpse of her mansion and saw the distorted face of Natasha in the lighted window.”

\textsuperscript{190} “A woman, about twenty-years-old, with naturally black, curly hair, gazed out from the mirror at thirty-year-old Margarita.”
обернулась, чтобы в последний раз глянуть на особняк, где так долго мучилась, и увидела в пылающем окне искаженное от изумления лицо Наташи” (814).

The collection of these lantern, light, and mirror images continues to gain significance as Margarita flies away from her mansion. In the final redaction Margarita lives in a room that has the same shape and function of a street lantern: the light streams out of the window, by which Margarita sees Natasha’s face “in the burning window” (в пылающем окне). She also transforms herself into a witch in front of the three-paned mirror (one half of the “lantern” window image) that reflects the bright lights in her room. Finally she barely escapes killing herself by running into a street lantern. These three images were not connected in all of the redactions, however. In the third redaction the mirror and the street lantern are both present, but there is little to connect them. In the sixth redaction, with the addition of the lantern window (в фонаре, фонарем) the link between all three images appears linguistically. The last redaction makes the connection the most explicit, when, in the epilogue, the narrator describes the tower in which Margarita’s bedroom is located as a “lantern with a three-paned window” (фонарь с трехстворчатым окном) (932).

The Lantern in the Labyrinth

The “lantern” as the defining feature of Margarita’s mansion develops out of Bulgakov’s poetics of realia. In creating the defining space of Margarita’s mansion, Bulgakov draws on the deep semiotic well of “labyrinthine Moscow,” Moscow’s mysterious network of built, natural, and verbal environments. Anecdotal accounts of what folklorist I.S. Veselova has referred to as

191 “Margarita looked back to get a last glimpse of the mansion where she had suffered for so long and saw the distorted face of Natasha in the burning window.”
“labyrinthine Moscow” will make the significance more clear. Moscow boasts multiple Mazurin mansions, several Morozov mansions, and multiple historical layers of street names, church names, and building names. Al’fred Barkov’s citation of Shaliapin’s memoirs provides anecdotal proof of “labyrinthine Moscow”:

Я помню характерное слово одного из купеческих тузов Москвы--Саввы Тимофеевича Морозова. Построил он себе новый дом на Арбате (выделено мною -- А.Б.) и устроил большой праздник, на который, между прочим, был приглашен и я. В вестибюле, у огромной дубовой лестницы, ведущей в верхние парадные залы, я заметил нечто, похожее на фонтан, а за этим большие цветные стекла, освещавшиеся как-то изнутри. На стекле ярко выступала чудесная лошадь, закованная в панцырь, с эффектным всадником на ней--молодым рыцарем, которого молодые девушки встречали цветами.

A commentator on this memoir, as cited by Barkov, makes a note that the Morozov mansion in the Arbat belonged to A.I. Morozov and not S.T. Morozov. Barkov, however, argues that the commentator, and not Shaliapin, was mistaken, that the gothic-style house belonged to S.T. Morozov and was located on Spiridonovka, which was then considered to be part of the Arbat region. As proof of “labyrinthine Moscow,” it does not matter who is right and who is wrong.

The confusion and flux inherent in the way Moscow space has been structured, named, and renamed over the centuries is obvious and real.

---

192 Veselova, “‘Logika moskovskoi putanitsy,” 98.
193 A.N. Barkov, Roman Mikhail Bulgakova “Master i Margarita”: Al’ternativnoe prochtenie (Kiev: Tekna A/T, 1994), 60. “I remember a characteristic word of one of the merchant parties in Moscow at Savva Timofeevich Morozov’s mansion. He build himself a new new home on the Arbat (emphasis of A. Barkov) and organized a big festival to which, incidentally, I was invited. In the vestibule, by the huge oaken staircase that leads into the upper ball rooms, I noticed something that looked like a fountain, and behind it large colored panes of glass that were somehow illimated from within. An amazing horse dressed in armor was depicted on the glass, with a pompous young knight in the saddle, whom young women were greeting with flowers.”
Belyi scholar N.A. Kozhevnikova points out Belyi’s use of the textual potential of “labyrinthine Moscow” in his 1926 novel, *Moscow*:

> “Вот ‘Москва’ переулков! Она же -- Москва; точно сеть паучинная.”

Переулки -- олицетворение невнятицы, нелепицы, которая воплощена в самих их названиях, подчеркнуто непохожих на московские: Фелефоков, Гартагалов, Селеленьев. Москва переулков противопоставлена всей остальной Москве: “Здесь, в комнате, десятилетия делалось страшное дело Москвы: не教授ской, интеллигентской, дворянской, купеческой иль пролетарской, а той, что, таясь от артерии уличной, вдруг разрасталась гигантски, сверши только с улицы: в сеть переулков, в скрещенье коленчатых их изворотов, в которых тонуло все то, что являлось; из гущи России, из гордых столиц европейских; все здесь -- искажалось, смешалось, перекорячилось, столбенея в глухом центровом тупике.”

From the very beginning, Bulgakov imbues Margarita’s mansion with a great deal of mystery and intentionally confusing information (невнятица), a fact that contrasts sharply with the overly precise coordinates for 302bis on Sadovoe, apartment 50. The textological history of the image begins in the novel’s third redaction. Up to that point neither Margarita nor her mansion play any part in the development of Bulgakov’s secret masterpiece. What strikes one, however, upon reading this draft of Margarita is that, although Bulgakov had what appears to be a very complete concept of her character, he intentionally creates gaps in her description. Based

---


195 Belyi, *Moskva*, 218-19; as cited in N.A. Kozhevnikova, “Ulisy, pereulkii, krivuli, doma v romane A. Belogo ‘Moskva,’” in *Moskva i ‘Moskva’ Andreia Belogo*, po materialam konferentsii “Moskva i ‘Moskva’ Andreia Belogo,” prokhodivshi v “Memorial’noi kvartire Andreia Belogo na Arbate” 18-20 dekabria 1995 g, eds. M.L. Gasparov (otv. red.), M.L. Spivak, and T.V. Tsiv’ian (Moscow: RGGU, 1999), 97. “‘That is the ‘Moscow’ of alleys! It is the same Moscow; like a spider web.’ Alleys are the personification of confusing information, absurdity, that is embodied in the very names, decidedly not resembling Muscovite names: Felefolkov, Gartagalov, Selelen’ev. The Moscow of alleys is juxtaposed to all the rest of Moscow: ‘Here, in the room, for decades the terrible business of Moscow has unfolded: not the Moscow of professors, intelligentsia, nobility, merchants, or proletarian, but the Moscow that, lurking away from the arteries of the main thoroughfares, suddenly expands prolifically just as soon as you turn off the street: in this network of alleys, in the junctions of the kinks in their twists, in which everything has drowned that ever appeared there; from the deep rural areas of Russia, from the proud European capitals; everything here has been distorted, mixed up, confused, as it petrifies into a blind, central, dead end.’”
on the manuscripts, one can identify two separate forms of self-censorship at work: 1) obscuring Margarita’s mansion by leaving a blank for the street name that would identify its location and 2) excising information about Master and Margarita’s relationship that had already been committed to paper.\textsuperscript{196} In both cases Bulgakov withholds from potential readers specific information that would identify one particular mansion or particular people close to him. With regards to the location of Margarita’s mansion, however, the reader is made to feel that they easily can find the mansion, but Bulgakov designs the description to always lack some necessary detail for complete identification.

The fourth and fifth redactions contain no new material on Margarita. It is interesting to note, however, that the fifth redaction ends just as the Master begins to tell Ivan the details of his love affair: “Выяснилось, что он написал этот роман, над которым просидел три года в своем уютном подвале на Пречистенке, заваленном книгами, и знала об этом романе только одна женщина. Именн ее гость не назвал, но сказал, что женщина умная, замечательная...” (363).\textsuperscript{197} Thus in both the third and fifth redactions of the novel Bulgakov intentionally fails to write down all of the information he has created about Margarita, and, more specifically, the location of her mansion. Bulgakov picks up work on Margarita’s character once again in the sixth redaction. By this time most of Margarita’s character is well developed, and,

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{196}] In \textit{Moi bednyi, bednyi master,} Losev indicates both forms of censorship with ellipses. The ellipses on p. 161 of Losev’s edition correspond to pp. 408-31 (Bulgakov’s numeration) of manuscript 562.6.7. The ellipses that appear after “бросились бы в особняк на” in Losev’s edition also appear in the manuscript. The other ellipses in Losev’s edition, however, represent pages that Bulgakov tore out of the notebook: manuscript pp. 412-29 are torn off close to the binding. While Bulgakov did leave a blank for the address of Margarita’s mansion, he never wrote it in. The address was not torn out; it simply was never included.
\item[\textsuperscript{197}] “It became clear that he wrote this novel, on which he had worked three years in his cozy basement apartment, every surface covered with books, on Prechistenka, and that only one woman knew about this novel. The guest did not reveal her name, but said that she was a clever, remarkable woman....” One should also note that Bulgakov deletes a specific reference to the address of the Master’s apartment (here “on Prechistenka”) from the last redaction.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
with several important exceptions, the image of her and her mansion already exist as they will in
the last redaction.

Bulgakov’s self-censorship could partially be explained by the biographical context of the
novel. Master and Margarita contains overtly autobiographical elements, and Bulgakov would
certainly have wanted to mask anything that might cause trouble for people he cared about
during the darkest days of the Stalinist Terror. In order to tease out aesthetic from biographical
concerns, the following paragraphs analyze the most important descriptors of the structure,
appearance, and location of Margarita’s mansion, the primary textual evidence against which to
evaluate any potential prototype. In addition to direct descriptions of Margarita’s mansion
within the text, the conspicuous narrative intrusions that reference the mansion have particular
relevance for any analysis of realia.

In each of its redactions the narrative intrusion demonstrates Bulgakov’s debt to Gogol:

Разбросанные по вариантам романа реплики повествователя вроде “скажу адрес”, “укажу дорогу” свидетельствуют об общей игровой направленности и вовлечении читателя в поиск этих мест. Они вызвали к жизни целое направление в булгаковедении: “личностное краеведение”. Баланс авторской фантазии и реальных отсылок порождает большое количество версий и непрекращающихся дискуссий. Особняк Маргариты — одна из таких реалий.

Just as Gogol’s unreliable narrators provoke suspicion about their reliability through
protestations of authentic knowledge and swearing by their life and health, so should Bulgakov’s

198 See Appendix IV (p. 185-95) to compare the variants of the most important features of Margarita’s mansion.

199 Irina Belobrovets’eva and Svetlana Kul’ius, Roman M. BulgaKoV: Kommentarii (Moscow: Knizhnyi klub 36.6,
2007), 341-2, and “The narrator’s intrusions are scattered throughout the variants of the novel; things like, ‘I’ll tell
you the address,’ ‘I’ll show you the way,’ testify to the generally playful direction of the device as it draws the reader
into the search for these places. These intrusions have brought to life a whole sub-field of Bulgakov scholarship:
“The literary study of a region.” The balance of the author’s fantasy and real references generates a large quantity of
versions and unending discussions. Margarita’s mansion is one of such realia.”
narrative intrusions about Margarita’s mansion make the reader suspicious of the narrator’s reliability. Bulgakov obviously wants to conceal the location of and exact architectural information about Margarita’s mansion, so protestations of the narrator’s willingness to share that knowledge seem contradictory. The manuscript of the third redaction does not break off here inadvertently; Bulgakov intentionally obscures the exact location of his heroine’s abode.

The narrative intrusions in the third and last redactions come at the same point in the narrative, and yet they intrude in different ways. In the third redaction the Gogolian intrusion describes envy for Margarita’s living quarters, in the last it concerns the existence and location of Margarita’s mansion in “real” Moscow. Bulgakov relocates his description of how envious other Muscovites should be of Margarita’s housing to another place in the text, saving the narrative intrusion about location to cast doubt upon the existence of Margarita’s mansion in “real” Moscow. This is a telling glimpse into Bulgakov’s creative process. He felt the need for a narrative intrusion when describing the mansion, and in the third redaction the narrator swears on his life that hundreds of thousands of women would long to live there. Then Bulgakov realizes that he does not want anyone to know the exact location of the mansion and inserts several ellipses. In the end he creates ambiguity about the existence of the mansion through Gogolian-style narrative intrusion and removes the description of the mansion as an object of envy to a less prominent part of the text.200

It can be tempting to view the narrator’s proclamation, “Пусть обратиться ко мне, я скажу ему адрес, укажу дорогу -- особняк цел еще до сих пор,” as a hint, or perhaps even a

200 The mansion as an object of envy must also be interpreted in light of the Gogolian narrator’s unreliability. Margarita’s privileged position makes her a prime candidate for the purges that take place during the writing of the novel: a woman in her position would have lived in a “gilded cage,” in almost constant fear for her life and that of her husband. Envy of such a position speaks more to the character of those envying than that of the envied. See Appendix IV, “Features of Margarita’s Mansion: Narrative Intrusion,” at the end of this chapter (p. 185).
straightforward affirmation, that Margarita’s mansion exists in modern day Moscow, and to therefore set out on a search for its prototype in historical Moscow.\textsuperscript{201} The reader should, however, be highly suspicious of the unreliable narrator’s protestations. Bulgakov wrote \textit{Master and Margarita} at a time when beautiful architectural landmarks were disappearing from Moscow at a rate that could only have alarmed and grieved him, as it did so many other members of the Russian intelligentsia who rejected Stalin’s plan to reconstruct Moscow to reflect Soviet ideals.\textsuperscript{202} One could only be sure that a beautiful building that stands today would still be standing tomorrow if it existed in a Moscow that the Stalinist rewriting of urban space could not touch.

The most prominent and symbolic example of the pervasive “rewriting” of Moscow’s architectural dominant is the Church of Christ the Savior. In early manuscripts Bulgakov includes the Church of Christ the Savior by name: Ivan takes his sacramental dip in the blackish, oily waters of the Moscow river directly in front of the church (61). However, Bulgakov removes direct mention of the church after it disappears from the Moscow skyline.

When Bulgakov arrived in Moscow in 1921-22 the architectural dominant was the “Muscovite moderne,” of which Margarita’s mansion is a most prominent literary incarnation. When he stopped working on the last redaction of the novel almost twenty years later, the shift towards Stalinist monumentalism was well on its way towards overshadowing the artistic, airy, miniature stylizations of its architectural predecessor. Bulgakov observed the transformation as it happened, and therefore his statement “standing even today” (цел до сих пор) casts doubt on the

\textsuperscript{201} “Let the reader come ask me, I’ll tell him the address, I’ll show the way; the mansion still stands to this day.”

\textsuperscript{202} Stalin’s plan to reconstruct Moscow significantly included the destruction of major portions of the central part of “labyrinthine Moscow.” Large areas of Moscow’s alleys were eventually destroyed to make way for thoroughfares; Sobach’ia ploshchadka and the network of alleys around was destroyed to make way for Kalininskii prospekt (now Novyi Arbat).
likelihood that Margarita’s mansion survived in the “real” Moscow, the one a reader could still visit today. If the mansion with the “lantern” window still stands, it is only in the “labyrinthine Moscow” that Bulgakov created from the text of the Moscow he lived in while it was being rewritten from provincial, historical capital of the Empire to new, megapolis-museum of world communism.

**The Semiotics of Margarita’s Mansion**

Margarita’s mansion has inspired numerous theories and potential prototypes in the pages of Bulgakov scholarship, most of which combine the features described in the novel with elements of Bulgakov’s biography that would have brought him into contact with a particular mansion in “real” Moscow. More than biography and ornate architecture, however, dictates Bulgakov’s citation of the Arbat’s *realia*; Margarita’s mansion may be best explained by the semiotics of “labyrinthine Moscow.” The “Muscovite *moderne*” architecture on which Bulgakov bases Margarita’s mansion provided important landmarks in the confusing labyrinth of the Arbat’s alleys. In Stalinist society they maintained a link to a cultural heritage that ideology was rapidly transforming beyond recognition; this labyrinth provided a sort of escape from the totalitarian principle that dominated the Moscow Bulgakov lived in while writing drafts of the mansion (1933-34 to 1938-39). A labyrinth can be a dangerous place to get lost, but it can also be an invulnerable hiding place for a character who knows the way -- like the members of the intelligentsia who lived there -- or, in Margarita’s case, with supernatural aid.

The contradictions of current scholarship best reveal the nature of Bulgakov’s use of *realia*, “labyrinthine Moscow,” to lead readers into the labyrinth surrounding Margarita’s
mansion. After sorting through the textual evidence for descriptions of Margarita’s mansion, numerous fans and scholars have argued for various prototypes for Margarita and, by extension, her mansion.\textsuperscript{203} B.S. Miagkov provides the most comprehensive analysis of potential biographical prototypes for Margarita’s mansion.\textsuperscript{204} He discusses the “Streshnevo” sanatorium on Volokolamskoe shosse (The Volokolamsk Highway) and Baroness Meiendorf’s gothic castle in Barvikha as potential prototypes for the gothic features of Margarita’s mansion.\textsuperscript{205} He also lists Starokoniushennyi pereulok 14 (Lev Kolodin’s version, as published in “Московская правда”, 1976, 30 July), Glazovskii pereulok 8 and Denezhnyi pereulok 16. Miagkov writes, “‘Соблазнительные’ двухэтажные особняки, близкие к “готическому” стилю, есть ... и на других улицах, в других переулках по обеим сторонам Арбата, но именно такой точно дом решительно отсутствует.”\textsuperscript{206}

\textsuperscript{203} Here I describe Miagkov’s theories about Margarita’s mansion because they present coherent argumentation; many other theorists provide no justification whatsoever for their chosen prototype. For example, Sorokina argues, “Исходной точкой полета мог быть только Кропоткинский, бывший Штатный или Стадный переулок, по которому в 17 веке гнали на продажу стада коров от реки Коровьему валу – крепостной стене Посада, антиподу Белого города. Этим готическим особнячком мы считаем особняк, спроектированный для жены богатого московского промышленника А.И. Дерожинского Ф.О. Шехтелем.” Liubov’ Mikhailovna Sorokina, “Сакральна география Москвы в романе М.А. Булгакова ‘Мастер и Маргарита,’” (PhD dissertation, PGU im. Lomonosova, Arkhangel’sk, 2010), 107.

\textsuperscript{204} Margarita Petrovna Smirnova publicly staked her claim as a prototype for Margarita and her mansion as the prototype for Margarita’s mansion. Her story is relayed in full in V.I. Sakharov’s \textit{Pisatel’ i vlast’} (Moscow: “OLMA-PRESS, 2000), 403-418. See Lidia Ianovskaia’s article for an analysis of Smirnova’s claims (Ianovskaia 2005, http://tpuh.narod.ru/yanovsk7b.htm). The polemical Al’fred Barkov proposes a prototype for Margarita’s mansion based on his theory that the prototype for the Master is the writer Maksim Gorkii. He connects S.T. Morozov to Gorkii because of the love triangle between the writer, the wealthy merchant, and the actress M.F. Andreeva. Barkov likens their relationships to the Master and Margarita’s relationship with her influential husband. Based on this premise, Barkov argues that the S.T. Morozov mansion at 17 Spiridonovka is a major source of the gothic features of Margarita’s mansion. Barkov, \textit{Roman Mikhail Bulgakova Master i Margarita}, 154-155. Leonid Parshin provides another, more sophisticated prototype analysis of Margarita’s mansion in Chertovshchina v amerikanskom posol’stve v Moskve, ili 13 zagadok Mikhaila Bulgakova (Moscow: Izd-vo Knizhnaia palata, 1991), 143. In terms of the architectural features, Parshin settles on building number 10 in Chistyi Lane (formly Obukhov). For location he winds up in Malyi Vlas’evskii Lane, building 12. In both cases Parshin focuses on Bulgakov’s potential biographical connections to these places to bolster his architectural and locational arguments.

\textsuperscript{205} B.S. Miagkov, \textit{Bulgakov na Patriarshikh} (Moscow: Algoritm, 2008), 224-5, 248.

\textsuperscript{206} Miagkov, \textit{Bulgakov na Patriarshikh}, 248. “‘Seductive’ two-story mansions with something of a ‘gothic’ style also exist on other streets, in other lanes, on both sides of the Arbat, but a building exactly [like Margarita’s] is decidedly absent.”
After discussing these less convincing candidates, Miagkov turns his attention to what he considers the most important and relevant ones. Miagkov first suggests the building at Ostozhenka 21, commonly referred to as Kekushev’s mansion.

Невольно возникает вопрос: если прототипов главного героя -- Мастера несколько, то нет ли соответствующих двойных-тройных прообразов у героини романа -- Маргарты?
Оказывается, у одного из прототипов Мастера -- Сергея Топленинова была “своя Маргарита” с не менее романтической историей, связанной с “готическим особняком”. Звали ее Мария Кекушева, дочь известного архитектора, Льва Кекушева, чей вычурный двухэтажный дом-особняк псевдоготического стиля до сих пор красуется совсем близко от “Дома Мастера” (как и в романе!) -- на Остоженке, 21.207

As indicated in this quotation Miagkov searches for biographical connections as well as locational and architectural ones.

207 Miagkov, Bulgakov na Patriarshikh, 254-5. “The question begs to be asked: if there are several prototypes for the main hero, the Master, then could there also be two-three pertinent prototypes for the novel’s heroine, Margarita? As it turns out, one of the prototypes of the Master, Sergei Topleninov, had “his own Margarita” with a similarly romantic story and a ‘gothic mansion.’ Her name was Mariia Kekusheva, the daughter of the famous architect, Lev Kekushev, whose fanciful, two-story pseudo-gothic mansion still stands in its all its glory very near to the “Master’s home” (just like in the novel!), at Ostozhenka 21.”
Ostozhenka 21, “Kekushev’s mansion” (courtesy of Museum of Moscow).
Several features of Kekushev’s mansion at Ostozhenka 21 correspond to Bulgakov’s description of Margarita’s mansion. Some major discrepancies, however, demand attention. For example, the garden from which Nikolai Ivanovich sees Margarita in the window could only be behind the house. Were Kekushev’s mansion really to be the prototype, then it is and always has been located much too close to Ostozhenka. The garden is in the back, not in between the bay window and the street. Furthermore, as is the case with the S.T. Morozov mansion, Kekushev’s is not technically located in the Arbat, but in the Prechistenka region.

Miagkov recognizes this problem, and to answer the need for a locational prototype he retraces Margarita’s flight from the Arbat to Malyi Vlas’evskii pereulok 9, the address of Evgenii Vasilievich Luzhskii’s house. The house was demolished in the sixties, but Miagkov claims that the roofline of the older building on the sides of existing structures is still visible. One of Miagkov’s primary arguments for this locational prototype is that Bulgakov’s in-laws, Elena Sergeevna’s sister Olga Bokshanskaia and her husband Evgenii Evgenivich Kaluzhskii, lived here. The home they lived in, inherited from Luzhskii, was similar to the description of Margarita’s mansion. Miagkov writes, “В самом доме Калужских были похожие на описанные в романе ‘готические’ архитектурные детали: трехстворчатое окно, фонарь-терраса на первом этаже, витая лестница.”

208 Malyi Vlas’evskii 9 is directly across the street from Parshin’s nominee, Malyi Vlas’evskii 12. Parshin, Chertovshchina v Amerikanskom posol’stve, 143.


Notice the bench and the garden with large trees.
These pictures reveal considerable discrepancy, however, between the architectural features described in *Master and Margarita* and Luzhskii’s house on Malyi Vlas’evskii pereulok.\textsuperscript{211} It is a two-story building, the garden exists with large trees, a bench, and a path, but there is very little to recommend itself as gothic or pseudo-gothic and there is no three-paned window facing the street. Furthermore there exists some doubt about Miagkov’s biographical argument. Bokshanskaia did indeed marry Kaluzhskii, who did indeed at one point live in this

\textsuperscript{211} A related photograph of this building, taken in August of 1964, (Ул. Танеевых, д. 3., М. Власьевский пер. 9а) shows the view of M. Vlas’evskii looking out to Sivtsev Vrazhek. The other side of the Luzhskoe vladenie on Sivtsev Vrazhek is visible, as can be identified by the window cornices, the brick base and plaster top and the windows, all of which correspond in style and size. M. Vlas’evskii 9а is not visible, but there is a wrought iron fence and a big tree, the very corner of the garden in front of 9а. The wrought iron fence and tree were of primary interest to me. (Museum of Moscow 7849 оф).

The “газовый фонарь” in the picture of the intersection of Malyi Vlas’evskii lane and Sivtsev Vrazhek is on the wrong side of the street to be the one Margarita almost runs into. She crosses the street and then almost runs into the lantern. The real question, however, is not whether or not that is the right street lantern. It is certainly only one of many that existed in the Arbat region in the 20s and 30s. The significance of this photograph is the similarity in shape between the lantern and the architectural feature that characterizes Margarita’s mansion (the “lantern” window). The lantern pictured here has only four sides, but one can still sense the similarity between the architectural window and lantern shapes.
house. They were officially married only in 1940, however, a family member and the archivist in charge of Luzhskii’s and Kaluzhskii’s archive insist that the two did not live on Malyi Vlas’evskii pereulok.212 Bokshanskaia was Kaluzhskii’s second wife, and they lived together in the apartment that Elena Sergeevna had occupied with her second husband, Evgenii Shilovskii before their divorce (Boľ’shoi Rzhevskii pereulok, bldg. 11, apt. 1).

Another of Miagkov’s prototypes that satisfies biographical, architectural and locational criteria exists at the intersection of Malyi Rzhevskii and Khlebnyi lanes. Miagkov writes,

До ухода к Булгакову в 1932 году она [E.S. Bulgakova] жила в квартире Е.А. Шиловского в Большом Ржевском переулке, а по соседству с этим домом, за Поварской, на перекрестке бывшего Малого Ржевского и Хлебного переулков, стоят привлекающие внимание своей архитектурой, “под модерн”, вычурностью два угловых здания. Одно из них (его прежний адрес -- улица Палиашвили, дом 6), с трехстворчатыми готическими окнами, башенкой, внутренней винтовой лестницей, и явило, по всей видимости, прообразом особняка Маргариты: провожая свою будущую жену после прогулки по Москве в Большой Ржевский переулок, Булгаков наверняка часто проходил мимо этого особняка.213

---

212 Ekaterina Arkad’evna Shingareva (historian at MKhAT), in discussion with the author, Moscow, Russia, May 6, 2010. Irina Aleksandrovna Kaluzhskaia (descendant of E.E. Luzhskii), in discussion with the author, Moscow, Russia, March 12, 2010.

213 Miagkov, Bulgakov na Patriarshikh, 253-4. “Before she left [Shilovskii] for Bulgakov in 1932, [Elena Sergeevna] lived in E.A. Shilovskii’s apartment in Bol’shoy Rzhevskii lane. Very near to this building, just across Povarskaia Street, at the intersection of the former Malyi Rzhevskii and Khlebyi lanes, stand two corner buildings that attract attention with their fanciful, ‘moderne,’ architecture. One of them (its former address is Paliashvili Street 6), has three-paned, gothic windows, a tower, an interior circular staircase, and was, in all likelihood, a prototype for Margarita’s mansion: when walking his future wife home to Bol’shoy Rzhevskii pereulok after their strolls about Moscow, Bulgakov most likely often passed by this mansion.”
Malyi Rzhevskii pereulok 3. The “lantern window” is the main point of interest in this mansion (photograph courtesy of Tim Whetmore, 2010).

Malyi Rzhevskii pereulok 6, “Solov’ev’s home.” Some say Bulgakov combined the gothic details of this home with the bay window feature of Malyi Rzhevskii 3, pictured above (photograph courtesy of Tim Whetmore, 2010).
Southern facade detail, Malyi Rzhevskii pereulok 6, “Solov’ev’s home” (photograph courtesy of Tim Whetmore, 2010),
Western facade detail, Malyi Rzhevskii pereulok 6, “Solov’ev’s home.” Note the bat above the mailbox and the owl that adorns the drainage pipe (photograph courtesy of Tim Whetmore, 2010).
In addition to the features Miagkov points out in his description of Malyi Rzhevskii 6, one could note the tiled moonscape on the southern side of the mansion with the winged woman underneath, the cement owls at the water spouts, and the bat above the mail slot. The three-paned bay window is lacking, although the two-storied bay-window on the corner of Malyi Rzhevskii 3 does provide a prototype nearby. The garden behind the mansion, while not large, could potentially be in the appropriate spatial relationship to the window Margarita would have flown out of, although it seems small in comparison to Bulgakov’s description and large trees are lacking.

As a locational prototype, these two buildings conform to the route of Ivan’s chase. In the Epilogue of the novel we read that every year Ivan retraces the route of his chase on that fateful spring night and ends up at Margarita’s mansion. The two routes, Margarita’s flight and Ivan’s chase, coincide, making the location of these two buildings very appropriate. In the picture below one sees both Malyi Rzhevskii 6 and 3, and just between them is the Church of the Ascension. Just on the other side of that church is where Ivan exits onto Nikitskie Vorota (The Nikitskie Gates), and from that point the reader receives no specific information about his route, but he very easily could have walked past these two buildings on his way to the next point of his chase, Arbatskaia ploshchad’ (Arbat Square).
These biographical prototypes are interesting in their own right, and each offers a unique perspective on the background of Bulgakov’s image. A semiotic prototype would not exclude the biographical, but it would seek another, complementary, layer of meaning in the relationship between prototype and literary image. A biographical prototype tells us something about Bulgakov, a semiotic one tells us something about the Moscow Text and its uses in Russian literature. Such a semiotic prototype exists in another of the Arbat’s numerous mansions: the Mazurin mansion that stood on Sobach’ia ploshchadka (Dog Square) until 1962, when it was razed to make way for Kalininskii Prospekt (Kalinin Avenue, now New Arbat).
From this postcard one can discern pseudo-gothic features no less striking than those of Miagkov’s candidates.\textsuperscript{214} A garden lies in appropriate relationship to a three-paned bay window in a tower-like architectural feature. A fence and a gate separate the mansion from Sobach’ia ploshchadka. Like other prototypes, however, it is incomplete: the bay window appears to be only one-story, although the building on the whole is conceivably two-storied. No large trees stand between Margarita’s bedroom window and the garden gate, although one can see the sapling growing in an appropriate location to brush Margarita’s face as she flies past at a future date (the picture is taken in 1903-5, therefore the tree would conceivably have been 25-30 years older when Bulgakov was writing). To summarize, in terms of the built and natural environments

\textsuperscript{214} Another photograph of the Mazurin mansion was published between 1903 and 1917 (judging by the formatting on the back of the card). The image is a bit darker than the one shown here and the edge of the fence is shown as it butts up to the adjoining building. Horses and carriages are visible. There is a “lantern” on the corner of the street that runs away from Sobach’ia ploshchadka. A creeping vine is visible coming over the wall. There is the same small tree (Museum of Moscow, ОФ 12496).
the mansion is perhaps not more fitting than the prototypes proposed by Miagkov and others, but neither is it less so.

The Mazurin mansion has locational merits as well. First of all it is located in the Arbat region, just as described in the novel. Miagkov’s biographical argument that Bulgakov would have walked passed Malyi Rzhevskii 6 and 3 on his walks with Elena Sergeevna is certainly no less applicable to Sobach’ia ploshchadka. Perhaps even more interesting is that Margarita ends her vengeful flight through Moscow very near to this gothic mansion: Bol’shoi Nikolopeskovskii pereulok 12 is just around the corner from Sobach’ia ploshchadka. The Mazurin mansion marks the end of Margarita’s flight, just as the locationally appropriate but architecturally wanting Luzhskii mansion prototype (Malyi Vlas’evskii 9a) stands at the beginning of her flight.

The truly semiotic potential of the Mazurin mansion, however, lies in a chance mistake, a very ordinary mislabeling, but one that illustrates the semiotic principle of “labyrinthine Moscow” that dominates turn-of-the-century Moscow.
Close comparison of the building in the second postcard to the first one with the same label suggests that the second photograph portrays a different side of the same mansion. There are elements of gothic in each photo and the fence seems to be made according to similar design. Upon closer inspection, however, one finds it very difficult to believe that they could actually represent the same mansion. The rooflines differ considerably and the broadness of the street in both postcards casts doubt on the possibility that the mansions are the same. Moscow is known for its narrow streets. The facade of the mansion in the first photograph is indisputably facing Sobach’ia ploshchadka, and the street pictured in the second postcard is simply too broad to be an adjacent alley.

The second postcard is an ordinary mistake, not uncommon in the production of postcards of lesser known buildings like the Mazurin mansion. While there is only one on Sobach’ia ploshchadka, there is more than one Mazurin mansion in Moscow. The photographer could have easily confused the names of which building he was photographing, or perhaps only cursorily glanced at the postcard and mislabeled it, an understandable mistake. Even if both postcards are the same building, however, these postcards still illustrate a prominent feature of the Moscow landscape Bulgakov chose for the setting of his novel: it is confusing. In Bulgakov’s words, a “mysterious network of the Arbat’s lanes.”

Иван ... углубился в таинственную сеть арбатских переулков и начал пробираться под стенками, пугливо косясь, ежеминутно оглядываясь, по временам прячась в подъездах и избегая перекрестков со светофорами, шикарных дверей посольских особняков (my emphasis, 682).215

215 “Ivan ... struck out into the mysterious network of the Arbat’s lanes and began making his way along the walls, fearfully looking around, by the minute looking back, at times hiding in entryways and avoiding intersections with stoplights and the swanky doors of the ambassadorial mansions” (my emphasis).
Indeed, this quote points out that the prototypes for Margarita’s mansion, several of which now serve as embassies, exists in a mysterious network, where things may not be what they seem. I propose these two postcards as a *semiotic* prototype for Margarita’s mansion, a prototype that reveals Bulgakov’s use of his chosen landscape to create meaning, to use space as a signifier. As a semiotic prototype, the two contradictory postcards labeled “Mazurin mansion on Sobach’ia ploshchadka” reveal the “labyrinth” inherent in Moscow’s built and natural environments.

Bulgakov relies on this deceptive aspect of Moscow space for aesthetic effect. He intentionally makes Margarita’s mansion impossible to find to highlight the deceptive nature of Moscow space, a space that the terrors of political and ideological repression in the 1930s made even more deceptive and hard to navigate. The mansion symbolizes Margarita’s labyrinth: she was in a very dangerous position with no clearly marked safe path. One false move by her or her husband and they could have disappeared forever to a place very different from the luxury of Stravinsky’s modern clinic, eternal peace, or light. The mansion symbolizes a similar labyrinth for Ivan, although it is one from which he never escapes. As a professor of history and philosophy Ivan has achieved some measure of success, but in the Soviet Union’s two most ideologically restricted, and therefore dangerous, fields. His privilege leaves him unable to follow artistic truth, to continue the Master’s novel; he does not escape the gilded cage of his privilege as Margarita did.

In addition to these aspects of built and natural environment, the verbal environment of Margarita’s mansion also reflects “labyrinthine Moscow.” Scholars have long accepted Malyi Vlas’evskii pereulok as the address for the mansion.\(^{216}\) The first of these clues comes in the form

---

of a musical anagram. Margarita hears a waltz (вальс, val’s) in her mansion even in the earliest versions of her characterization. In the third redaction Margarita hears the sounds of a waltz played on a piano wafting through her open window from the alley outside. In the sixth redaction Bulgakov moves the waltz to the scene in which Margarita flies out of the window on her way to the witches’ sabbath and, eventually, to Woland’s Ball. The sentence seems to indicate that the reader already knew about the waltz, despite its absence. The gap in narration points to the fact that the sixth redaction is incomplete; Bulgakov relied on earlier redactions to fill in the blanks. The final redaction makes it clear that the waltz is an important element of setting. The Russian val’s is an anagram for Vlas’, a saint from whom the church of St. Vlasii takes its name and then bestows the same name on two nearby streets: Bol’shoy and Malyi Vlas’evskii Pereulki.

Malyi Vlas’evskii Pereulok, like the poetics of realia behind the mansion itself, also stands to benefit from semiotic analysis. Like several of the alleys and lanes near the old Arbat, Malyi and Bol’shoy Vlas’evskii take their names from a church, in this case, The Church of the Holy Martyr of St. Vlasii on Goat’s Swamp (Церковь священномученика Власия, что на козьем болоте). The name of the church has several interesting implications. Saint Vlasii is a classic example of “dual faith” (двоеверие). Early in the history of the Christianization of the Slavs he became the patron saint of livestock. It is no coincidence that the Slavic god Veles was also the god of livestock. The close phonetic resemblance of their names ensured the survival of some pagan lore about Veles as his function was assumed by the Christian Saint Vlasii. This type

As presented by both Parshin and Miagkov, the primary explanation for Malyi Vlas’evskii Lane is biographical in nature: Olga Sergeevna’s marriage to Kaluzhskii, the son of the owner of Malyi Vlas’evskii 9. While this may indeed be what drew Bulgakov’s attention to the place, it cannot be the final interpretive meaning of the location.

of layered duality resonates with other aspects of Bulgakov’s metaphysics in *Master and Margarita*.

The significance goes deeper, however. Two other lanes in the novel take their names from churches on “Goat’s Swamp”: the names of both the Church of Saint Ermolai (Ermolaevskii Lane) and the Church of Saint Spiridon (Spiridonovka) are often followed by the same descriptive phrase, “на козьем болоте.”219 Just beneath the contemporary surface of Patriarch’s Ponds lurks the same descriptor preserved in the names of both churches. The Patriarch built his residence on a swamp that was named for the wild goats that came there to drink: козье болото. Thus one of the meanings behind the choice for Patriarch’s Ponds as the opening scene for the novel is in the layered history of the place: demonic, chthonic space overlaid with an ecclesiastical, hierarchical veneer.220 Goats have long been associated with metaphysical evil in Jewish, and later Christian, narratives; in Russian folklore devils often live in swamps, as attested by the proverb, “devils teem in a quiet swamp” (в тихом омуте черти водятся).

This same semiotic layering is very typical of Moscow and other ancient cities like it. One could cite the old names for “Chistye prudy” (Pure Ponds) and “Prechistenka” (Most Holy Street) as examples: “Poganye prudy” (Foul Ponds) and Chertol’skaia (Demon Street). The polyvalence of Moscow’s toponyms attracted Bulgakov’s attention for the settings of his novel.

---

219 The theme of “labyrinthine Moscow” is at work here as well. Elena Lebedeva writes, “Возможно, это была простая ошибка. Ведь тогда “Козьим болотом” именовалась совсем другая, очень обширная местность – в районе современной Спиридоновки.” Elena Lebedeva, “Moskovskaya tserkov’ sv. Vlasiia,” *Internet-zhurnal sretenskogo monastiria: Kul’tura*, http://www.pravoslavie.ru/jurnal/culture/svmos-vlasy.htm. It was not a mistake, however, or if it was then it was a commonly known mistake. Other documents depict a bog called “koz’e boloto” (kozikha) in the area of both B. and M. Vlas’evskii and refer to the Vlasii church as “na koz’em bolote.”

The paths of both Ivan and Margarita intersect numerous times with the path of the river Chertoroi (Devil’s Ditch).\textsuperscript{221} Just as there are two levels of explanation for Ivan’s behavior (schizophrenia, logical reaction to the demonic) so the plot plays out in two separate Moscow spaces: the superficial Soviet space of Patriarch’s Ponds, renamed Pioneer Ponds in 1924, and the underlying demonic space of “Goat’s Swamp” (козье болото). Ivan Bezdomnyi references this older name for Patriarch’s Ponds as he slips under the influence of Stravinsky’s medicine. Looking at the moon he begins to wonder why he cares so much about Mirtsev (Berlioz) falling under the streetcar in the first place: “В конечном счете, ну его в болото!” (fifth redaction, 352; sixth redaction, 446).\textsuperscript{222}

The semiotic analysis of the built, natural, and verbal environment of Margarita’s mansion reveals a complicated and sophisticated resonance with the \textit{realia} of “labyrinthine Moscow.” Whereas the biographical approach to the textual data explains why perhaps Bulgakov would have experienced certain \textit{realia}, the semiotic approach employs these \textit{realia} to analyze Bulgakov’s characterization of Margarita and Ivan. The metaphorical and literal labyrinth of Moscow in the 1920s and 30s shapes the paths of Margarita and Ivan. Margarita’s mansion stands at the nexus of these paths through the labyrinth, but its “lantern” is at best only an ambivalent source of light.

\textbf{Belyi’s Skazka and the Characterizations of Margarita and Ivan}

A semiotic prototype for Margarita’s mansion that demonstrates its roots in “labyrinthine Moscow” only explains part of Bulgakov’s use of the Moscow Text; there is also an important

\textsuperscript{221} Sorokina, “Sakral’naia geografiia Moskvy v romane M.A. Bulgakova ‘Master i Margarita,’” 25.

\textsuperscript{222} “When it comes down to it, he can go to hell [literally, into the swamp]!”
poetics of citation at work in the creation of Margarita’s mansion. Other authors before Bulgakov rely on the realia of the Arbat’s built, natural, and verbal environments, setting their heroine’s abode in one of the swanky “Muscovite moderne” mansions that dominate the Arbat region of Moscow in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In the first year of the new twentieth century the young Boris Bugaev experimented with the idea of writing a literary symphony, an experiment that would result in his first published work and a novel that would cause a stir in literary circles when published by Briusov’s publishing house “Skorpion” in 1902: Vtoraia simfoniia (Second Symphony, sometimes referred to as Bely’s “Moscow Symphony”).

Significant textual evidence Master and Margarita suggests that Bulgakov knew Bely’s Vtoraia simfoniia. In addition to other similarities, both Vtoraia simfoniia and Master and Margarita are satirical in tone and autobiographical in inspiration; both include musical motifs; both are set in the Arbat region of Moscow in the face of impending apocalypse; and both describe heroines with identifiable historical prototypes who live in homes built in the “Muscovite moderne” style.

A closer look at the texts will make the link clear. The first descriptions of Skazka’s home in Bely’s Vtoraia simfoniia marks it as “the most stylish and decadent.” These descriptions correspond to Bulgakov’s description of Margarita’s mansion, first as “fanciful” (sixth redaction) and finally as “gothic.” Just as Bulgakov’s description of Margarita’s

---

223 For example, M.A. Osorgin’s heroine, Taniusha from the novel Sivtsev Vrazhek, listens to piano music, ponders death, looks in a mirror, with an open window, in an mansion on Sivtsev Vrazhek (160-162).

224 Bely’s buffoonish character Popovskii suggests a potential prototype for Bulgakov’s Popovskii, an early name for Ivan Nikolaevich “Bezdomnyi.”

225 All quotations from Vtoraia simfoniia are taken from Andrei Bely, Simfoni, ed. A.V. Lavrov (Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1991).

226 See Appendix V, “Descriptions of Skazka’s ‘Decadent Home’: First Four Descriptions,” at the end of this chapter (p. 195).
mansion has inspired theories about the historical prototypes of both owner and home, so has Skazka’s. The accepted prototype for Skazka is M.K. Morozova, the wife of a well-to-do merchant. Lavrov writes, ‘‘М. К. М.,’ объект мистической влюбленности Белого, -- Маргарита Кирилловна Морозова, с которой он тогда даже не был лично знаком, -- прообраз ‘сказки.’’

Kozhevnikova points out that the home in which Margarita Kirillovna lived was not decadent, and names the O.A. List mansion in the nearby Glazovskii pereulok, building 8. Perhaps it is not surprising after all that some Bulgakov fans have looked for Margarita’s mansion in the same place. Kozhevnikova goes on to point out that Belyi rewrites the Arbat quite freely, combining architectural flourishes from many different real buildings to describe one fictional home, a device Bulgakov also uses.

---

227 A.V. Lavrov, “U istokov tvorchestva Andreia Belogo,” in Simfonii, by Andrei Bely, ed. A.V. Lavrov (Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1991), 20-1, http://rvb.ru/belyi/symph_intro.htm. ‘‘М.К.М.,’ the object of Belyi’s mystical infatuation is Margarita Kirillovna Morozova, with whom he was not even personally acquainted at the time.”

228 Kozhevnikova, “Ulitsy, pereulki, krivuli, doma v romane A. Belogo ‘Moskva,’” 92.

Significantly, the most important architectural feature in the first description of this stylish and decadent home is a window, through which we see Skazka gazing at the moon and pining for her dreamer. When Skazka fixes her hair it recalls the familiar gesture of Margarita doing the same just inside the window of her gothic mansion. The moon plays an important role in Vtoraia simfoniia, in terms of the theme of apocalypse and eternal return: “Вставала луна. Опять, как вчера, она вставала. Так же встанет и завтра. А затем уж не миновать ей невольного ущемления.”

In the second description of Skazka’s home the reader, entering through the open window, learns of her boredom. Bulgakov also leads his readers through Margarita’s bedroom window to observe her grief and general boredom with life without the Master.

---

230 Belyi, Simfonii, 104, 109. “The moon rose. Again, like yesterday, it rose. It will rise in the same way tomorrow. And after that its involuntary incarceration cannot be avoided.”
The third image of Skazka’s home is immediately preceded by the troubling image of the suicide of Skazka’s dreamer, about which she will only find out later. Much like Skazka, Margarita reads the burnt remnants of the Master’s novel and ponders whether he is alive or dead. While the Master did not commit suicide, Margarita is very concerned about the state of his mental health and berates herself for having left him in such a vulnerable condition.231

In the fourth image, the characterizations of the heroines in the fancy homes start to diverge: Skazka still does not know of the death of her dreamer, who really has died, while Margarita’s hope is directed in an opposite direction. Her dream has made her hope that she shall soon see the Master, whether or not he is alive or dead. The grief that awaits Belyi’s unknowing Skazka is hope for Bulgakov’s prescient Margarita.

The final three descriptions of Skazka’s home parallel Bulgakov’s three descriptions of Margarita’s mansion in more interesting ways. Skazka lives in a decadent home, Margarita in a gothic mansion. The sun streams through Skazka’s window and strikes a mirror, Margarita looks at her window curtains that are backlit by the sun as she sits in front of a mirror. Skazka’s window leads us to a neighboring room to observe her weeping, Margarita’s mirror reflects her tears. Skazka weeps for the dreamer, Margarita for the Master. Skazka weeps for one who has already gone to the grave (вечный покой), while Margarita weeps for one with whom she will inhabit an eternal refuge (вечный приют) and who will earn peace (покой).232

There is another striking similarity in the context for both passages. Margarita’s dream of the Master in the sixth redaction closely parallels Skazka’s memory about the dreamer.

231 It is possible to read the deaths of Margarita and the Master as suicides. They willingly drink Azazello’s poison, and Margarita’s leaves a “suicide” note for her husband.

232 See Appendix V, “Descriptions of Margarita’s ‘Gothic Mansion and Skazka’s ‘Decadent Home’: First Comparative Description,” at the end of this chapter (p. 197).
**Master and Margarita:**

Да, как бы ни были прекрасны земные моря, а сонные еще прекраснее. Вода в них синего цвета, а дно золотого песку.... По морю во сне можно плыть в лодке без весел и паруса и с быстройю автомобилия. Оба они, перегоняя друг друга, в двух легких лодочках скользили по воде и смеялись. Да, смеялась Маргарита во сне, и за это, проснувшись, платила частым тихим и тайным плачем (520-1).233

**Vtoraia simfoniiia:**

9. Память о мечтателе, сидя в челне, уплывала в даль изумрудного моря: это была девушка в ожерели из слез.234

In both of these instances the themes of memory, tears, dreams and love are set in one of the distinctive architectural masterpieces of the “Muscovite moderne” style that defined the architectural atmosphere of the Arbat region at the turn of the century.

The images of Skazka’s memory about Demokrat and Margarita’s dream about the Master also reveal significant similarities. The image is repeated in Belyi’s novel several times and is not unlike Margarita’s dream of the Master in the sixth redaction of the novel (520-521).

**Vtoraia simfoniiia:**

3. Память о мечтателе, сидя в маленькой лодочке, уплывала в даль изумрудного моря.235

---

233 "Yes, however beautiful earthly seas may be, they are even more beautiful in dreams. Their water is dark blue, but the bottom is golden sand.... In a dream one can sail through the sea in a boat without oars or sails, as fast as an automobile. Both of them, passing one another in two small, light boats, skipped over the surface of the water, laughing. Yes, Margarita laughed in her dream, and she paid for that, upon waking, with frequent, quiet, and secret tears."

234 Belyi, *Simfonii*, 140. “9. Her memory of the dreamer sitting in a skiff soared into the distance of the emerald sea: this was a girl with a necklace of tears.”

13. Память грустно улыбалась и гребла в неизведанную даль, потому что надвигались иные годы и несли иные вести.²³⁶
8. А память уплывала в даль изумрудного моря; это была юная девушка в ожерелье из слез.²³⁷

In a different passage, Belyi’s description of Skazka’s mansion once again closely parallels Bulgakov’s second description of Margarita’s mansion.²³⁸ Whereas the previous description of both mansions was during the day, this one is at night. Both heroines are preparing to go to a ball, both stand in front of a window. Both heroines are illuminated by the nighttime luminaries, both have intense emotional experiences of joy and sadness, both move upwards towards the heavens, Margarita literally and Skazka emotionally. Both images also contain the idea of a “vision” of sorts. Belyi’s is direct and serious. His heroine looks like a “holy vision.” Bulgakov’s version of this is obviously of a different nature and more indirect. Nikolai Ivanovich sees Margarita and is stunned by her beauty (the reader most likely assumes that her nudity is more stunning than her holiness). However, later we learn that Nikolai Ivanovich refers to Natasha as a “goddess” when he saw her (820). In the case of Belyi’s image, the viewer of Skazka’s beauty is unnamed, but present.

Bulgakov takes the image in a very different direction, naming the viewer (Nikolai Ivanovich), adding a double (Natasha), and describing an erotic instead of a “holy” vision. This is just one more example of Bulgakov playing with the poles of good and evil, however. Ivan Nikolaevich Ponyrev would give anything to know what Nikolai Ivanovich sees when he looks

²³⁶ Belyi, Simfonii, 140. “13. Her memory sadly smiled and rowed into the unknown distance because different years were approaching, carrying different rumors.”
²³⁷ Belyi, Simfonii, 142. “8. But her memory sailed into the distance of the emerald sea; this was a young girl with a necklace of tears.”
²³⁸ See Appendix V, “Descriptions of Margarita’s ‘Gothic Mansion’ and Skazka’s ‘Decadent Home’: Second Comparative Description,” at the end of this chapter (p. 199).
at the window on moonlit spring nights, an image that lends an air of nostalgia and a touch of the
divine to the “vision” of Margarita and her double Natasha (“Venus!” “Венера!”) at the window
(932).

Immediately preceding this passage from Vtoraia simfoniiia, Belyi describes Skazka
metaphorically. She rushes along in a carriage drawn by two chargers down an illuminated street.
The wintery night surrounds her, and her eyes fix in the white snow. Her features pale. She is
described as a “tsaritsa” (царица), carried on the wings of fantasy, and the wings of fantasy are
described as stories of what was not, but what might have been. She fixes her gaze into the abyss
and the abyss is reflected in her eyes. The very last image in this stunning description is quoted
here in full, “Вот летела она, как священное видение, подымая снежную пыль.”239 The next
image of Skazka is in her home, the description cited above. The repetitions of the image stand
out: “holy vision,” “what could have been, but had not turned out,” frost, the ball, emotional
elation, the abyss. Belyi’s images in many ways predict what Bulgakov will do with Margarita
(королева), her gothic mansion, and her flight through the lanes of the Arbat region (albeit on a
broom, not in a carriage).

The last descriptions of Skazka’s and Margarita’s mansions are the most noticeably
unlike one another for one basic reason: Skazka is left still weeping in her decadent home to be
comforted by her centaur of a husband, while Margarita dies and leaves the space she has so
thoroughly grown to hate to be with the Master.240 Life is unpleasing to Skazka, but she does not
have the strength to leave it behind, to pursue what could have been and to make it happen.

239 Belyi, Simfonii, 170. “There she was, flying, like a holy vision, raising a cloud of snow.”
240 See Appendix V, “Descriptions of Margarita’s ‘Gothic Mansion’ and Skazka’s ‘Decadent Home’: Third and Final
Descriptions,” at the end of this chapter (p. 200).
Margarita truly fulfills the demands of a magic tale’s heroine (сказочная героиня), leaving behind the comforts of her magic-tale (сказочный) mansion for the Master’s basement.

This final scene at the window-lantern of Margarita’s mansion emphasizes the cowardice of both Ivan Nikolaevich and his double. Nikolai Ivanovich foolishly asked for a note to explain his absence, Ivan Nikolaevich fails to continue the Master’s novel. Both men are drawn to this mysterious, moonlit window, but both remain isolated within “labyrinthine Moscow.” Instead of sharing the Master’s art with the world, the path which Ivan begins in Stravinsky’s clinic, Ivan shares chronic bouts of mental illness every spring with a typical Soviet bureaucrat (чиновник), while the Pilate narrative, the Master’s artistic truth, appears only in a drug-induced dream. Ivan receives a temporary “peace” in the moonlight, but does not achieve artistic truth (934).

The cowardice of Ivan best explains his inability to find a path. He is cursed to return and wander the same route every year, never to reach a destination because he lacks the moral courage to reject a Muscovite culture devoid of musical, artistic, and literary truth; a Soviet Moscow that perpetuates centuries of Russian censorship and propaganda, in the most vulgar (пошлый) ways imaginable. The Moscow of the epilogue contains no literary and cultural allusions: Woland and retinue, along with all of their cultural antecedents, are forgotten; the Master’s novel, along with its cultural antecedents in Pushkin, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, and others, is forgotten; the music of Gounod, Tchaikovsky, Meyerbeer, Stravinsky, and Berlioz ceases to fill Moscow’s streets with melodies; no waltz can be heard on Malyi Vlas’evskii pereulok.

Ivan Nikolaevich and Nikolai Ivanovich contemplate a gilded cage, a “Muscovite moderne” mansion, that once caged a magic-tale heroine, a woman capable of pursuing artistic truth and beauty with the aid of magical helpers, but who has gone forever. Margarita remains
devoted to what scraps remain of the Master’s artistic truth; she accepts Woland and his retinue in her quest to preserve the Master’s artistic truth in a the hostile environment of 1930s Soviet Moscow. Margarita finds her “path” out of Soviet Moscow’s “labyrinth” of official documents (справки), ideological denunciations (доносы), and generalized vulgarity (пошлость) because she recognizes and values the pursuit of artistic truth.

Bulgakov rewrites Skazka, the privileged wife of a well-connected member of the decadent, fin-de-siècle intelligentsia living in “labyrinthine Moscow.” In Bulgakov’s poetics of citation, Skazka provides contrast for Margarita and for Ivan. Unlike Skazka, Margarita leaves the labyrinth of decadent comfort and selfish contentment in the culture of the Terror. For Ivan, “the holy vision” is gone, the gilded cage is empty. Ivan is too confused (спутан) to recognize artistic truth. Woland is not The Devil, he is a literary incarnation of many artistic truths about the devil: folkloric, literary, theological, philosophical. Similarly, Ieshua is not Jesus Christ, but a combination of historical, literary, philosophical, theological attempts to depict the artistic truths of the historical Jesus. In Master and Margarita, Bulgakov contrasts a culture that courageously pursues artistic truths with a culture that abandons the search for artistic truth in favor of ideology. Berlioz dies not because he is an atheist, but because he is an atheist who has lost the power to recognize artistic truths. The “labyrinthine Moscow” of Margarita’s mansion traps Ivan because he has lost the ability to discern a mansion from a gilded cage; the epilogue leaves Ivan thoroughly and pitiably confused (спутан). He contemplates with intense nostalgia the mansion Margarita so desperately wanted to leave in pursuit of the Master and the truth of his Pilate narrative, unable to pursue those truths for himself.
Conclusion

Margarita’s mansion links the paths of Margarita and Ivan through Moscow’s urban space. Bulgakov’s poetics of *realia* and citation exploits the textual potential of “labyrinthine Moscow” to contrast the paths of his characters with the labyrinth of Soviet Moscow through which they travel. Their pursuits of artistic truth lead to the opposition of “peace” and “light,” most traditionally associated with the Master and Pilate. This analysis reveals that Margarita’s mansion does more than simply serve as one of the several “anti-homes” in the novel: it is a literary setting that draws on the Moscow Text through a poetics of *realia* and citations to structure the characterizations of two of Bulgakov’s most important heroes.
Appendix IV: The Development of Margarita’s Mansion in the Manuscripts of *Master and Margarita*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features of Margarita’s Mansion: Narrative Intrusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Redaction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Сотни тысяч женщин в Москве, за это можно ручаться здоровьем, жизнь, если бы им предложили занять то положение, которое занимала Маргарита Николаевна, в одну минуту, не размышляя, не задумываясь, задыхаясь от волнения, бросились бы в особняк на ...... . . . и поселились, и сочли бы себя счастливейшими в мире” (161). The narrative skips from here to the middle of Margarita’s thoughts as she sits by the Kremlin and observes Berlioz’s funeral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sixth Redaction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative intrusion not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Redaction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Маргарита Николаевна со своим мужем вдвоем занимали весь верх прекрасного особняка в саду в одном из переулков близ Арбата. Очаровательное место! Всякий может в этом убедиться, если пожелает направиться в этот сад. Пусть обратиться ко мне, я скажу ему адрес, укажу дорогу -- особняк цел еще до сих пор” (801).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Все пять комнат в верхнем этаже особняка, вся эта квартира, которой в Москве позавидовали бы десятки тысяч людей, в ее полном распоряжении” (803).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features of Margarita’s Mansion: Five Rooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Redaction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No mention of the number of rooms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Features of Margarita’s Mansion: Five Rooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>пять комнат</th>
<th>Sixth Redaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Целый три дня она предоставлена самой себе, целых три дня никто не помешает ей думать, мечтать. Все пять комнат в ее распоряжении” (522).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Redaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Все пять комнат в верхнем этаже особняка, вся эта квартира, которой в Москве позавидовали бы десятки тысяч людей, в ее полном распоряжении” (803).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Features of Margarita’s Mansion: Garden

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Third Redaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Сладкий ветер задувал чуть-чуть из лунного сада, шевелил шелковую шторку” (166).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | “Немедленно хлопнула дверь, ведущая в сад особняка, и на кирпичной дорожке появился добрый знакомый Николай Иванович, проживающий в верхнем этаже” (166). |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sixth Redaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Луна висела в чистом небе полная, разрисованная таинственным рисунком, и настолько залила сад, в котором был особняк, что отчетливо были видны кирпичики дорожки, ведущей к воротам. Липы, клены, акации разрисовали землю сложными переплетами пятен” (531).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | “Машина зашумела, удаляясь, стукнула калитка, и на плитках дорожки послышались шаги” (534). |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features of Margarita’s Mansion: Garden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>сад, лунный сад, скамейка, калитка, решетка, кирпичная дорожка, клен, липа, акация, ворота, вальс</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Посмотрев еще на луну, вздохнув для приличия, Маргарита повернула голову в сад и действительно увидела Николая Ивановича, обливаемого луной. Н.И. сидел на скамейке, и видно было по всему, что опустился он на нее внезапно” (535).

“Процесс, Наташа! -- визгнула Маргарита и, вздернув щетку, полетела к воротам. И вслед ей полетел совершенно безумный вальс” (536).

**Last Redaction**

“Луна в вечернем чистом небе висела полная, видная сквозь ветви клена. Липы и акации разрисовали землю в саду сложным узором пятен” (810).

“Машина зашумела, удаляясь от ворот. Стукнула калитка, и на плитках дорожки послышались шаги” (813).

“Еще полюбовавшись на луну, вздохнув для приличия, Маргарита повернула голову в сад и действительно увидела Николая Ивановича, проживающего в нижнем этаже этого самого особняка. Луна ярко заливала Николая Ивановича. Он сидел на скамейке...” (813).

“-- Процесс, Наташа! -- прокричала Маргарита и вздернула щетку. -- Невидима! Невидима! -- еще громче крикнула она и между ветвями клена, хлестнувшими ее по лицу, перелетев ворота, вылетела в переулок. И вслед ей полетел совершенно обезумевший вальс” (814).
### Features of Margarita’s Mansion: Gothic Mansion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redaction</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Redaction</strong></td>
<td>No mention of gothic or other architectural style. In this redaction Margarita lives in what is described simply as “особняк.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sixth Redaction</strong></td>
<td>“... Маргарита проснулась около одиннадцати часов утра в своей спальне, выходящей фонарём в башню причудливой архитектуры особняка в одном из переулков Арбата” (521).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Redaction</strong></td>
<td>“... ей нужен был он, мастер, а вовсе не готический особняк, и не отдельный сад, и не деньги” (801).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Затем снимается с места и всегда по одному и тому же маршруту, через Спиридоновку, с пустыми незрячими глазами идет в арбатские переулки. Он проходит мимо нефтелавки, поворачивается там, где покосившийся старый газовый фонарь, и подкрадывается к решетке, за которой он видит пышный, но еще не одетый сад, и в нем -- окрашенный луною с того боку, где выступает фонарь с трехстворчатым окном, и темный с другого -- готический особняк” (932).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Features of Margarita’s Mansion: Three-paned Window

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redaction</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Redaction</strong></td>
<td>“И Маргарита взвилась над городом, оставив сзади себя освещенный луной сад, пылающее окно спальни с сорванной шторой, и вслед ей с грохотом полетел буйный вальс” (167).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sixth Redaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features of Margarita’s Mansion: Three-paned Window</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“... Маргарита проснулась около одиннадцати часов утра в своей спальне, выходящей фонарем в башню причудливой архитектуры особняка в одном из переулков Арбата” (521).

“Трехстворчатое окно в фонаре, открытое, но задернутое шторой, светилось бешеным электрическим светом” (531).

This quotation from Losev’s edition requires additional comment. Originally the manuscript read “Трехстворчатое окно, задернутое шторой, в фонаре светилось бешеным электрическим светом.” Then in Bulgakov’s hand the following insertions and deletions are made, “Трехстворчатое окно, [в фонаре, открытое и] задернутое шторой, в фонаре светилось бешеным электрическим светом” (562.7.10, pp 649-650).

### Last Redaction

“Маргарита проснулась около полудня в своей спальне, выходящей фонарем в башню особняка” (802).

“Трехстворчатое окно в фонаре, открытое, но задернутое шторой, светилось бешеным электрическим светом” (810).

“Затем снимается с места и всегда по одному и тому же маршруту, через Спиридоновку, с пустыми незрячими глазами идет в арбатские переулки. Он проходит мимо нефтелавки, поворачивается там, где покосившийся старый газовый фонарь, и подкрадывается к решетке, за которой он видит пышный, но еще не одетый сад, и в нем --
### Features of Margarita’s Mansion: Three-paned Window

окрашенный луною с того боку, где выступает фонарь с трехстворчатым окном, и темный с другого -- готический особняк” (932).

### Features of Margarita’s Mansion: Three-paned Mirror

**Third Redaction**

“Чтобы впустить его [вальс] в комнаты, Маргарита начала открывать форточки. Но очень скоро потеплело, и окно открылось настежь. ... В раскрытом настежь трехстворчатом зеркале туалета миллионы раз отражались огни трехсвечий. Под потолком горел яркий фонарь...” (165).

**Sixth Redaction**

“Так шептала Маргарита Николаевна, глядя на пунцовые шторы, наливающиеся солнцем, одеваясь, беспокойно расчесывая перед большим зеркалом короткие завитые волосы” (522).

“Утирая слезы, Маргарита Николаевна оставила тетрадь, локти положила на трюмо и, отражаясь в трехстворчатом зеркале, сидела, не спуская глаз с фотографии” (523).

“Под потолком люстра, на трюмо у зеркального триптиха два трехсвечия, два кенекета по бокам шкафа, ночной лампа на столике у кровати. Огни, и сами по себе яркие, да еще отражающиеся и в туалетных зеркалах и в зеркале шкафа, освещали полный беспорядок” (531-532).

**Last Redaction**
### Features of Margarita’s Mansion: Three-paned Mirror

| “Так шептала Маргарита Николаевна, глядя на пунцовые шторы, наливающиеся солнцем, беспокойно одеваясь, расчесывая перед троиным зеркалом короткие завитые волосы” (802). |
| “Вернувшись с этим богатством к себе в спальню, Маргарита Николаевна установила на трехстворчатом зеркале фотографию...” (803). |

### Features of Margarita’s Mansion: Waltz

- **Third Redaction**
  
  “С наступлением весны по вечерам один и тот же вальс стал взмывать в переулке. Где-то, как казалось Маргарите Николаевне, на четвертом этаже, его играл какой-то хороший пианист” (165).

- **Sixth Redaction**
  
  “Вальс над садом ударил сильнее” (535).

- **Last Redaction**
  
  “В это время откуда-то с другой стороны переулка, из открытого окна, вырвался и полетел громовой виртуозный вальс и послышалось пыхтение подъехавший к воротам машины” (812).

### Features of Margarita’s Mansion: Malyi Vlas’evskii pereulok

- **Third Redaction**
  
  “Вынырнув из переулка, Маргарита пересекла Сивцев Вражек и устремилась в другой переулок. ... влетев в переулок, она едва не разбилась о старый газовый фонарь” (167).

- **Sixth Redaction**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features of Margarita’s Mansion: Malyi Vlas’evskii pereulok</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Малый Власьевский переулок</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Она пронеслась по переулку и вылетела в другой, пересекавший первый. Этот заплатанный, заштопанный, кривой и длинный переулок с покосившейся дверью нефтелавки, где кружечками продают керосин и жидкость от клопов во флаконах, она перерезала в одно мгновение и тут усвоила второе.... Только чудом затормозившись, она едва не разбилась насмерть о старый покосившийся газовый фонарь на углу. ... Третий переулок вел прямо к Арбату” (536).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the phrase about the “старый газовый фонарь” “на углу” was inserted by Bulgakov at a later time (562.7.10, 668).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Redaction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“... между ветвями клена, хлестнувшими ее по лицу, перелетев ворота, вылетела в переулок” (814).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Пролетев по своему переулку, Маргарита попала в другой, пересекавший первый под прямым углом. Этот заплатанный, заштопанный, кривой и длинный переулок с покосившейся дверью нефтелавки, где кружками продают керосин и жидкость от паразитов во флаконах, она перерезала в одно мгновение и тут усвоила, что, даже будучи совершенно свободной и невидимой, все же и в наслаждении нужно быть хоть немного благоразумной. Только каким-то чудом затормозившись, она не разбилась насмерть о старый покосившийся фонарь на углу. Третий переулок вел прямо к Арбату” (814).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features of Margarita’s Mansion: “Sivtsev Vrazhek”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Redaction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Вынырнув из переулка, Маргарита пересекла Сивцев Вражек и устремилась в другой переулок” (167).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sixth Redaction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“... Маргарите нежного было надеть, все ее вещи остались в особняке в переулке у Сивцева Вражка...” (631).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“-- Я много переводила, -- говорила Маргарита, -- и теперь знаю, что все, что было... то есть Сивцев Вражек, вежливые выражения, Николай Иванович, одетая Наташа и прочее, все это -- чушь собачья!” (634).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“-- Я потому голая, -- заговорила Наташа, -- что платья мои все в Сивцевом, а носу туда сунуть нельзя...” (634).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Redaction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“... Маргарите решительно нежного было надеть, так как все ее вещи остались в особняке, и хоть этот особняк был очень недалеко, конечно, нежного было и толковать о том, чтобы пойти туда и взять там свои вещи” (910).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features of Margarita’s Mansion: Kaloshin Pereulok</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Redaction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Вынырнув из переулка, Маргарита пересекла Сивцев Вражек и устремилась в другой переулок” (167).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sixth Redaction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Redaction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features of Margarita’s Mansion: Arbat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Redaction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Летела она медленно, аккуратно проскальзывая над проводами, и вылетела на Арбат...” (167).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“... она влетела осторожно в темную подворотню, а затем во двор и там поднялась к окнам четвертого этажа. Окно смрадной кухни было открыто настежь, и Маргарита влетела в него” (168).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“На крыше Маргарита Николаевна сломала радиомачту, перевалила в соседний двор, влетела, снизившись, в парадный подъезд, увидала щит на стене, концом щетки перебила какие-то фарфоровые белые штучки, от чего весь дом внезапно погрузился в тьму” (168).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sixth Redaction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“При самом влете на сияющий Арбат освещенный диск с черной конской головой преградил всаднице дорогу” (537).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Redaction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Но и при медленном лете, у самого выхода на ослепительно освещенный Арбат, она немного промахнулась и плечом ударилась о какой-то освещенный диск, на котором была нарисована стрела” (815).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Она пересекла Арбат, поднялась повыше, к четвертым этажам, и мимо ослепительно сияющих трубок на угловом здании театра проплыла в узкий переулок с высокими домами” (815).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Откинув дугу трамвая № 4, от чего тот погас и остановился, Маргарита покинула Арбат и повернула в Плотников переулок. Здесь......” (169). The manuscript of Margarita’s Flight breaks off here and jumps straight to her participation in the Witches’ Sabbath.

“Арбат надоел Маргарите, и, взмыв, она мимо каких-то сияющих зеленым ослепительным светом трубок на угловом здании театра вылетела в переулок” (537).

“Она пересекла Арбат, поднялась повыше, к четвертым этажам, и мимо ослепительно сияющих трубок на угловом здании театра проплыла в узкий переулок с высокими домами” (815).

Внезапно ударил колокол, и с Арбата в переулок вкатила красная пожарная машина с лестницей... Но дальнейшее уже не интересовала Маргариту.” (819).

Appendix V: Comparisons of Skazka’s “Decadent Home” and Margarita’s “Gothic Mansion”

“1. ...Поднялась шелковая занавеска. Кто-то открыл окно на том конце города.
2. Дом был самый модный и декадентский, а в окне стояла сказка.
3. Она оправляла свои рыжие волосы; улыбалась, глядя на луну. Она говорила: «Да... знаю».
4. Она смотрела синими печальными очами, вспоминая своего
Description of Skazka’s “Decadent Home”: First Four Descriptions

“1. Окно декадентского дома было открыто, и в окне мелькало очертание бёклиновской сказки.
2. Сказка бесцельно шагала по комнате, и, казалось, темное горе заволакивало ее лицо.
3. Наконец она сказала: «Скука!» Села в кресло.
4. И вдали, вдали, как бы в насмешку над миром, заорали: «Караул!» Раздались тревожные свистки.
5. Это один разбил нос другому, потому что оба были пьяны” (105).

“1. В тот час застрелился молодой демократ, не окончивший заказанной ему критической статьи.
2. Прикладывая револьвер к виску, он улыбался, вспоминая свою сказку, сказку демократа.
3. С улыбкой вспоминала своего мечтателя” (115).

“1. В ту пору к декадентскому дому подкатил экипаж; из него вышла сказка с сестрой, полусказкой.
2. Обе были в весенних парижских туалетах, и на их шляпах колыхались громадные черные перья.
3. Сказка не знала о смерти демократа. Обе болтали в передней, обсуждая платье графини Каевой.
### Descriptions of Skazka’s “Decadent Home”: First Four Descriptions

4. В ту пору в Новодевичьем монастыре усердная монашка зажигала лампадки над иными могилками, а над иными не зажигала.
5. Была свежая могила демократа украшена цветами, и металлический венок колыхался на кресте.
6. Нагнувшись, можно было разобрать многозначительную надпись на кресте: «Павел Яковлевич Крючков, родился 1875 г., скончался 1901 г.»
7. Но сказка ничего не знала о кончине мечтателя и продолжала болтать с полусказкой о туалете графини Каевой” (122-123).

### Descriptions of Margarita’s “Gothic Mansion” and Skazka’s “Decadent Home”: First Comparative Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Belyi</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“1. В окна декадентского дома рвались золотые струи света.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Они падали на зеркало. Зеркало отражало соседнюю комнату. Оттуда неслись сдержанные рыдания.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Среди цветов и шелка стояла побледневшая сказка; ее красноватые волосы сверкали в золоте солнца, и бледно-фиолетовый туалет ее был в белых ирисах.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. На цветочном празднике она узнала о смерти мечтателя — и вот ломала свои тонкие, белые руки осиротевшая сказка.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Дрожали коралловые губы, а по бледно-мраморным щекам катились серебряные жемчужины, застывая в ирисах, приколотых к груди”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Она стояла растерянная и рыдала, смотря в окно.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. А из окна на ее слезы хохотала безумная зорька, прожигая</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Descriptions of Margarita’s “Gothic Mansion” and Skazka’s “Decadent Home”:
First Comparative Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First comparative description</th>
<th>яшмовую тучку.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Тщетны были сказкины слезы, потому что проходила пора демократов.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Волна времени смыла мечтателя, унесла его в вечный покой” (139).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bulgakov**

“Маргарита Николаевна со своим мужем вдвоем занимали весь верх прекрасного особняка в саду в одном из переулков близ Арбата. ... ей нужен был он, мастер, а вовсе не готический особняк, и не отдельный сад, и не деньги” (801). “Маргарита проснулась около полудня в своей спальне, выходящей фонарем в башню особняка. ... Так шептала Маргарита Николаевна, глядя на пунцовые шторы, наливающиеся солнцем, беспокойно одеваясь, расчесывая перед тройным зеркалом короткие завитые волосы” (802). “Вернувшись с этим богатством к себе в спальню, Маргарита Николаевна установила на трехстворчатом зеркале фотографию...” (803). Утирая слезы, Маргарита Николаевна оставила тетрадь, локти положила на подзеркальный столик и, отражаясь в зеркале, долго сидела, не спуская глаз с фотографии” (804).

The Belyi quote in the first box continues:

“10. Это ей рассказала безумная заря, хохотя до упаду, и сказка рыдала над разбросанными ирисами.
11. А... в соседней... комнате стоял потрясеный кентавр. Он вошел в эту комнату... увидел свою нимпу в образении.
12. Он стоял ошеломленный, не веря зеркальному отражению, не смея проверить коварное зеркало.”

241 This is the image of skazka’s husband, an interesting analogue to Margarita’s kind husband. The mirror motif is also significant: “kovarnoe zerkalo.”
13. Две скорбные морщины легли на лбу добrego кентавра, и он задумчиво теребил свою изящную бородку.
14. Потом он тихо вышел из этой комнаты” (140).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptions of Margarita’s “Gothic Mansion” and Skazka’s “Decadent Home”: Second Comparative Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Belyi</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“1. Вся осыпанныя бриллиантами, она стояла у морозного окна.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Звездный свет сиял где-то там, и она, осяянная звездным светом и луной, в белом платье своем походила на священное видение.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Она ехала на бал, а сейчас стояла у окна и вспоминала то, чего нет, но что могло бы быть, да не вышло.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Душа грустила и, грустя, веселилась... И, грустя, вырастала до неба!..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ...И вот сверкнула на голове ее диадема из двенадцати звезд... И она, оторвавшись от морозного окна, продолжала собираться на бал...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. И в синих очах ее была такая ясность и такая сила, что две звезды скатились с лунного неба, трепеща от дружеского сочувствия...” (174).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bulgakov</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| “Луна в вечернем чистом небе висела полная, видная сквозь ветви клена. ... Трехстворчатое окно в фонаре, открытое, но задернутое шторой, светилось бешеным электрическим светом” (810). Втирания [крема] изменили ее не только внешне. Теперь в ней во всей, в каждой частице тела, великая радость, которую она ощутила, как пузырьки, колющие все ее тело” (811). “Маргарита рванула штору в сторону и села на подоконник боком, охватив колено руками. Лунный свет лизнул ее с правого бока. Маргарита подняла голову к...
Descriptions of Margarita’s “Gothic Mansion” and Skazka’s “Decadent Home”:
Second Comparative Description

луне и сделала задумчивое и поэтическое лицо” (813).

Descriptions of Margarita’s “Gothic Mansion” and Skazka’s “Decadent Home”:
Third and Final Descriptions

**Belyi**

“1. «Мне скучно... Эта жизнь меня не удовлетворяет...
2. Я улыбаюсь, как кукла, а душа просит того, чего нет, но что могло бы быть, да не вышло».
3. Сказка разрыдалась у окна, поднося к синим очам надушенный платочек.
4. И молчал поникший кентавр, в огорчении кусая ногти.
5. Он делал все зависящее, чтобы развлекать любимую жену.
6. А она рыдала у окна, шепча: «Скучно, скушно!» Машинально смотрела, как на улице дворники счищали грязную слякоть.
7. На улице зажгли фонарь... И вот сверкнула в чудных волосах ее бриллиантовая звезда...
8. И она походила на священное видение.
9. День угасал, как печальная свеча” (190).

**Bulgakov**

“Первым долгом он [Азазелло] бросился в окно и через несколько мгновений был в особняке, в котором жила Маргарита Николаевна. ... Азазелло видел, как мрачная, дожидающаяся возвращения мужа женщина вышла из своей спальни, внезапно побледнела, схватилась за сердце и, крикнув беспомощно: -- Наташа! Кто-нибудь... ко мне! -- упала на пол в гостиной, не дойдя до
Descriptions of Margarita’s “Gothic Mansion” and Skazka’s “Decadent Home”: Third and Final Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“кабинета” (914).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Он [Иван]... подкрадывается к решетке, за которой он видит пышный, но еще не одетый сад, а в нем -- окрашенный луною с того боку, где выступает фонарь с трехстворчатым окном, и темный с другого -- готический особняк” (931-932).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 4
The Spring Ball of the Full Moon and Moscow’s Sandunov Bathhouses: Space and Plot

Москва без бани, не Москва.242

-- Proverb, reported by Vladimir Giliarovskii in Moscow and Muscovites

No trip to Moscow is complete without a trip to a Russian bathhouse (баня), and Woland would not live up to his philosophical, literary, religious, and folkloric predecessors were he to pass up a visit to the premier bathhouse in Moscow. The Sandunov Bathhouses (Сандуновские бани), originally built by a favorite of Catherine the Great, deserve their reputation for luxury, extravagance, elitism, and (occasionally non-traditional) pleasure. Bulgakov combines a poetics of realia and citation connected to the cultural, architectural, and literary traditions of “Sanduny” to compose one of the most important and puzzling settings in Master and Margarita: the Spring Ball of the Full Moon.

What information does a prototype express about the image in which it hides? Because it blends into the textual fabric of a setting, knowledge of a prototype may bring certain imagery to the foreground that otherwise goes unnoticed. In the case of the Spring Ball of the Full Moon, virtually no criticism acknowledges the bathhouse imagery that pervades the setting of Woland’s Ball from beginning to end. Traditionally, criticism has focused on the “Spring Ball” at Spaso House that Bulgakov attended in 1935 at the invitation of American Ambassador to the Soviet Union, William Bullitt.243 Woland’s Ball displays a more complicated array of spaces, however, including bathhouse imagery that can only find its source at “Sanduny.” Bulgakov layers the

242 Vladimir Giliarovskii, Moskva i moskvichi (Saint Petersburg: Azbuka-Klassika, 2010), 358. “A Moscow with no bathhouses is not Moscow.”

243 B.V. Sokolov, Mikhail Bulgakov: Zagadki tvorchestva (Moscow: Vagrius, 2008), 441-3.
space of Woland’s Ball, and each layer adds to the Ball’s interpretive richness. To Spaso House scholars have added a nineteenth-century ball at Mikhailovskoe described by the Marquis de Custine, the ancient Roman Festival of Roses, connected to the Dionysian festival of wine, Anthesteria, which reflect ancient festivals of the dead, a Parisian ball attended by artists in the company of their nude models, Leonid Andreev’s “Zhizn’ cheloveka” (“Person’s Life”), Il’ia Il’f and Evgenii Petrov’s account of a reception at the Soviet consulate in New York City in October 1935, and many others. Bathhouse imagery enhances the imagery from these other prototypes, explaining their fertile synthesis and sometimes paradoxical union in the setting of Woland’s Ball.

Knowledge of a prototype can also aid the reader in visualizing a setting in which a plot unfolds, in recognizing its parallels to a novel’s other settings and plot events. Photographs from the Sandunov Bathhouses help the reader orient themselves in the dizzying variety of spaces through which Margarita passes as the hostess of Woland’s Ball. Having visualized the basic elements of interior architecture characteristic of “Sanduny,” one begins to connect the spaces at Woland’s Ball to other settings in Master and Margarita, uncovering new layers of the richly self-referential poetics in Master and Margarita.

Ultimately, identifying a prototype uncovers part of the creative process, clarifying the motivation behind an author’s word choice, the importance of certain images, and the significance of plot events, as they are shaped by setting. The Spring Ball of the Full Moon is arguably the apex, the primary purpose, of Woland’s visit to Moscow. Bathhouse imagery enhances the ritual nature of the plot events that unfold at the Ball, highlighting the significance

244 Sokolov, Zagadki tvorchestva, 441-95; Anne Nesbet, “Skyscrapers, Consular Territory, and Hell: What Bulgakov and Eizenshtein Learned about Space from Il’f and Petrov’s America,” Slavic Review 69, no. 2 (Summer 2010): 382-5.
with which they fulfill earlier events in the novel. For example, because the bathhouse has been a supernatural place in Russian folklore since a time before written histories and contemporary philosophies, the setting of a bathhouse reinforces Woland’s ancient argument against Berlioz’s modern atheism. Woland finishes the conversation he began with Berlioz at Patriarch’s Ponds in the setting of the Ball, saturated with imagery of the supernatural. Bathhouse imagery also enhances the meaning of the death of Baron Maigel’, the Muscovite informer. In the bathhouse, nakedness, usually masked by clothing (literally) and deception (figuratively), must be exposed; when Abadonna executes the informer Maigel’, Woland’s judgement lays bare his surreptitious behavior. The Russian bathhouse is a demonic place: peasants would never sit for a third heating of the bathhouse because it belonged to the bathhouse spirit (банкник) and his devilish friends; human sacrifices were common at the building of new bathhouses. Bathhouse imagery enhances the ambivalence of the setting for these plot developments, and perhaps most importantly, provides an appropriately hellish setting for the inversion of the Eucharist, the plot event that echoes Ieshua’s crucifixion as the result of Pilate’s cowardice and foreshadows the poisoned wine that ushers the Master and Margarita into eternal peace.

**Textual History of the Bathhouse Imagery at the Spring Ball of the Full Moon**

The bathhouse imagery at the Spring Ball of the Full Moon does not appear until the sixth redaction. In the third redaction Bulgakov drafts an initial version of the ball, Elena Sergeevna’s favorite, which she referred to as the “little ball” (малый бал). Bulgakov contained this first draft

---

of the ball within apartment 50. The “little ball” offers some spatial illusions, but the ballroom and the activities that take place are all conceivably sized for an apartment of the type in which Berlioz and Stepa Likhodeev lived. There are several different rooms within the apartment, a device that Bulgakov carries over into the later redactions, but they all realistically fit into one large Soviet Moscow apartment without the need for any fifth dimension.

In adding bathhouse imagery from “Sanduny” to the Ball, Bulgakov makes one of the primary revisions between the third and sixth redactions of the novel. He expands the “fifth dimension” in which the Ball took place to include several noticeably Muscovite features of interior architecture: most famously Spaso House, but just as importantly, the Sandunov Bathhouses.

An overview of the very complex structure of the Spring Ball of the Full Moon will provide necessary background for the detailed analysis of Bulgakov’s language that follows in this chapter. The maze-like parade of seemingly endless rooms, stairways, fountains and pools quickly disorients Margarita and the reader, and yet Bulgakov provides very specific and concrete spatial structure for the Ball. Through Margarita’s eyes the reader sees eleven or twelve basic rooms, several more than once.

246 G. Lesskis and K. Atarova, Putevoditel’ po romanu Mikhaila Bulgakova Master i Margarita (Moscow: Izd-vo “Raduga,” 2007), 74-5; B.V. Sokolov, Bulgakov: Entsiklopediia (Moscow: Algoritm, 2003), 139; Sokolov, Zagadki tvorchestva, 441.

247 Bulgakov perhaps chose to include bathhouse imagery in order to introduce the refined eroticism that pervades the Spring Ball of the Full Moon in its last redaction. The third draft contains overtly erotic and masochistic images. However, by the sixth manuscript those images are replaced by suggestive references to serving girls and a scene in which an elderly woman gambles away her sixteen-year-old granddaughter to a middle-aged man. In the last redaction overt eroticism evolved into a more subtle, pervasive and yet understated nudity, an appropriate accent for the generalized bathhouse theme. Were the devil to hold a ball it would surely exhibit the lascivious nature of its host, and Bulgakov seems to have relied at least in part on the potent and historically documented subtle eroticism of the bathhouse to fulfill this function. Bathhouse traditions in Russia historically included co-ed bathing, a practice the Orthodox Church worked hard to eliminate. One of the distinguishing features of the Sandunov Bathhouses when they were first built at the end of the eighteenth century was their separate bathhouses for men and women. There were, however, private bathhouses available for rent within the Sandunov complex, and these private bathhouses enjoyed a reputation worthy of Woland’s devilish pedigree.
Margarita arrives at Apartment 50 after her limousine flight from the Witches’ Sabbath and ascends the staircase to the fifth floor (824-825). When she enters the apartment, one can immediately recognize the staircase upon which all of Woland’s guests will eventually ascend (825). She walks up the stairs with Azazello and meets Korov’ev, who has been descending stairs in the opposite direction to meet her on a landing, the same landing on which Margarita will personally greet each of the guests (825, 836). Korov’ev then leads her up the stairs and Margarita finds herself in a seemingly endless hall with a colonnade (“... в совершенно необъятном зале, да еще с колоннадой, темной, и по первому впечатлению бесконечной” (825). In this room Korov’ev and Margarita sit and talk for a while on a couch, but they eventually rise, walk along the colonnade, and after a time emerge into a different hall, which smells of lemons (827). The final room into which Korov’ev leads Margarita is Woland’s bedroom: “Маргарита увидела лежащую на полу перед нею полоску света под какой-то темною дверью” (827-828).

After a lengthy and entertaining discussion with Woland and his retinue, the time for the Ball to begin approaches. Margarita leaves the bedroom and enters a maze of rooms and halls, several of which are identical to the spaces through which Margarita passes during her initial tour in the dark with Korov’ev. At the end of the Ball, after drinking from the chalice offered to her by Woland, the grandiose rooms and halls crumble, fade away, and Margarita finds herself in the black space described upon her first entry into Apartment 50: “А просто было, что было -- скромная гостиная ювелирши, и из приоткрытой в нее двери выпадала полоска

248 “… in an immense hall, which even had a colonnade, dark, and upon a first impression, endless.”

249 “Margarita saw lying on the floor in front of her a stripe of light beneath some sort of dark door.”
Thus Margarita enters Woland’s bedroom for the second time, by following the same stripe of light upon which she entered his bedroom the first time (827-828). Thus, all of the various endless spaces described at the Ball are somehow contained in the living room (as opposed to the bedroom) of Apartment 50.

In order to provide a comprehensive map of the Spring Ball of the Full Moon and to create a better understanding of the bathhouse imagery within it, I have created a flow chart of Margarita’s progress through the space of the Ball. Each room carries a different level of significance to shape the events that unfold within its walls.

---

250 “But it was simply what it was, the modest living room of a jeweler’s wife, and from the door that was cracked open into the living room fell a stripe of light.”
[1] Room with a pool
(candles, pool, blood and rose oil shower, crystal bench, green leaves, massage)

[2] Tropical forest
(bathhouse humidity)

[3] Ballroom
(colonnade, columns of yellowish, sparkling stone, negroes with silver headbands, orchestra behind a wall of tulips)

[4] The next hall
(no columns, walls of roses and camellias, three pools with fountains, negroes in scarlet headbands, silver dippers, jazz band behind wall of roses)
[5] Площадка (Landing)
Where Korov’ev first greets Margarita, crystal bunches of grapes, amethyst column, marble wall with champagne fountain flowing into a pool made of ice

[6] Грандиозная лестница (Grand staircase)
staircase covered with a carpet, Margarita looks down into the enormous fireplace, neither the top nor the bottom of the staircase, but both, a liminal space

[1] Комната с бассейном (Room with a pool)
blood shower, massage

[3] Бальный зал (Ballroom)
stage for musicians behind tulips, mirror-like floor, satin butterflies, columns, marsh-fires, fireflies
[7] Pool, bordered by a colonnade

Black Neptune, negroes, columns, champagne, cognac, echoes, “like in a bathhouse”

[8] Mountains of oysters in stone ponds

[9] Glass floor, with hellish furnaces and devilish cooks

[10] Cellars


[3] Ballroom

two daises in the middle of the room, where previously there had been none, the throng crowds together among the columns leaving the center open
The flow chart of Margarita’s progress through the Ball highlights several important spatial features. First, it becomes obvious that the Ballroom is the most important space, since Bulgakov repeats it four times: once during the tour Korov’ev gives Margarita in the dark and three times after Behemoth announces the beginning of the Ball. Second, the reader is given the impression that there are numerous rooms connected to the ballroom, almost as if it is a portal through which one may access most of the rooms that appear in the chart. The “tropical forest,” the “room with a pool,” and the room with the polar bears and salamander-conjuror seem to lead into the ballroom, and the ballroom seems to lead into both the room with the walls of roses and camellias and the “pool, bordered by a colonnade.” Finally, each room Margarita sees has at least some detail of bathhouse imagery that could potentially link it to the Sandunov Bathhouses save four, the four yellow boxes that immediately precede the blue box that represents Margarita’s last visit to the Ballroom.251

The following paragraphs detail the primary features of imagery inspired by the Sandunov Bathhouses and literature about them as it evolved from the sixth to the last redaction: the word bathhouse itself (баня), shower, pools, ballroom, fountains, roses, precious metals, minerals, jewels, and bathhouse accoutrements.252

Bulgakov includes the word “bathhouse” (баня) and its adjectival form in the phrase “bathhouse steaminess” (банная духота) sparingly in the last redaction of the Spring Ball of the Full Moon. Given the pervasive bathhouse imagery, it is interesting to note that in the sixth redaction Bulgakov only uses the adjectival form of “bathhouse” (банная), but does not use the

251 At least some of the imagery represented in these four boxes seems to be inspired by the ball at the Spaso House more so than by the Sandunov Bathhouses. They are relatively insignificant spaces at the Spring Ball of the Full Moon in the sense that Margarita passes through them very quickly. Each is described in only one or two sentences.

252 See the tables in the Appendix VI for a detailed look at Bulgakov’s original language (pp. 247-56).
noun form of “bathhouse” (баня). When Margarita leaves the room in which she bathed and prepared for the Ball she immediately senses the “bathhouse steaminess” of the forest. The changing of temperatures is perhaps the defining feature of the Russian bathhouse. Most traditional bathhouses are made up of two rooms: the hot room and the cool room. There is usually also a trip outside of the bathhouse as well, to jump in a nearby river or lake or, in the winter, a snow drift. Bulgakov subtly builds Margarita’s sensations of temperature into her journey through the various rooms from the very beginning of the description of the Ball in the sixth redaction, although he avoids the word “bathhouse.”

In the last redaction the word “bathhouse” appears for the first time at the Spring Ball of the Full Moon, in the scene with the large pool of champagne and cognac surrounded by columns. While the sixth redaction makes no direct mention of the word “bathhouse” here, the Africans who wrap the bathers in sheets are reminiscent of the activities of a bathhouse worker (банщик). Bulgakov makes the description more explicit in the last redaction, adding the descriptive phrase, “like in a bathhouse” (как в бане).253 In the later redaction, Bulgakov simplifies other imagery, drawing the parallel to the bathhouse and removing extraneous details. The addition indicates that the bathhouse is an important, intentional, and meaningful dimension of Woland’s Spring Ball of the Full Moon.

253 The same phrase, “как в бане,” also appears on Margarita’s flight to the witches’ sabbath. Just after the column of water caused by Margarita’s entry into the river shoots up and almost reaches the moon the water is described as being warm, “like in a bathhouse.” “Вода оказалась теплой, как в бане...” (822). There is an interesting parallel here to the women diving into the champagne, sending columns of sparkling beverage into the air, miniature variations of what Margarita’s dive does to the sparkling, moonlit river water. Both images are associated with the bathhouse. It should also be noted that in the sixth redaction the parallel description of Margarita’s sensation of the river water reads, “Но вода оказалась теплой, как в бане...” (546). These seemingly minor changes between sixth and last redactions indicate that in the sixth redaction Bulgakov is still in transition towards the very definite bathhouse imagery of the last redaction. The “bathroom” and “bathtub” imagery in the sixth redaction is replaced by imagery specifically and uniquely associated with the culture of the Russian bathhouse (баня).
Throughout the Spring Ball of the Full Moon indirect bathhouse imagery is more prominent than the direct usage of the word “bathhouse.” For example, Margarita’s preparations for the Ball begin with a shower, one of the obligatory procedures of bathhouse culture. Margarita’s blood and rose oil shower introduces the reader to both the Spring Ball of the Full Moon and to bathhouse imagery. It is interesting to note that Bulgakov drops the term shower (душ) in the last redaction of Margarita’s initial bathing ritual, changing the image slightly to one more of the Russian bathhouse: Hella and Natasha pour blood and rose oil over Margarita’s head, probably from some sort of bucket as opposed to a shower head connected to a plumbing system. Within bathhouse culture, however, the function remains the same. In an urban public bathhouse after the intense heat of the steam room one either takes a cold shower, jumps in a pool, or dumps cold water over their body with a tub or bucket. In the country the analogue to the cold shower, pool, or bucket bath is a quick jump in a river, lake, or snow drift. Even in the last redaction Bulgakov includes the word “shower” (душ) during Margarita’s second trip to the “room with a pool.”

Bulgakov makes two significant changes from the sixth to last redactions in this opening scene of the Ball. First, in the sixth redaction Margarita’s bathhouse workers (банщицы) use sheets to rub her down; in the last redaction they use green leaves. Second, Bulgakov replaces “bathtub” (ванна) and “bathroom” (ванная) with “pool” (бассейн) and “room with a pool” (комната с бассейном). In both instances he exchanges words that evoke a bathroom for more concretely bathhouse images. The green leaves remind the reader of the bundles of dried birch leaves (венники) used in the steam room of the Russian bathhouse as a sort of full body massage that intensifies heat, opens pores, removes dirt, and relaxes muscles. This pool is the
first of several to appear in the novel, replacing the bathtub of the sixth redaction, and extending
the importance of the pool image.

The shower imagery introduces the pattern of repetition, one of the defining features of
the Russian bathhouse: steam room, immersion in something cold, cooling room, repeat.
Accordingly Margarita repeats her shower several times throughout the evening. First,
Margarita’s shower of blood and rose oil (figurative blood) is repeated metaphorically when the
music of Strauss and his orchestra “pours” over her body. Thus she is bathed in the essence of
human life (blood), a ritually symbolic substitution for it (rose oil), and music, a cultural
metaphor for the essence of human culture.

As already noted in Bulgakov’s use of the word “bathhouse,” the connection between the
literal shower of blood and rose oil and the musical one is made more specific in the last
redaction. In the sixth redaction Bulgakov describes the music as “running down her body” and
“washing over her like waves,” but in the last redaction the music “pours over her body like
blood” and the orchestra “pours sound over Margarita.” In both instances in the last redaction
Bulgakov chooses the verb “to pour” (окатить) to describe what the orchestra does to Margarita
with its music, the same verb that is used to describe what Natasha and Hella do to Margarita
with blood and rose oil. The final repetition of the shower comes after the prolonged suffering
Margarita experiences greeting the guests. She collapses in the room with the pool and gets
another shower of blood and rose oil and another massage, which revives her for the last part of
the Ball.

The numerous pools dispersed throughout the rooms in which the Spring Ball of the Full
Moon takes place provide another element of bathhouse imagery. Margarita bathes in a pool
filled with blood and then rose oil. Later three pools made of precious stone serve as basins for fountains of champagne. Another pool made of ice holds wine that flows out of a marble wall. Finally, the largest of all of the pools, which I will call the “Roman pool,” recalls an ancient Roman bath. Columns surround it on all sides and a fountain made in the image of the Roman god of the sea, Neptune, rises above the surface of the champagne with which it is filled. This last pool is the most important in terms of bathhouse imagery: Bulgakov provides much more detail about it than the other, primarily decorative, pools that foreshadow it.

Concerning the pools, Bulgakov simplifies many of the images in the last redaction. The frogs who in the sixth redaction play the foxtrot while seated on the Neptune fountain disappear in the last redaction, along with a golden school of fish-women and an aquarium simile. Structurally, however, nothing of substance is changed in the “Roman pool,” evidence of its central importance to Bulgakov’s revised conception of the Spring Ball of the Full Moon from third to sixth redaction.

The structure of the ballroom bears a striking resemblance to the “Roman pool” and to other rooms of the ball. In the sixth redaction Bulgakov describes Margarita’s sensation of the room as she stands with her back to it, greeting Woland’s guests. Part of that sensation includes pulsating floors made of marble, mosaics and crystal. After greeting the guests and reviving in her second blood shower Margarita visits the room and is amazed by the sight that greets her. In this description, the floors are not marble, crystal, or mosaic, but mirror-like, surrounded by columns. Just as during Margarita’s flight, Bulgakov plays with the reflecting surface of water as a mirror, and sets the ball in the same structural space as the “Roman pool.” The countless pairs
of dancers would have therefore been doubled on account of their reflection in the mirror-like floor.

The third and last time Margarita thinks about the ballroom is during the dramatic finale and Woland’s grand entrance, which takes place in the ballroom above the mirror-like floor. The sixth redaction demonstrates that Bulgakov wanted to make use of the mirror device to create the illusion of endlessness. The guests form two ranks that file across the ballroom floor and into the room with the champagne fountains and the walls of roses and camellias. In the last redaction, Bulgakov deleted this detail, but its presence in the sixth redaction hints at the author’s intention to connect all of the rooms and to construct them as mirror images of each other. This is just the sort of space, surrounded by mirrors, that creates the requisite atmosphere for the more serious, ritual part of Woland’s yearly Ball.

Several other wine fountains in addition to the Neptune fountain above the “Roman pool” decorate the setting of Woland’s Ball. Margarita senses how the icy receptacle for the champagne fountain contrasts with Behemoth’s warmth in the last redaction. In the sixth redaction Bulgakov does not mention the coolness the fountain radiates. This is perhaps another subtle element of the duality of the bathhouse experience in terms of temperature. On the whole, however, Bulgakov makes few changes to these fountains, suggesting that he did not place a lot of importance on the images within the Ball itself. They provide echoes of the fountain in Herod’s Palace that splashes by Pilate’s chair and function more generally within the novel’s leitmotif structure.

Roses are another element of bathhouse imagery at the Spring Ball of the Full Moon. Roses function at the Ball as one of the elements in which Margarita is bathed, her slippers are made of rose petals, and the walls of roses and camellias prominently figure into the Ball’s
interior architecture. In a strict sense, roses are not a requisite component of bathhouse culture. Rose oil was, however, used in various types of massage associated with the Russian bathhouse, and the Sandunov Bathhouses in particular. Rose oil is a precious substance, one of many that adorn the Spring Ball of the Full Moon: crystal, amethyst, rose and other types of flower oils, gold, silver, marble, etc.\(^{254}\)

Finally, Bulgakov includes several lexical items that recall bathhouse culture: “dipper” (черпаки), “towel” (полотенце), “fluffy towels” (мохнатые полотенца), “pool” (бассейн), “shower” (душ), “bench” (ложе), “to pour” (окатить), “sheets” (простыня), and “heated sheets” (нагретая простыня). These words appear consistently throughout the Spring Ball of the Full Moon in both the sixth and last redactions.

In summary, the Spring Ball of the Full Moon is a heavily layered space, wrapping back upon itself numerous times and in numerous ways, creating an illusion similar to a Mobius strip. Diverse spaces like the Sandunov Bathhouses, Spaso House, the “Roman pool” at Sanduny, the ballroom, walls of people, and walls of flowers all run seamlessly together within apartment 50. Bathhouse imagery enhances the illusion.

The Built Environment of the Sandunov Bathhouses

One reason bathhouse imagery at the Spring Ball of the Full Moon has been overlooked is because it is not the generalized bathhouse imagery of a rural, *dacha* bathhouse, but unique to Moscow’s most famous and luxurious urban bathhouses, the Sandunov Bathhouses. As a member of Moscow’s cultural elite Bulgakov undoubtedly would have visited the favorite

\(^{254}\) In addition to the way these precious metals, stones, and oils point to the luxurious interiors of the Sandunov Bathhouses, Bulgakov’s use of them recalls the folkloric and Symbolist interpretation of such materials as otherworldly, symbolic of the otherworld, the world of the dead.
bathhouse of the famous literary and cultural figures whose works he grew up reading. A source similar to documented evidence for such a visit comes early in Bulgakov’s autobiographical prose: Notes of a Young Doctor. In “V’iuga” (“Snowstorm”), the young physician-hero dreams about the luxurious warmth and comfort of the Sandunov Bathhouses as he travels out to visit a dying patient in a terribly cold and brutal snowstorm in rural Russia.\(^{255}\)

Regardless of the biographical evidence for Bulgakov’s knowledge of the Sandunov interiors, the best evidence for their importance in analyzing Bulgakov’s poetics of realia in Master and Margarita comes from turn-of-the-century photographs of the upper men’s quarters at “Sanduny.” Bathers enter the labyrinth of exotic rooms that make up the upper men’s quarters of “Sanduny” through the stairway pictured below. This staircase obviously differs considerably from the staircase upon which Margarita and Woland’s guests ascend, but its baroque design provides a foretaste of the architectural ingenuity that awaits at the top of its steps.

The stairway that leads from the entrance of the Sandunov Bathhouses to the atrium, which in turn leads into the gothic dressing room of the upper men’s quarters of the Sandunov Bathhouses, adjacent to the “Roman pool” (courtesy of Sandunov Bathhouses).

Like the staircase at Woland’s Ball, a long carpet adorns this staircase. This photograph demonstrates the remarkably deceptive appearance of the staircase: the opposing openings in the foreground at first appear to be mirrors, when in reality they are the space underneath the continuations of the staircase on both sides of the photograph. “Sanduny” seems to have been designed to create the impression of space wrapping in upon itself. Just as Margarita’s guests enter the ball at the bottom of the enormous staircase upon which Margarita waits to greet them, so visitors to “Sanduny” enter by means of this staircase. The stairway splits at the landing and wraps around in opposing directions to reunite on the landing of the next floor, the atrium (pictured below).
This atrium is located directly above the stairway leading up to it. The railings on each side mark the path through which visitors ascend, they mark the upper half of the staircases pictured in the previous photograph. The walls feature large floral paintings that include rose-like flowers. Four columns command the center of the room, and the two sets of double doors at the far end lead into the gothic dressing room (pictured below). The symmetry of the Sandunov interiors strikes the viewer in this photograph as well as the photograph of the stairway and provided fertile material for Bulgakov’s imagination, as attested by the extensive mirror imagery in *Master and Margarita*.

The flower paintings and columns of this room recall in a modest way the walls of real roses and Japanese double camellias that create the central feature in one of the rooms at Woland’s Ball. In the last redaction Bulgakov writes that there were no columns in this room,
that instead there were two walls of roses and camellias. In the sixth redaction, however, Bulgakov writes, “В следующем зале не было видно колонн. Их закрывала стена из роз ... на левой руке, а на правой -- стена японских махровых камелий” (561). It is quite possible that Bulgakov drew inspiration for these “walls” and columns from the atrium at “Sanduny.”

![Image](image.jpg)

*№ 13. Готическая раздевальня 50 коп. бань.*

The Gothic dressing room of the upper men’s quarters of the Sandunov Bathhouses, adjacent to the “Roman pool” (courtesy of Sandunov Bathhouses).

Although this gothic dressing room does not directly influence spatial themes at Woland’s Ball, it does demonstrate that, like the successive rooms of Woland’s ball, the Sandunov Bathhouses are constructed to amaze their visitors with elaborate and exotic detail. However, its proximity to the “Roman pool” discussed below makes it a very conspicuously styled space, and

---

256 “In the next room one could not see the columns. They were covered by a wall of roses on the left, and on the right, a wall of Japanese double camellias.”

219
one that reflects the two gothic details associated with Margarita: her gothic mansion and her medieval ancestry.

These first three spaces reflect certain principles of spatial organization along with some minor details of the interior design of certain spaces at Woland’s Ball. The “Roman pool” pictured below, however, is the most directly significant space Bulgakov borrows from the Sandunov Bathhouses for his novel.

![The “Roman pool” in the upper men’s quarters of the Sandunov Bathhouses](image-url)

In the last decades of the nineteenth century the owner of the Sandunov Bathhouses, Aleksei Gonetskii, hired the architect B.V. Freidenberg to rebuild the Sandunov Bathhouses, which had fallen into disrepair. The two men traveled around Europe gathering ideas to make “Sanduny” Moscow’s most notable public bathhouse. In this photograph the influence of one of their destinations can be seen quite clearly. Freidenberg designed the pool of the upper men’s
quarters at the Sandunov Bathhouses to recall the style of ancient Roman baths, in particular the most impressive ones built by Caracalla and Diocletian. The black statue of Neptune, the Roman god of the sea, provides the central visual focus of the pool surrounded by white columns. The “Roman pool” was designed to be both vertically and horizontally symmetrical, echoing the symmetry of the entryway staircase and atrium. The skylight in the ceiling mirrors the shape of the rectangle pool directly below it. The reflection of the columns and skylight on the surface of the water create an illusion of endless space. Sound waves rebound off of the elaborately decorated walls, floor and ceiling, amplifying the noise produced by each bather.

The relationship of the pool in the upper men’s quarters to Woland’s Spring Ball of the Full Moon is twofold. First, the photograph demonstrates a literal resemblance, albeit scaled down in size, to the description of the large pool filled with champagne, the one in which Behemoth transforms the champagne into cognac. This photograph reveals a “pool, surrounded by a colonnade” (бассейн, окаймленный колоннадой) and a “black Neptune” (чёрный Нептун). One can easily imagine women diving into this pool and then retreating behind the columns when the champagne turns to cognac. The sheets held by the Africans is another detail that points specifically to the Sandunov Bathhouses. From his tour of European bathhouses Gonetskii brought a unique detail to bathing at Sanduny: the Hungarian tradition of greeting someone finished with their steaming by dropping a “warmed sheet” (теплая простыня) on their shoulders (Gol’din 59, 88). Finally the lighting in the pool bears a resemblance to the pool described by Bulgakov. While it does not have a “crystal bottom” (хрустальное дно) it does

---

257 I.I. Gol’din, *Moskva bez ban ‘-- ne Moskva: Iz istorii moskovskogo byta* (Moscow: In-t etnologii i antropologii Rossiiskoi akademii nauk, 1999), 54. The Roman theme of this pool has significance for both Patriarch’s Ponds and Iershalaim, a topic I will return to in section four of this chapter.
have a skylight that mirrors the shape of the pool, so that there appears to be sunlight reflecting up from the bottom of the pool itself, an inverted, instead of invisible bottom.

The reflecting surface of the water suggests a connection to yet another room at Woland’s ball: the grand ballroom with the mirror floor. Once again Bulgakov describes an open space surrounded by columns. Looking at the photograph of the pool in the upper men’s quarters at “Sanduny” it is easy to imagine the surface of the water as a mirror-like floor. This ballroom is the same one in which Woland presides over the inversion of the Eucharist at the end of the Ball. The guests are crowded underneath the columns while Woland and the other actors in the rite occupy the middle, above the water/mirrored floor. Once again the playful space of the “Roman pool” dovetails nicely with Bulgakov’s artistry. The ceiling, the reflection of it in the pool, and the actual bottom of the pool beneath the reflection provide just the sort of multi-dimensional space in which such an important ritual should be enacted.

To summarize, while the first three spaces one experiences on a visit to “Sanduny” are not described in the same detail as the “Roman pool,” Woland’s guests travel through a similarly constructed space: stairway, rooms designed to impress with their luxurious and exotic themes, to the pool/ballroom which is where the most important and memorable events of the evening take place, including Woland’s annual, ritualized renewal by means of inverted Eucharist. Taken all together, the evidence is quite clear that Bulgakov structured the Spring Ball of the Full Moon with certain features of the traditional Russian bathhouse in mind. Furthermore, these photographs from the Sandunov Bathhouses as they were at the beginning of the twentieth century suggest that the bathhouse imagery as well as the structure of the different rooms through
which Woland’s guests make their way throughout the evening are also closely connected to the unique *realia* and structure of “Sanduny.”

**The Sandunov Bathhouses in Russian Literature**

Since “Sanduny” was a popular destination for many nineteenth and early twentieth century writers, Bulgakov had a rich tradition of literary versions of “Sanduny” from which to draw. Several of these versions provide insight into the role Woland’s Ball plays in plot development. Gol’din suggests that Chekhov, who lived next door to “Sanduny” for some time, was inspired to write his story “*V bane*” (“In the Bathhouse”) while bathing at the famous site.  

More to the point, however, are the bathhouses described by Pushkin in “*Ruslan i Liudmila*” (“*Ruslan and Liudmila*”) by Giliarovskii in *Moskva i Moskvichi* (*Moscow and Muscovites*), and by Belyi in his *Tret’a simfonia* (*Third Symphony*), “*Vozvrat*” (“*Return*”).

Pushkin’s imagery in “*Ruslan i Liudmila*” provides an excellent starting place. In part four of the poem, the young knight-hero Ratmir, tired from his journey in search of Liudmila, stumbles upon some gothic towers in the mountains. They beckon to the weary young man, and he is soon snared by the charms of a sorcerer, who sold his soul to the devil along with the souls of his twelve beautiful daughters. Before he knows it, Ratmir has lost all memory of his quest and chaste ardor for the imperiled Liudmila. The quote below demonstrates the role of the bathhouse in Ratmir’s failed quest:

“Она манит, она поет;  Девицы красные толпою;
И юный хан уж под стеною;  При шуме ласковых речей
Его встречают у ворот  Он окружен; с него не сводят

---

Они пленительных очей;
Две девицы коня уводят;
В чертоги входит хан младой,
За ним отшельниц милых рой,
Одна снимает шлем крылатый,
Другая—кованые латы,
Та меч берет, та—пыльный щит;
Одежда неги заменит
Железные доспехи брани.
На нем усталый хан ложится;
Прозрачный пар над ним клубится;
Потупя неги полный взор,
Прелестные, полунагие,
В заботе нежной и немой,
Вкруг хана девы молодые
Теснятся резвою толпой.
Над рыцarem иная машет
Ветвями молодых берез,
И жар от них дуистый пашет;
Другая соком вешних роз
Усталы члены прохлаждает
И в ароматах потопляет
Темнокудрявые власы.

This passage reveals some similarities to the bathhouse images Bulgakov incorporates into the Spring Ball of the Full Moon. The “silver baths” (сребрянные чаны) and “cooling fountains” (хладные фонтаны) recall the “silver dippers” (серебрянные черпаки) and numerous fountains observed by Margarita at the ball. Nude Natasha and Hella massage Margarita with leaves, blood, and rose oil in preparation for the ball. Ratmir experiences a similar massage with birch branches and rose oil at the hands of female bathhouse attendants (банщицы), the sorcerer’s daughters, in various degrees of nudity.

---

259 A.S. Pushkin, “Ruslan i Liudmila: Poema, 1817-1820,” in Pushkin, A.S. Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, 1837-1937: V 16 t., eds. V. Tomashevskii et al., vol. 4 (Moscow: Izd-vo AN SSSR, 1937), 53-4. “She sang; and as she sang she beckoned: And soon Ratmir had reached the walls; A throng of lovely girls were waiting To greet him at the castle gates; His ears rang to their words of welcome As they encircled him; they couldn’t Tear their bewitching eyes away. While two girls led his horse to stable, The young khan entered the apartments, Admiring hermit-girls behind. One lifted off his feathered helmet; Others untied his plated armour, And took his sword and grimy shield; Soon they would bring him leisure wear In place of battledress steel. But first the young lad they conducted To a magnificent Russian bathhouse. There steaming water was already Cascading into silver baths; Fine spray gushed forth from cooling fountains; Luxurious rugs bestrewed the floor; The khan stretched out upon them, tired, Still visible through swirling steam. Turning fond eyes aside, the girls, Seductive in their scanty clothing, Crowded excitedly around, And overwhelmed the young Ratmir With mute and delicate attentions. One of them waved above the khan A bunch of young birch twigs, with which she Wafted at him warm, fragrant air. Another soothed his weary limbs With attar squeezed from vernal roses And drenched his darkly curling hair In aromatic distillations.” Translation in Alexander Pushkin, Ruslan and Lyudmila, trans. Roger Clarke (London: Hesperus, 2005), 113-15.
While these details demonstrate a significant level of intertextuality, the role these bathhouse scenes play in the plot development of their respective texts suggests more significant parallels. Both bathhouse scenes include a gothic theme; both occur under the auspices of the devil’s power, both include some sort of pact with the devil. For Ratmir the bathhouse represents the end of the road: a trial that he failed to pass, an obstacle he was unable to overcome. The bathhouse scene ends Ratmir’s siuzhet. The pleasures of sensuality distract him from his ascetic quest, revealing the basic falsehood of his love for Liudmila. Woland’s ball is also a trial of sorts for Margarita. Only by successfully bearing the burden of the wearisome necklace and suffering the pain in her knee does she earn the Master’s extraction from Stravinsky’s clinic. Both Ratmir and Margarita face trials in a bathhouse; Margarita, however, perseveres where Ratmir fails.

In Moskva i moskvichi Giliarovskii asserts that Pushkin’s images are directly related to the Sandunov Bathhouses. Pushkin, Giliarovskii writes, “воспевает ... прелесть русских Сандиновских бань, которые он посещал со своими друзьями в каждый свой приезд в Москву.” Unfortunately Giliarovskii provides no additional evidence beyond the text of the poem itself for his assertion, a claim that would need to be researched in archival materials. However, at this level of interpretation the question of Pushkin’s true prototype for the images becomes irrelevant. Moskva i moskvichi went through several publications from 1926 to 1934 and Bulgakov was sure to have read it and retained the association of “Ruslan i Liudmila” with “Sanduny,” even if only on a subconscious level.

Two other details from Giliarovskii’s famous book on Moscow and its inhabitants also prove relevant to bathhouse imagery at the Spring Ball of the Full Moon. Giliarovskii writes,

260 Giliarovskii, Moskva i moskvichi, 394. “praises ... the charm of the Russian Sandunov Bathhouses, which he visited with his friends every time he arrived in Moscow.”
Like Dolgorukov, Woland, another all-powerful master of Moscow, had need of silver bathhouse accoutrements and the most luxurious bathhouse the capital could offer.

The second detail comes from the history of a different bathhouse, but one that Bulgakov could have borrowed. Giliarovskii tells the story of how the pond in the yard of the Chelyshevskii Bathhouses unexpectedly disappeared so that the bathhouses were left without their usual supply of water. The next day the water reappeared and everything went back to normal.262 Perhaps just such a historical anecdote, preserved in Giliarovskii’s text, inspired Behemoth’s trick of charming away the champagne and refilling the “Roman pool” with cognac. Giliarovskii’s anecdotes speak to the important place the Sandunov Bathhouses occupy in Moscow’s perception of itself, in Moscow urban folklore, and as a point of pilgrimage for visitors to the old capital.

A third literary prototype provides direct relevance to specific images and their hermeneutic significance for Master and Margarita in general: Andrei Belyi’s “Vozvrat.” Boris Sokolov first pointed out the relationship between the descriptions of bathhouses in “Vozvrat” and Master and Margarita: “Многие детали роскошного бассейна на балу Воланда заимствованы из третьей симфонии А. Белого, “Возврат”, где описан мраморный бассейн

---

261 Giliarovskii, Moskva i moskvichi, 356. “In the 1880s the all-powerful ‘master of the capital,’ the military general and governor, V.A. Dolgorukov, visited the Sandunov Bathhouses, where in a luxurious section of the family section he was provided with silver buckets and tubs. Even in his own palace there were marble bath tubs, still a rarity in Moscow at that time.”

262 Giliarovskii, Moskva i moskvichi, 369.
moskovskikh banь, украшенный чугунными изображениями морских обитателей.”

Indeed, reading these bathhouse passages from Belyi and Bulgakov together turns out to be instructive.

Общие бани были роскошны. На мраморных досках сидели голые, озабоченные люди, покрытые мылом и в небывалых положениях. Седовласый старик окатил себя из серебряной шайки. Яростный банщик скреб голову молодому скелету. В соседнем отделении был мраморный бассейн, украшенный чугунными изображениями морских обитателей. Изумрудно-зеленое волнение не прекращалось в прохладном бассейне, зажигая волны рубинами. Старик учил сына нырять в бассейн. С вытянутыми руками нырвался в волны, образуя своим падением рубиновый водоворот; от него разбегались на волнах красные световые кольца и разбивались о мраморные берега. Хандриков вымылся в бане. Он стоял под душем, и на него изливались теплые струи, стекая по телу жемчужными каплями. Хандриков думал: Другие Хандриковы вот так же моются в бане. Все Хандриковы, посеянные в пространстве и периодически возникающие во времени, одинаково моются.

As suggested by the name of Belyi’s third symphony, “Vozvrat,” the author is concerned with Nietzsche’s idea of “Eternal Return.” Belyi develops his own metaphysical interpretation of Nietzsche’s philosophy in “Vozvrat,” which lies at the core of his image of the “Roman pool” at the Sandunov Bathhouses. For example, in part one of “Vozvrat,” a “citizen of the sea” teaches his sons to dive from cliffs into the maritime abyss. This image expresses an event on the eternal,

---

263 B.V. Sokolov, Tainy “Masters i Margarita”: Russkikhovannyi Bulgakov (Moscow: EKSMO, 2006), 261. “Many details of the luxuriant bathhouse at Woland’s ball are borrowed from A. Belyi’s third symphony, “Return,” where [Belyi] describes a marble pool of one of Moscow’s bathhouses, decorated with cast-iron images of sea dwelling creatures.”

264 Belyi, Simfonii, 220-1. “The common bathhouses were luxurious. Naked, preoccupied people, covered with soap and in the strangest of positions, sat on marble benches. A grey-haired elderly man doused himself from a silver tub. A frenzied bathhouse attendant rubbed the head of a young skeleton. In the neighboring section was a marble pool, decorated with cast-iron images of sea-dwelling creatures. An emerald-green agitation did not cease in the cool pool, where the waves were ignited with rubies. The elderly man was teaching his son to dive into the pool. With arms outstretched he dove into the waves, creating a ruby whirlpool with his entry; red, luminescent rings fled from his body and broke apart against the marble embankments. Khandrikov finished washing in the bathhouse. He stood under the shower, and warm streams poured out over him, flowing down his body like drops of liquid pearl. Khandrikov thought: Other Khandrikovs have washed in exactly this way in the bathhouse. Every Khandrikov, disseminated in space and periodically showing up in time, washes in exactly the same way.”
metaphysical level. That same image finds expression in the empirical, everyday scenes from “Return” when the elderly man in the bathhouse teaches his son to dive into the “Roman pool” at “Sanduny.”

Within the context of “Return,” the “Roman pool” and shower scene from “Sanduny” is an example of the two worlds from which Belyi creates a framework for his artistic expression of eternal return. The eternal world for Belyi is harmonious and whole; the world of time is chaotic and fragmented. This theme of two worlds drew considerable attention:

Тема двоемирия и символической связи двух планов мирового единства нашла в “Возврате” чрезвычайно яркое и последовательное художественное отображение. Брюсов, рецензировавший “Возврат”, расценил это произведение как наиболее совершенный и внутренне законченный опыт “симфонического” творчества Андрея Белого, покачнувшего “недвижную основу трехмерного пространства” и приоткрывшего “второй план вселенной.”

“Sanduny” for Belyi becomes one of those places that reflects an eternal reality in temporal form.

The “Roman pool” in Master and Margarita reveals Bulgakov’s poetics of realia and citation at work: he relies on both the “real” “Sanduny” and Belyi’s description of it in “Vozvrat.” Both Bulgakov and Belyi describe luxurious bathhouses: silver accoutrements, marble, jade, rubies, pearl. Both authors reflect the luxurious reality of “Sanduny” as well as the folkloric and Symbolist commonplace of using jewels and precious metals to symbolize

---


266 Lavrov, “U istokov tvorchestva Andreia Belogo,” 27. “The theme of two worlds and the symbolic link between two schemas of world unity found in “Return” an exceptionally bright and consequential artistic reflection. Briusov, who reviewed “Return,” judged this work to be the most complete and intrinsically finished attempt of Andrei Belyi’s creative attempts to write ‘Symphonies.’ [Belyi] had shaken the ‘immovable foundation of three dimensional space’ and discovered a ‘second order of the universe.’”
otherworldliness. Belyi describes one skinny bather at the “Roman pool” as a skeleton; all of Woland’s guests arrive in skeleton form in Bulgakov’s novel. Belyi describes the image of bodies entering the water and swimming among the bubbles their entry creates; Bulgakov describes the shimmering bodies of women swimming beneath the surface of bubbling champagne after diving. Both describe showers of precious material: pearl (Khandrikov), blood and rose oil (Margarita).

Furthermore, Khandrikov’s metaphysical musings during his shower reflect the reality of Margarita’s own experience. Khandrikov ponders that “every Khandrikov, disseminated in space and periodically showing up in time, washes in exactly the same way” as he is washing just then (Все Хандриковы, посеянные в пространстве и периодически возникающие во времени, одинаково моются).267 Margarita learns that every year a Margarita somewhere in the world serves as the Queen of Woland’s ball. Not only does she learn of other Margaritas disseminated in space, but of their common activity outside of time, since Woland’s ball takes place at the liminal hour of midnight, extended indefinitely. Ultimately Margarita’s otherworldly bathhouse experience, unlike Khandrikov’s, leads her to escape time and space, to arrive at Eternal Peace and Refuge, in a timelessness that inversely parallels the concept of Eternal Return so important to Belyi’s “Vozvrat.”

The bathhouse imagery at Woland’s Spring Ball of the Full Moon reveals a rich combination of a poetics of citations and realia. Each new text about “Sanduny” builds on its predecessors, reflecting the new meanings that accrue to a place as historical events wash over and around it. Additionally, this analysis accentuates the meaning of “Sanduny” for Moscow.

267 Belyi, Simfonii, 220-1.
“Sanduny” is a locus, but its significance derives from its location within the topos of Moscow. Conversely, “Sanduny” is a locus that defines the topos of which it is a part, providing rich semiotic potential for interpreting the myths of Moscow, including “Moscow--Third Rome.” There is no Moscow without bathhouses, but neither is there a “Sanduny” without Moscow.

The “Roman Pool” and the Art of Layering Spaces in Soviet Moscow

When creating the Spring Ball of the Full Moon, Bulgakov built on the concept of otherworldliness that Pushkin and Belyi created in their versions of “Sanduny.” Woland’s Ball is otherworldly, but in a way that connects it to the other “worlds” of the novel, and, as in Belyi’s novel, the primary parallelism resides in the “Roman pool.” Just as the “Roman pool” at “Sanduny” reflects the otherworldly cliff and ocean in Belyi’s “Return,” in Master and Margarita the “Roman pool” links the Ball to the novel’s other “worlds.” In particular, Bulgakov’s “Roman pool” has implications for both Moscow and Iershalaim spaces, namely, Patriarch’s Ponds, Herod’s Palace, and Bulgakov’s sketches of “Imagined Iershalaim” (Воображаемый Ершалаим).

Woland’s decision to host his annual Spring Ball of the Full Moon in Moscow explains the “local flavor” of Moscow spatial themes like Spaso House and “Sanduny” that dominate the festivities. These references lead the reader out of the text to historical places in the city, but the images may also lead the reader to other places within the novel, in Master and Margarita itself. The “Roman pool” is not the only image that functions in this way. In his classic article, “Observations on the motif structure of M.A. Bulgakov’s novel Master and Margarita,” Boris Gasparov discusses many superficial similarities between details of character, space, plot, and
theme that link Moscow, Iershalaim, and the Spring Ball of the Full Moon chapters. The basic structure of the “Roman pool,” with its open center and colonnade around the edges, finds a reflection in the ballroom as already discussed, but also in Patriarch’s Ponds.

Patriarch’s Ponds, described in detail in the novel, is surrounded on all four sides by a colonnade of linden trees, whose branches form a sort of portico over the walkways that extend along each side of the square pond. Additionally, the buildings that surround the area are continuous, forming a walled enclosure that Bulgakov described the very first time he wrote about it in the third redaction: “Тут он [Woland] окинул взглядом дома, окаймляющие пруды, и видно стало, что, во-первых, он видит это место впервые, а во-вторых, что оно его заинтересовало. Часть окон в верхних этажах пылала ослепительным пожаром, а в нижних тем временем окна погружались в тихую предвечернюю темноту” (83). This description remains relatively constant throughout numerous revisions and speaks to the strength of the original impression the shape of Patriarch’s Ponds made on Bulgakov. And so it turns out that Patriarch’s Ponds, the “Roman pool,” and the Ballroom with the mirror-like floor all share the same basic “floor plan,” illustrated below (the bold square represents the outer wall, circles represent columns, the inner square represents pool, mirror-like floor, pond):

---

268 “Here [Woland] glanced around at the buildings that surrounded the ponds and it became apparent that, for starters, he was seeing this place for the first time and, second, that it interested him. Part of the windows in the upper floors burned with a blinding fire, while the lower windows, by that time, had submerged into a quiet, early-evening darkness.”
At Patriarch’s Ponds everything happens on the edges of the “floor plan.” Woland converses with Bezdomnyi and Berlioz and predicts Berlioz’s death, and the streetcar beheads Berlioz all in between the linden tree “portico” and the “wall” of buildings that surround the square. At the Spring Ball of the Full Moon, the action moves to the center: bathers move between pool and colonnade, depending on the type of alcohol with which the pool is filled, dancers cover the floor of the ballroom. In the final scene of the Ball, Woland occupies the center of the area on the mirror-like ballroom floor and the spectators watch from behind the columns.

The similarity of these spaces begs interpretation. In one sense, the similarity is just one more detail that links the themes, characters, and events of the Spring Ball of the Full Moon to what takes place at Patriarch’s Ponds. In another sense, the location of parallel events in different parts of the “floor plan” highlights their difference in importance. At Patriarch’s Ponds Woland acts indirectly and ambiguously and at times feigns indifference to the conversation and events that happen around him. The plot unfolds on the periphery of the “floor plan,” between the pond and the buildings that surround the square. Indeed the whole scene seems tangential to Woland’s stated goal of coming to Moscow. In the opening Moscow chapters set at Patriarch’s Ponds, everything is peripheral, represented in the figure below.
The situation changes however, at the Spring Ball of the Full Moon. Bulgakov returns to the events that take place at Patriarch’s Ponds, but now reveals their metaphysical significance. Woland unveils the true meaning of his conversation with Ivan and Berlioz to Berlioz’s silent, suffering head, a direct reminder of his violent death by streetcar. Another murder takes place, this one directly ordered by Woland himself, unlike the idiosyncratic way in which he predicts Berlioz’s untimely accident. Woland’s true purpose and authority, only hinted at in the opening chapters, is revealed and fully manifested in the center of the ballroom at the Spring Ball of the Full Moon, spatially represented below.
Given the quantity of images, leitmotifs and details that connect Moscow, the Spring Ball of the Full Moon and Iershalaim, it would only be logical to look for a similar “floor plan” in the Iershalaim narrative, once its significance for both Patriarch’s Ponds and the Ball is discovered. In a notebook from 1938-39 Bulgakov drew two separate sketches based on his research of Jerusalem and his own “imagined” model of the holy city for Master and Margarita. One roughly corresponds to the northern half of Jerusalem during the Second Temple Period and the other corresponds to the southern half.

Bulgakov’s sketch of the northern part of Jerusalem, entitled “Imagined Iershaim” (courtesy of NIOR RGB 562.8.1. “Materialy k 6-oi i 7-oi redaktsiiam,” 55).
These sketches illustrate Bulgakov’s interest in the location of two different pools or “ponds” (the Russian word Bulgakov uses is пруд, meaning pond, the same word used in the title, “Patriarch’s Ponds”): the Bethesda Pool and Solomon’s Pool (another name for the Siloam Pool). The drawings are relatively simplistic. Virtually everything that Bulgakov labeled in these sketches appears by name in the last redaction of the novel with the exception of the Bethesda Pool, Hasmonean Palace, and the Xystus. Concerning the pools, perhaps his interest lay in the theme of healing with which both pools are associated in the Gospels, a theme prominently reflected in Ieshua’s healing of Pilate’s migraine. Their similarity in name to Patriarch’s Ponds,

---

269 Regarding the Hasmonean Palace and the Xystus, Bulgakov could have used them as the location for Herod’s Palace and the Ifostroton from which Pilate sentences Ieshua. There is historical conjecture that it was actually in this palace that Pilate sentenced Jesus, and the Xystus best fits Bulgakov’s description of the setting where Pilate delivers his dreaded announcement. While they do not appear by name in the novel, it is easy to explain their presence on Bulgakov’s sketch.
however, and their similarity in cultural function to the Russian bathhouse suggests that further research might be productive.270

While we will never actually know the reason Bulgakov included the Bethesda Pool in his sketch but not in the novel, reconstructions of its physical dimensions curiously reflect the “floor plan” of the “Roman Pool” at “Sanduny” and Patriarch’s Ponds as outlined in this chapter. In *The Final Days of Jesus*, author Shimon Gibson includes a detailed drawing of the Bethesda Pool.271 The drawing shows how the Bethesda Pool actually consisted of two pools, one for *miqwa’ot*, the Jewish ritual bath in preparation for entrance to the holy city, and one for retaining water so that the water in the bathing pool could be replenished with ritually clean water at required intervals. Both pools are approximately the same size, both are surrounded by a colonnade on all four sides and share one colonnade in the middle, thus reflecting the biblical description of Bethesda, which specifies five porticoes (John 5:2). Below is my version of Gibson’s reconstruction.

270 Both pools were used for the required ritual bathing (*miqwa’ot*) required of Jews upon entering the Holy City. Historically there has been considerable debate about their actual function. In the first century there were several reservoirs of water in Jerusalem. Bethesda and Siloam, however, appear to have been specifically set aside for ritual cleansing (*miqwa’ot*). “The Siloam and Bethesda Pools were situated on the south and north sides of the Temple Mount, respectively, so they might provide a service for Jewish pilgrims arriving in Jerusalem from different directions. Both pools ... were associated with Jesus’s healing activities. The Siloam Pool is already mentioned in the sources as a pool adjacent to the city fortifications in Nehemiah’s day. It is referred to as “Solomon’s Pool” in Josephus....” Shimon Gibson, *The Final Days of Jesus: The Archaeological Evidence* (New York, NY: Harper Collins, 2009), 71. In the 1930s there was much less clarity about the actual location and function of these pools, as indicated in several of Bulgakov’s sources for *Iershalaim*, Farrar *The Life of Christ* and Fonvizin’s travel notes. Farrar suggests that perhaps Bethesda was near Solomon’s Pool and Fonvizin references the excavations that were taking place during his visit in the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

Bulgakov obviously searched out similar spaces to include in his depiction of Iershalaim.

In fact, the layout of Herod’s Palace seems to follow a very similar “floor plan,” with the buildings separated by a large courtyard surrounded by colonnades. Bulgakov repeatedly describes Roman columns and colonnades, adding in more detail with each redaction: the balcony and garden in which Pilate talks with Ieshua and Kaifa include colonnades (267, 272, 293, 295, 298, 375, 379, 382, 656, 657, 663, 667, 668, 670), the dais from which Pilate addresses the crowd is surrounded by Roman soldiers and the scene is reminiscent of the scene in which Margarita observes Woland send Berlioz to nonexistence and Maigel’ to death (385, 388, 671).

Bulgakov was looking for places in Iershalaim surrounded by columns; he likely envisioned pools with porticoes, intended for ritual bathing and built in Jerusalem during the Roman occupation, as reflections of this basic architectural “floor plan.”
Bulgakov connects Iershalaim to Woland’s Ball through several parallel plot events and images: numerous columns, fountains, sentencing to death of Berlioz and Maigel’ in a space similar to the one where Pilate pronounces Ieshua’s sentencing, rose oil, walls of roses, swallow images, parodic images of the Eucharist. In the fourth redaction Pilate feels like everything smells of rose oil, described in the same language as the stream of rose oil in which Margarita bathes: “... к запаху дыма примешивается поганая розовая струя” (267). The sixth redaction continues the image, “...проклятая розовая струя” (375); “...к горковатому дыму, свидетельствовавшему о том, что в манипулах кашевары начали готовить обед, примешивался все тот же жирный розовый дух” (375-6).272

This sixth redaction of the novel contains more elements that recall the structure and architecture of Woland’s Ball, like the fountain near Pilate’s chair: “On the mosaic floor by the fountain” (На мозаичном полу у фонтана) (376). This is the first time that the fountain is mentioned in connection to Pilate’s chair. In earlier redactions the chair appeared with no mention of the fountain. The sixth redaction also contains the image of a fountain, a swallow, a Roman colonnade, and a bronze statue in a niche:

Ласточка быстро влетела в колоннаду, стремительно порхнула под ту часть ее, что была прикрыта кровлей, сделала там круг. Стремительно пронеслась, чуть не задев острым крылом лица медной статуи в нише, укрылась за капитель колонны. Быть может, ей пришла мысль вить гнездо за капителю колонны. ... Ласточка фыркнула крыльями над самой головой игемона, метнулась к чаше фонтана и вылетела на волю. Прокуратор

272 “... a foul waft of rose oil mixed with the smell of smoke.” “... a cursed waft of rose oil.” “The same greasy smell of rose oil mixed with an acrid smoke, which testified to the fact that in the Roman legion the cooks had started to prepare lunch.”
These images create the leitmotif structure that links Jerusalem and the Ball. The pillar of dust, a folkloric commonplace for the presence of the devil, also hints at the presence of the demonic at the time of Ieshua’s sentencing in the middle of a balcony surrounded by columns. After the execution scene, the beginning of the third Jerusalem chapter opens with visions of the temple, Herod’s palace, and then the colonnade in the garden with more rose imagery: “Вместе с водяной пылью на балкон под колонны забрасывало сорванные розы и листва, мелкие сучья деревьев и песок” (591). Rose imagery returns, linking the walls of roses and camellias at the Ball to the two walls of roses Bulgakov includes in the last redaction of Ieshua’s sentencing (671).

Finally, Pilate also sits under a colonnade, drinks wine (some of which has spilled on the ground from a broken pitcher, resembling a pool of blood, much like the one that would form from Baron Maigel’s wound) and eating bread: “Он сидел в том самом кресле, в котором вел утром допрос. Рядом с креслом стоял низкий стол и на нем кувшин с вином, чаша и блюдо с куском хлеба. У ног прокуратора простиралась неубранная красная, как бы кровавая, лужа и валялись осколки другого, разбитого кувшина” (sixth redaction, 591).

---

273 "The swallow quickly flew into the colonnade, flitted like a shot under the part of it that was covered by a roof and made a circle there. Like a shot it flew past, almost grazing the face of a bronze statue in a niche with its sharp wing, and hid in the capital of the column. It possibly occurred to the swallow to build a nest behind the capital of the column. ... The swallow skimmed the top of the hegemon’s head with its wings, darted up to the bowl of the fountain and flew out to freedom. The procurator raised his eyes up to the prisoner and saw that near him the dust had lit up in a pillar."

274 "Torn rose petals and leaves, small tree branches and sand lay strewn about together with the watery dust on the balcony under the columns."

275 “He sat in the very same chair in which he had conducted the interrogation that morning. Next to the chair was a low table and on it stood a pitcher of wine, a bowl, and a plate with a piece of bread. An untouched, red, almost blood-like puddle spread slowly at the procurator’s feet and shards of a different, broken pitcher lay scattered around.”
celebrates his own “communion,” inverting the Eucharist in a way similar to Woland: “Сидящий в грозовом полумраке прокуратор наливал вино в чашу, пил долгими глотками, иногда притрагивался к хлебу, крошил его, заедал вино маленькими кусочками” (591, see also the last redaction 862-3).276

Perhaps the most striking function of this parallel space is the parallel function it serves in connecting three of the novel’s most important plot developments: the executions of Berlioz, Baron Maigel’, and Ieshua. Pilate has his philosophical and religious conversation with Ieshua during the trial on a balcony surrounded by columns. Woland converses with Berlioz and Bezdomnyi at Patriarch’s Ponds, a spatial analogue for the basic “floor plan” of which Pilate’s balcony is a variant. Both of these conversations are a type of trial. Pilate sentences Ieshua from a variant of the “floor plan.” After Kaifa leaves the garden, Pilate looks out and sees the crowd. “Кроме того, он видел ослепительное сверканье доспехов в квадрате, окаймлявшем мраморный возвышенный остров — помост лифостротона. И на этот остров вышел Пилат, машинально сжимая в кулаке ненужную пряжку” (from the sixth redaction, 388).277 The crowd, pressed back behind the figurative columns formed by the soldiers in a square formation, creates an open space reminiscent of the ballroom at the Spring Ball of the Full Moon. Pilate is on an elevated dais, just like the ones reserved for Margarita and Woland during the second death of Berlioz and the murder of Maigel’.

276 “‘Sitting in the thunderous semi-darkness, the procurator poured the wine into the bowl, drank it in long swallows, occasionally touching the bread, crumbling it, and eating it in small pieces after a swallow of wine.’ Margarita also drinks blood-wine at Woland’s inversion of the ritual feast, which foreshadows the wine Azazello will give her and the Master to initiate their last flight to eternal peace, the same wine Pilate drinks, wine that turns everything the color of blood (914).

277 “Besides that, he saw the blinding sparkle of armor in a square, surrounding a raised marble island — the dais of the platform. And onto that island walked Pilate, mechanically squeezing the useless clasp in his fist.”
The “Roman pool” “floor plan” deserves a slot on the lengthy lists of details through which Bulgakov links Moscow, the Spring Ball of the Full Moon, and Iershalaim. The floor plan connects the “Roman pool” of “Sanduny,” the pool in which Behemoth turns champagne into cognac, the ballroom with the mirrored floor, Patriarch’s Ponds, the balcony and garden of Herod’s Palace, the dais from which Pilate announces the sentencing of Ieshua, and the Bethesda Pool, carefully and accurately marked on Bulgakov’s sketches of “Imagined Jerusalem.” The “Roman pool” is one more spatial piece to the leitmotif puzzle that creates one of the most innovative and characteristic aspects of Bulgakov’s poetics in Master and Margarita.

In the Bathhouse at Midnight

The Sandunov Bathhouses as a prototype for the Spring Ball of the Full Moon complicates the space of the Ball, enriching its interpretive potential. The traditionally liminal status of the bathhouse in Russian culture explains certain features of the “fifth dimension” in which the boundaries between this world and the other world grow thin and inhabitants of one world, like Baron Maigel’, unexpectedly fall into the world of the dead. Bulgakov painstakingly layers liminality at the Spring Ball of the Full Moon. It takes place at midnight, the “time between times,” but it also takes place in a space that is a threshold for numerous other spaces. The “Sanduny” are a liminal space not only because bathhouses are liminal, but also because the structure of “Sanduny” recalls the structure of other places: Patriarch’s Ponds and Iershalaim. It is a “portal” through which Bulgakov taps into other “worlds” of urban semiotic wealth.

Furthermore “Sanduny” accentuates the meaning of the most popularly acknowledged prototype for Woland’s Spring Ball of the Full Moon: Spaso House. Traditionally, the entries
from Elena Sergeevna’s diary, which make concrete connections between Woland’s Ball and the “Spring Ball” at Spaso House, have attracted critical attention. Perhaps because Elena Sergeevna so carefully reported on the nature of Spaso House as a prototype, other aspects of its meaning, the meaning it brings beyond a historically verifiable source for certain details, has gone largely unrecognized. Having recognized the mirroring of spaces that Bulgakov accomplishes with the basic “Roman pool” “floor plan,” one immediately notices the similarity of the architectural design at the Spaso House. The central ballroom in the ambassador’s residence also corresponds to the “Roman pool” “floor plan.” It is a square, surrounded by stylized columns topped with Romanesque capitals (see picture below).

The “ballroom” of Spaso House, the residence of the American ambassador (photo by Sidney Dement, special thanks to Ambassador John Beyrle and Jocelyn Green for permission to photograph the interiors of Spaso House and to David Odell for arranging the visit).

---

278 Sokolov, *Bulgakov: Entsiklopediia*, 139.
The overall design of the mansion itself relies on the same mirror-like qualities of “Sanduny” to create a space that deceives the viewer into believing it is actually much larger than it seems. From the outside the mansion is designed to look small and modest, while every detail of the interior works to the opposite effect, largely through the use of mirrors.

The semiotics of the Sandunov Bathhouses reinforces the idea that the ball Bulgakov attended in 1935 was indeed a very liminal space for him, and one about which he had no small degree of anxiety. In terms of elite, high culture, there are few spaces, if any, in Soviet society of the 1920s and 30s that could be more liminal than the new residence of the American ambassador to the Soviet Union and the Sandunov Bathhouses. Diplomatic relations between the two ideologically hostile countries were established only two years earlier in 1933; the Sandunov Bathhouses reminded every Soviet worker not only of their historical roots in Russian bathhouse lore, but of the luxury afforded by the elite of tsarist society.

**Conclusion**

The Sandunov Bathhouses remind us that Woland’s Moscow Spring Ball of the Full Moon makes full use of Moscow spaces that are maximally liminal and pregnant with the semiotics of dangerously ambivalent feeling, all the while continuing to invite the reader to draw parallel conclusions about the executions, parodic Eucharists, and plot developments that so frequently overlap in *Master and Margarita*. Uncovering one more set of *realia* and citations behind the Spring Ball of the Full Moon underscores the extensive spatial referentiality built into Woland’s Ball: the artists’ ball in Paris, the bathhouses of Rome, the Romanesque architecture of
first century Jerusalem, the Soviet consulate in New York described by Il’f and Petrov in *Odnoetazhnaia Amerika (One-storied America)* and its Muscovite analogue, Spaso House, and Moscow’s “Sanduny” provide multiple layers to create one fictional space. A bathhouse, of all places, would provide the best access to the “otherworld” of America, portrayed in demonic images during the 1930s. It is the type of space that most successfully collapses the boundaries between “embedded spaces” like American territory in the Soviet Union and Soviet territory in America. Bulgakov “layers” space to build the highly phantasmagorical setting for the climax of the novel’s plots in the topological spaces in which they unfold: Iershalaim, Phantasmagorical space, and Moscow.

---

### Appendix VI: Bathhouse Imagery in the Manuscripts of *Master and Margarita*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bathhouse Imagery: <em>Bania</em></th>
<th>Sixth Redaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Банная духота сменилась тотчас прохладой необъятного бального зала, окаймленного колоннами из какого-то желтоватого искрящегося самоцвета” (561). The “bannaia dukhota” is part of the tropical forest that first greets Margarita as she leaves the “vannaia.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“От хохота и крика звенело над колоннами, фракчики отскакивали от брызг, негры укутывали купальщиц в простыни” (571).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Redaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Но лес быстро кончился, и его банная духота тотчас сменилась прохладою бального зала с колоннами из какого-то желтоватого искрящегося камня” (834-835).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Хохот звенел под колоннами и гремел, как в бане” (841).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bathhouse Imagery: <em>Shower</em></th>
<th>Sixth Redaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Наташа ... пустила из душа горячую густую красную струю. Когда эта струя ударила и окутала Маргариту, как матерей, королева ощутила соленый вкус на губах и поняла, что ее моют кровью. Кровавая струя сменилась густой, прозрачной, розоватой, и голова пошла кругом у королевы от одуряющего запаха розового масла” (559-560).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Ворвался в ванную комнату какой-то поваренок-мулат, а за ним сделал попытку прорваться и Николай Иванович” (560).

“И из ванной Коровьев, Маргарита и Бегемот выбежали в темноту” (561).

“Оглушительный рев труб придавил Маргариту, а вырвавшийся из-под этого рева змейный взмыв скрипок потек по ее телу. ... Ни на мгновенье не прерывая музыки, оркестр стоя окатывал Маргариту, как волнами” (561).

“Они сбежали вниз по лестнице, юркнули в камни и оттуда какими-то окольными и темными путями проникли в ту самую ванную комнату, где Маргариту одевали для бала. -- О, как я устала! -- простонала Маргарита, налившись на скамейку. Но Гелла и Наташа опять повлекли ее под кровавый душ, тело ее размяли и размассажировали, и Маргарита ожила вновь” (570).

“Запомнились свечи и самоцветный какой-то бассейн. Когда Маргарита стала на дно этого бассейна, Гелла и помогающая ей Наташа окали Маргариту какой-то горячей, густой и красной жидкостью. Маргарита ощутила соленый вкус на губах и поняла, что ее моют кровью. Кровавая мантия сменилась другую -- густой, прозрачной, розоватой, и у Маргариты закружилась голова от розового масла. Потом Маргариту бросили на хрустальное ложе и до блеска стали растирать какими-то большими зелеными листьями” (834).
“Тут Маргарита в сопровождении Коровьева и Бегемота шагнула из бассейной в полную темноту” (834).

“На нее обрушился рев труб, а вырвавшийся из-под него взмыв скрипок окатил ее тело, как кровью. ... Ни на мгновенье не прерывая музыки, оркестр, стоя, окатывал Маргариту звуками” (835).

“Через секунду, не понимая, как это случилось, Маргарита оказалась в той же комнате с бассейном и там, сразу заплакав от боли в руке и ноге, повалилась прямо на пол. Но Гелла и Наташа, утешая ее, опять повлекли ее под кровавый душ, опять размяли ее тело, и Маргарита вновь ожила. ... И Маргарита вновь вылетела из комнаты с бассейном” (841).

“Понимала она только, что в освещенной свечами комнате, где ее готовили к балу, не то черного стекла, не то какого-то дымчатого камня ванна, вделанная в пол, выложенная самоцветами, и что в ванной стоит одуряющий запах цветов” (559).

“Из зала, где были шампанские фонтаны, Маргарита попала в чудовищных размеров бассейн, окаймленный колоннадой. Из пасти десятисаженного Нептуна хлестала широкая розовая струя. Одуряющий запах шампанского подымался из бассейна. Здесь царствовало бурное веселье. Дамы, хохоча, сбрасывали туфли,
отдавали сумочки своим фрачным кавалерам или неграм, мечущимся с нагретыми простынями меж колонн, и ласточкой бросались в воду. Столбы игристого вина взметывало вверх. Хрустальное дно бассейна горело светом, свет пронизывал толщу вина, в котором ныряли, как рыбки в аквариуме, дамы” (571).

“Они выскакивали из воды, держась за золотые поручни, хохоча и шатаясь, совершённые пьяные. От хохота и крика звенело над колоннами, фрачники отскакивали от брызг; негры укутывали купальщиц в простыни, и, не будучи в силах перекрыть звянящий в колоннах крик, лягушки со своими саксофонами, сидящие на плечах Нептуна, бешено играли фокстрот” (571).

“В честь Маргариты шесть дам выстроились в ряд и под звуки лягушачьего марша вскочили на плечи своим кавалерам и с них взвились в воздух, а оттуда головами вниз в бассейн. Маргарита видела, как их сверкающие тела разлетелись под водой, как вспугнутая рыбья золотая стая” (571).

“... кот устроил и в бассейне номер, задержавший Маргариту со свитой. Резким пронзительным голосом он провыл предложение джентльменам искупаться и сделал какой-то повелительный жест неграм. Тотчас с шипеньем и грохотом волны взбушиваясь масса шампанского ушла из бассейна, а Нептун стал извергать не играющую, не пенящуюся волну темно-желтого цвета. Дамы с визгом и воплями “Коньяк!” кинулись от краев бассейна за колонны. Через несколько секунд бассейн был полон, и кот, перевернувшись
трижды в воздухе, обрушился в колыхающийся коньяк” (571).

**Last Redaction**

“Запомнились свечи и самоцветный какой-то бассейн. Когда Маргарита стала на дно этого бассейна, Гелла и помогающая ей Наташа окутили Маргариту какой-то горячей, густой и красной жидкостью. Маргарита ощутила соленый вкус на губах и поняла, что ее моют кровью. Кровавая мантия сменилась другою -- густой, прозрачной, розоватой, и у Маргариты закружилась голова от розового масла. Потом Маргариту бросили на хрустальное ложе и до блеска стали растирать какими-то большими зелеными листьями” (834).

“Потом [after the ballroom with the mirror floor] Маргарита оказалась в чудовищном по размерам бассейне, окаймленном колоннадой. Гигантский черный Нептун выбрасывал из пасти широкую розовую струю. Одуряющий запах шампанского подымался из бассейна. Здесь господствовало непринужденное веселье. Дамы, смеясь, сбрасывали туфли, отдавали сумочки своим кавалерам или неграм, бегающим с простынями в руках, и с криком ласточкой бросались в бассейн. Пенные столбы взбрасывало вверх. Хрустальное дно бассейна горело нижним светом, пробивавшим толщу вина, и в нем видны были серебристые плавающие тела. Выскакивали из бассейна совершенно пьяными. Хохот звенел под колоннами и гремел, как в бане” (841).

“... кот устроил и в бассейне номер, задержавший Маргариту. Бегемот наколдовал чего-то у пасти Нептуна, и тотчас с шипением и
грохотом волнующаяся масса шампанского ушла из бассейна, а Нептун стал извергать неиграющую, непенящуюся волну темно-желтого цвета. Дамы с визгом и воплем: -- Коньяк! -- кунались от краев бассейна за колонны. Через несколько секунд бассейн был полон, и кот, трижды перевернувшись в воздухе, обрушился в кольчающийся коньяк” (842).

Вонзившись в стену зала, Маргарита ловкостью и чистотой движения, стеною, вертятся в одном направлении, шли, угрожая смести все со своего пути. ... Атласные живые бабочки ныряли над танцующими полчищами, с потолков сыпался цветочный дождь. То погасали прожектора, и тогда на капителях колонн загорались мириады светляков, а в воздухе плыли болотные огни” (570).

“[Маргарита] вернулась в танцевальный зал. ... Пары распались, и гости выстроились в две шеренги, и шеренги эти стали бесконечны, потому что выстроилась гости и в зале с шампанскими фонтанами” (573).
Какой-то шорох, как бы крыльев по стенам, доносился теперь сзади из зала, и было понятно, что там танцуют неслыханные полчища гостей, и Маргарите казалось, что даже массивные мраморные, мозаичные и хрустальные полы в этом диковинном зале ритмично пульсируют” (840).

“На зеркальном полу несчитанное количество пар, словно слившись, поражая ловкостью и чистотой движений, вертаясь в одном направлении, стеною шло, ургожая все смести на своем пути. Живые атласные бабочки ныряли над танцующими полчищами, с потолков сыпались цветы. В капителях колонн, когда погасало электричество, загорались мириады светляков, а в воздухе плыли болотные огни” (841).

“Она в сопровождении Коровьева опять оказалась в бальном зале, но теперь в нем не танцевали, и гости несметной толпой теснились между колоннами, оставив свободной середину зала” (842). Woland performs the inversion of the Eucharist above the mirrored floor.

“Между стенами [of roses and Japanese camellias] уже били, шипя, фонтаны, и шампанское вскипало пузырями в трех бассейнах, из которых первый был прозрачный фиолетовый, второй -- рубиново-красный, третий -- хрустальный” (561).
“Сзади били и шипели струи; покосившись, Маргарита увидела, что и там шампанский буфет. Из бледно-розовой стены шампанское лилось по трем трубкам в ледяной бассейн. ... Осмотревшись, Маргарита почувствовала теплое и мохнатое у левой ноги. Это был Бегемот” (562-563).

**Last Redaction**

“Между этими стенами уже были, шипя, фонтаны, и шампанское вскипало пузырями в трех бассейнах, из которых был первый -- прозрачно-фиолетовый, второй -- рубиновый, третий -- хрустальный” (835).

“В спину веяло холодом. Оглянувшись, Маргарита увида, что из мраморной стены сзади нее бьет шипящее вино и стекает в ледяной бассейн. У левой ноги она чувствовала что-то теплое и мохнатое. Это был Бегемот” (836).

---

**Bathhouse Imagery: Roses**

**Sixth Redaction**

“Наташа припала к ногам и, пока Маргарита тянула из чашечки густой, как сироп, кофе, надела ей на обе ноги туфли, сшитые тут же кем-то из лепестков бледной розы” (560).

“В следующем зале не было видно колонн. Их закрывала стена из роз, красных, как венозная кровь, розовых, молочно-белых, [которая] возникла на левой руке, а на правой -- стена японских махровых камелий” (561).
“Из бледно-розовой стены шампанское лилось по трем трубкам в ледяной бассейн” (562-563).

### Last Redaction

“Маргарита не помнит, кто сшил ей из лепестков бледной розы туфли и как эти туфли сами собой застегнулись золотыми пряжками” (834).

“В следующем зале не было колонн, вместо них стояли стены красных, розовых, молочно-белых роз с одной стороны, а с другой — стена японских махровых камелий” (835).

---

### Bathhouse Imagery: Precious Metals, Minerals, and Jewels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sixth Redaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Хрустальные столики были завалены зернами жареного миндаля” (562). “Лестница пылала белым заревом, потому что на стене по счету ступенек висели налитые электрическим светом виноградные гроздья. ... Под рукой левой у нее оказалась срезанная аметистовая колонка” (562). “Как в танцевальном зале одурял запах цветов, духов и драгоценных цветочных масел, здесь вертел голову запах шампанского, клокочущего в бассейнах” (570-571).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Redaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Теперь на этой площадке глаза слепили от света, льющегося из хрустальных виноградных гроздьев. Маргариту установили на место, и под левой рукой у нее оказалась низкая аметистовая колонка” (836).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Bathhouse Imagery: Bathhouse Accoutrements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sixth Redaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“После крови и масла тело Маргариты стало розоватым, блестящим,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
и еще до большего блеска ее натирали раскраневшиеся [женщины] мохнатыми полотенцами. Особенно усердствовал кот с мохнатым полотенцем в руке” (560).

“В этом зале [with the walls of roses and camellias, fountains and pools] метались негры в алых повязках, с серебряными черпаками, наливая из бассейнов опаловые чаши” (562).

**Last Redaction**

“Потом Маргариту бросили на хрустальное ложе и до блеска стали растирать какими-то большими зелеными листьями” (834).

“Возле них [the three fountains] метались негры в алых повязках, серебряными черпаками наполняя из бассейнов плоские чаши” (835).
Chapter 5
Conclusions

From Moscow Text to Textual Dimensions of Moscow Space

This dissertation developed out of an early and abiding interest in intertextuality. For years one of my primary interests in a literary text has always been the myriad aspects of its referentiality (citation in its broadest sense: text within text, epigraph, quotation, allusion, imitation, parody, association, etc.). I began pursuing the uniquely intertextual aspects of Moscow as a setting well before I began the dissertation. Over the course of one year in graduate school I wrote term papers on Moscow in Lev Tolstoy’s *Voina i mir* (*War and Peace*), Mikhail Zagoskin’s *Moskva i moskvichi* (*Moscow and Muscovites*), Dmitrii Prigov’s collection of poetry also titled *Moskva i moskvichi* (*Moscow and Muscovites*), and Anton Chekhov’s short story “Pripadok” (“An Attack of Nerves”). In each of these papers I highlighted common tropes used to describe Moscow, historical themes of recurring interest, constant epithets that accrued over time as Moscow’s primary signifiers: “Mother Moscow” (матушка Москва), “regally-robed widow” (порфироносная вдова), and others.

To develop my theoretical foundation I read the literature produced by the Moscow-Tartu School of Semiotics, Iurii Lotman’s works in particular. I read and reread Vladimir Toporov’s works on the Petersburg Text and the literature inspired by that brilliant analysis; I also began collecting articles on the Moscow Text, particularly those that discussed its infamous non-existence. My theoretical breakthrough came from reading Toporov’s contemporary Moscow-Tartu semioticians on the Petersburg Text alongside Lotman’s works in general. Those authors gave me the theoretical framework to begin building my own approach to urban space in literature with confidence: framing my definition of text, citation, *realia*, locus, *topos*. After
several years of vacillating between Moscow as Text and Moscow as Myth, I finally gained a sufficiently sophisticated apparatus for positing the textuality of urban space.

At that point I transitioned to reading the literature on setting in *Master and Margarita*. Initially, I thought my contribution would come in the form of an explanation of how the novel’s “worlds” could each be read as unique hypostases of the Moscow Text, with the exception of the setting for “eternal peace,” granted to the Master and Margarita in the epilogue. That space, I reasoned, existed independently of Moscow’s semiosphere, the requisite distance to award the Master peace and deprive him of semiotic influence. Based on that hypothesis I ventured to Moscow to study the novel’s manuscripts, the photograph collections of Moscow’s major museums, and the text of the city itself. I intended to find evidence of citation in its literary form (in the manuscripts and other archival materials) and in the form of *realia* (in the photograph collections and those few urban environments that remain from Moscow of the 1920s and 30s).

In Moscow, my thesis about the novel’s “worlds” began to transform as I learned more about the details of setting in *Master and Margarita*. A major catalyst in that transformation came as I prepared to present my research to the Bulgakov Discussion Club hosted at the State Museum of M.A. Bulgakov in Apartment 50. The Club’s organizer, Aleksei Khegai, graciously invited me to present my research, which I did on March 23, 2010. The pressure to present my findings to this group of avid *Master and Margarita* readers crystallized my major discoveries about urban space in *Master and Margarita* for the first time. I initially wrote the presentation as a rough draft of a chapter about Moscow space, but, upon my return to the US in May, I realized that I had the entire dissertation in condensed form in that presentation. My focus changed from Moscow as a *topos* in Russian literature to the textual history of Moscow’s loci in *Master and Margarita*.
Margarita. This breakthrough helped me articulate one of the most vexing things about working on Moscow: its topological nature. Additionally, meeting with Tat’iana Tsiv’ian, a member of the original Moscow-Tartu school of Semiotics, reshaped my concept of what to do with the Moscow Text. My interest in proving its existence shifted towards being inspired by its concepts to develop a model for the textuality of urban space.

The way I marked space in Master and Margarita before and after these two events best illustrates this shift in my thinking. Before my interest in loci as setting I marked places in the text that referred to the totality of Moscow, passages that hinted at one of Moscow’s major mythologems: I marked the scene on Sparrow Hills, I researched the links between the ideologies of Moscow Third Rome and Moscow New Jerusalem, I looked for ways to distinguish phantasmagorical space from Moscow space. Distracted by these larger topoi I missed the fascinating functions of Moscow’s loci.

It was only during my preparation for the Discussion Club presentation that I began marking all the references to urban loci like Ivan’s “Chase” and Margarita’s “Flight.” I tabbed every possible instance of bathhouse imagery at the Spring Ball of the Full Moon; I analyzed the textual history of Margarita’s mansion, the Pushkin monument, Apartment 50, Sparrow Hills, Stravinsky’s clinic. The devil truly is in the details. This is the discovery that I wish I could go back and help myself make sooner. The most interesting things happen in the details of setting, not in the large sweeping statements. The Pushkin monument in 1937 is an infinitely more interesting setting than Moscow 1937 because it is more specific and because through it an author comments on the larger topos. Moscow in 1937 may tell us very little about the Pushkin monument. The Pushkin monument in 1937 tells an amazing story about Moscow in 1937. At
least in *Master and Margarita*, urban space functions from the inside out, the smaller unit defines and comments on the larger, the locus illustrates the *topos*. Having made that discovery, my dissertation ceased to be a daunting task; all that remained was to write it up.

**Contribution to the Study of Urban Space as Text and *Master and Margarita***

Two separate but related conversations transpire in the critical dialogue about city texts in Russian literature. The first has to do with the so-called Petersburg Text of Russian literature as defined by V.N. Toporov, of which his closest colleagues name him as the author (although Toporov himself wrote that the Petersburg Text was written by many authors).280 The Petersburg Text is Toporov’s own personal work, his own brilliant discovery of how Petersburg functions in Russian literature. It is a unique phenomenon, one that cannot be reproduced for other cities because Toporov has not composed it for other cities. He analyzed Petersburg, he categorized Petersburg, he counted the trees in Petersburg; he named the Petersburg Text of Russian literature and, by naming it, brought it into being. There is no Moscow Text of Russian literature within this conversation because there is no *author* of a Moscow Text.

The second conversation focuses on how cities function in textual ways in a culture and, as a subset of culture, literature. The phrase that Toporov coined, “Petersburg Text of Russian literature,” has inspired the imaginations of numerous scholars to consider other phenomena in Russian literature as “texts”: Moscow, Pushkin, Perm, Venice, etc. Toporov himself suggested this direction when he described the “Moscow-Petersburg comparative sub-text.”281 And yet

---


there is no one author for these other “texts.” There are anthologies of articles dedicated to them, two of the most well-known are Lotmanovskii sbornik II (Lotmanian Anthology II), and Moskva i “moskovskii tekst” russkoi kul’tury (Moscow and the “Moscow Text” of Russian Culture), and yet there is no author of the Moscow Text to parallel Toporov.282

The discoveries of this dissertation belong to the second conversation. I have not created a Moscow Text of Russian literature: I have neither defined nor codified it. I simply pointed out some possibilities in the application of theoretical models that juxtapose urban space to text in Russian literature; I suggested solutions to a few inconsistencies and created a model for analyzing urban space as a text in Russian literature and demonstrated the utility of such a hermeneutic tool. Toporov composed a “super-text” (сверхтекст); I have refined a theoretical model. Toporov’s work is fundamentally creative; mine is fundamentally analytical.

My theory of the textuality of urban space relies on the concept of citation as a basic function of textuality. I draw on Toporov’s idea of theoretically pairing city with text, but I take more from some of his colleagues in the Moscow-Tartu school of semiotics. I focus on the “combination of a poetics of realia and a poetics of citations.”283 I also deconstruct the idea of a strict canon as it relates to text, an idea already nascent in the article about the Petersburg Text in which Mints, Danilevskii, and Bezrodnyi break the canon down into a “core,” “core of the core,” and “periphery.” Citation may manifest itself in one of two primary categories: a citation of realia (a type of text) and a citation of another text. The combination of these two categories, more than the creation of a canon of literary works, defines the textual dimensions of Moscow.


Urban space in Moscow is textual in that it is composed of smaller units of meaning (signs) that merge into a structured whole (text), related loci within one *topos*: built (architecture, monuments, etc.), natural (parks, trees, rivers, etc.), verbal (street names, posters, songs etc.), and human (the crowd, passersby, etc.) environments of one city. The city takes on another dimension of existence in literature, where its each new literary incarnations builds on its predecessors.

The true significance of this tool is that it led to discoveries that shed light on a different body of theoretical literature: the study of urban space in M.A. Bulgakov’s *Master and Margarita*. To date, the study of setting in this major novel has been limited to two major approaches: 1) the implicit connection between Moscow and Iershalaim in the novel and the significance of this connection for interpreting the novel’s characters and themes; and 2) the study of biographical connections between the Moscow of the novel and the Moscow in which Bulgakov lived. This dissertation contributes to both of these approaches to urban space in *Master and Margarita*. It builds on the work of scholars like Boris Miagkov to discover still more layers of significance in Bulgakov’s use of Muscovite spatial prototypes. Additionally, it uncovers another textual layer of connections between the major settings of the novel: Moscow, Iershalaim, and phantasmagorical space. For example, the implicit theme of the “persecuted artist/poet” introduced at the Pushkin monument brings Iershalaim space into Moscow since Ieshua is also persecuted for his dissent from the prevailing ideology; in the context of Bulgakov’s novel, Opekushin’s statue is as much a monument to Ieshua as it is to Pushkin. Similarly, the architecture of the Sandunov’s “Roman Pool” doubles that of Iershalaim.
Individually these discoveries contribute each on their own to a more subtle understanding of the complex setting for the characters, events, and themes of *Master and Margarita*. When considered as a whole, however, these discoveries reveal a picture of Bulgakov’s poetics of space on a broader scale; they reveal what meaning he attributed to setting, what types of meaning he relied on space to express, what sort of detail he labored to include in spatial imagery, and how he might have ranked the significance of setting among other basic structural components of the literary text (character, plot, style, narration, theme, setting). The only possible conclusion is that space, and specifically Moscow space, does a lot of work in *Master and Margarita*.

That conclusion draws us to answer yet another question, why does space have to do so much work? This can hardly be considered a personal quirk of Bulgakov’s style or a chance element of his poetics. Rather it must be another way of writing between the lines, a strategy of using aesopian language to communicate an important message to those who have ears to hear. Bulgakov’s novel sustains an important conversation about power and freedom among the Soviet intelligentsia. In each of the three Moscow spaces discussed in this dissertation, Bulgakov uses a Moscow that is being rewritten by militant Marxist-Leninism to present arguments against and satirize that same ideology. In the Pushkin monument, Bulgakov relies on all the meanings inherent in the Pushkin monument to undo the propaganda of the day, to turn it on its head and reveal its dangerous inadequacy. In Margarita’s mansion, Bulgakov relies on a very old semiotic aspect of Moscow’s Arbat region, “labyrinthine Moscow,” to reveal the labyrinth of Soviet life through which Ivan and Margarita must find their way, a labyrinth with life and death consequences. Finally, Bulgakov relies on Russia’s elite cultural tradition of visiting the
Sandunov Bathhouses for part of the setting of the Spring Ball of the Full Moon, emphasizing the continuity of the timeless folkloric tradition of the bathhouse as a deeply ambivalent locus of the supernatural. “Sanduny,” along with Spaso House, provide convincing evidence that Moscow is not really a museum of communism in the way propaganda would have it be, nor will the true Moscow ever be. As an heir to an intelligentsia culture faced with destruction, Bulgakov uses the potent textual dimensions of Moscow urban space to record the struggle between the artist and humanist and those in power (власть) to define the limits of artistic and personal freedom (волю).

My discoveries about Master and Margarita are not limited to the novel, however. They also reveal an important feature of Moscow as a topos with a unique relationship to its various loci. If the genius loci of the youthful Petersburg is the Bronze Horseman, then ancient Moscow has a number of loci, each one reflecting a unique narrative -- separate, but semantically connected.

Various scholars have responded to this phenomenon in different ways, but the stimulus remains the same. Mednis describes this phenomena in terms of Moscow’s mythology, connected to individual points in the city like Lefortovo, but concludes that it fails to characterize the city as a topos in the same way that Petersburg’s loci do.284 Levkievskia describes three main bundles of function in Orthodox urban folklore, bundles that correspond to Moscow as “Third Rome,” “Kitezh,” and “Second Babylon.” Each city she names tells a story about a certain part of Moscow’s textuality in Orthodox urban folklore, but each is very related to the other two: each tells the tale of Moscow as a sacred center.285 The three loci of my dissertation function in a

similar way: they seem diverse on the surface, but they each reveal a similar function in the way that they relate to the meaning of Moscow as topos. In each case Bulgakov uses the inherent dvulikost’ (duality) of Moscow’s urban space to participate in a conversation about freedom and power.

Each of the three loci in this dissertation work in their own way to emphasize the dvulikost’ of Moscow in the 1920s and 1930s. Stalin may have been “rewriting” Moscow to modernize it and to reflect the values of militant dialectical materialism, but at the same time Bulgakov used the very same Moscow space to subvert Stalin’s rewriting of Moscow. Bulgakov creates the monument to Pushkin, long a locus of conflict between the intelligentsia and political authority (власть), to champion the poet’s freedom (воля). Margarita’s mansion emphasizes “labyrinthine Moscow” (московская путаница), which includes a semiotic doubling of ecclesiastical and demonic place names, Moscow’s dvulikost’, creating a uniquely Muscovite deceptive space. This ambivalence works against Stalinist Moscow: the mansion is Margarita’s cage, a place she detests and leaves with great happiness, first for the Master’s basement apartment, and finally forever. And yet for Ivan this same space, hated by Margarita, becomes a beacon of strangely ambivalent hope: a symbol of something greater than his normal, Soviet existence deprived of artistic truth. Finally, the Sandunov Bathhouses at the Spring Ball of the Full Moon also reflect Moscow’s dvulikost’. In Soviet Moscow, “Sanduny” still exist with all of their combined heritage of the cultural elitism of the Russian greats and the supernatural, demonic side of Russian bathhouse folklore. The Soviets may be atheists, but the bathhouse, with its ancient, traditional associations, is still a place where supernatural beings drink to their own existence, where “unclean forces” still hold sway.
These three spaces also demonstrate one of the fundamental features of Moscow’s
textuality. They each express a topological relationship to the topos of Moscow. This is perhaps
one of my most important discoveries about Moscow space: that it is uniquely topological. In its
simplest form, a topological space is an empty set opposed to a set in which all of its subsets
intersect. Lotman uses this concept to describe the spatial modeling of culture, in particular with
regard to plot (сюжет).[^286] This concept also neatly describes the way in which Moscow’s loci
relate to its topos. Each one of the loci analyzed in this dissertation intersect within a topological
framework, where Moscow is composed of a series of intersecting subsets and not-Moscow is
the open set.

One corollary of the assertion that Moscow is a topological space is how each locus
relates to the larger topos. The monument to Pushkin is a non-fictional spatial referent depicted
literally in a literary setting. It exists in one-to-one correspondence with its “real” referent. The
monument to Pushkin demonstrates how an author can create a literary setting that corresponds
directly to a city’s built, natural, verbal, and human environments in order to develop a major
theme (in Bulgakov’s case, the theme of the persecuted poet). This type of one-to-one
relationship implies not only that the monument is between Strastnoi Monastery and Tverskoi
bul’var, but that Tverskoi bul’var and Strastnoi Monastery exist on Moscow’s Boulevard Ring
(бульварное кольцо), which exists within the Garden Ring (садовое кольцо), with the Kremlin
at the very center.

The locus of Margarita’s mansion overlaps with the monument to Pushkin since by
implication of the literal depiction of the monument, the mansion also must exist in “real”

Moscow, and yet it does not. The building itself, unlike Pushkin’s monument, reflects a real semiotic principle of Moscow space, but there is no one-to-one correspondence between the mansion and Moscow space. The textual dimensions of the Arbat’s “labyrinthine Moscow” reveal how an author can use a semiotic principle of a city’s environments to enhance the characterizations of his heroes and heroines. In this way the mysterious locus of Margarita’s mansion intersects with the locus of the monument, but does not completely overlap, although each conditions the other’s mode of literary existence. The mansion does not “exist” in “real” Moscow: it is one literary setting made of a semiotic principle that defines Moscow, and yet its presence in the same novel as the monument to Pushkin gives it a sense of really existing.

Finally, the Sandunov Bathhouses incorporate aspects of both of these circles within Moscow’s topological space: they exist in “real” Moscow in a very definite location, and yet in Master and Margarita Bulgakov combines their space with that of several other “real” spaces to create a phantasmagorical setting that is not “real.” Sandunov Bathhouses are a non-fictional spatial referent combined with other non-fictional spatial referents to make one unique, fictional setting. The textual dimensions of the Sandunov Bathhouses reveal how an author can layer several of a city’s spaces into one literary setting to enhance the plot’s impact on the reader. All three of these spaces work together to create Moscow, each depicting a different facet of Moscow’s story, but each reflecting the inner structure (внутренняя структура) of a text, as the intersections of subsets within a topological space affirm its identity in contrast to the open set.

One of the defining features of the study of Moscow space as a textual unit is that it breaks down into loci of semiotic bundles; a topological space. Mednis noticed this topological space and found in it proof for the non-existence of a Moscow text, a lack of “semantic
connectivity.” Levkievskaia noticed the same phenomenon and created a unifying semiotic structure for the folklore of Orthodox Moscow: Rome, Kitezh, Babylon, all intersecting subsets within Moscow’s topological space defined as sacred center.

Viewing Moscow as a topological space where diverse loci intersect to form the whole provides a model for Moscow’s textuality that has so repeatedly been denied. The following quote from Bocharov is one such authoritative comment on the subject. Bocharov attributes to the Petersburg Text a “dvulikost’” of a type that has never characterized Moscow.

Раздвоение национального центра и имело следствием внутреннюю двуликость нового центра. Такую двуликость, какая не отличала Москву никогда. И -- кстати, но не в последнюю очередь, -- надо сказать, что петербургский текст описан у В.Н. как явление единственное и исключительное в нашей культуре; хотя идея эта и возбудила охотников составлять подобные тексты -- московский прежде всего, но также сибирский, крымский и пр., -- автором твердо заявлено, что обширные материалы московской литературы особого московского текста как структурного целого той же конструктивной оформленности, напряженности, плотности -- такого московского текста не образуют.

I find myself agreeing with Bocharov, but only tangentially. The exact same dvulikost’ that defines Petersburg Text has never characterized Moscow, because Moscow’s dvulikost’ differs from Petersburg’s: it is deceptive spatially in different ways. Moscow’s narrative is not about man conquering nature, but about man conquering man: empire, propaganda, Christianity conquering paganism, Communism conquering Capitalism, Atheism conquering Christianity, the

287 Bocharov, “Peterburgskii tekst Vladimira Nikolaevicha Toporova,” 12. “The bifurcation of the national center also produced the consequence of an inner duality of the new center; a unique duality, of a type that has never characterized Moscow. And, as a not insignificant aside, it should be said that V[ladimir] N[ikolaevich] describes the Petersburg Text as unique and exclusive phenomenon in our culture; although this idea has inspired those who seek to create similar texts, the Moscow Text most of all, but also a Siberian Text, a Crimean Text, and others, the author [Toporov] has in no uncertain terms declared that the vast materials in Muscovite literature do not formulate a unique Moscow Text as a structural whole of the same constructive formulation, tension, and density.”
conqueror’s struggle to maintain power and the loser’s continual struggle for freedom. Such is the *dvulikost’* of Moscow, which makes it possible for the subverted to subvert the subverter: where a creative tension between past and present, power and freedom, is written into the very stones, facades, and interiors of Moscow space.

The point of my conversation with Toporov is not to prove him wrong on the Moscow Text: I am not disagreeing with him at all. The point is that he discovered the unique textuality of Petersburg in Russian literature. His discovery is one of a kind and impossible to repeat. That discovery inspired a tool, a theoretical model for studying urban space in literature, that helps us make other discoveries about texts themselves. My discoveries are also unique, but my hope is that they can be replicated in other works, applied to other types of settings. If Toporov composed a text, the Petersburg Text of Russian literature, then I have sought to develop a model for analyzing the textual dimensions of urban space.

And so to that ever so nagging question, “Does a Moscow Text of Russian literature exist?” I would respond with my own variant of Krylov’s variant of Aesop’s perennially popular fable of the Fox and the Raven. A fox walks through the forest and sees a raven in a tree with a piece of cheese in its mouth. The fox asks the raven, “Tell me, is there a Moscow Text of Russian literature?” The raven sits quietly, ignoring the question. The fox persists, and asks the raven twice more. The third time the raven can no longer withstand the fox’s hunger for the cheese and squawks out a raven-ish “Yes!” The fox satisfies its hunger while the raven’s hunger proverbially transforms into reflection: “Would things have turned out differently if I had only said no?”

In an attempt to learn from the raven, I must also refuse to answer the question of whether or not the Moscow Text of Russian literature exists. I suspect that question is more about
the cheese than anything else. The real question worth answering is not whether or not the Moscow Text of Russian literature exists, but whether analyzing Moscow space as text results in significant discoveries about Russian literature. That question demands only the visual proof of the cheese: do you have cheese, or not? I like to think the raven would not succumb to such an obvious trick when the best response would be to eat the cheese in front of the fox and then say, “Why no, I don’t have any cheese, but I can tell you where to find some.” My response to the question about the Moscow Text of Russian literature is to point to the discoveries made possible by a theoretical model for analyzing the textual dimensions of Moscow in Russian literature: Pushkin and the theme of the persecuted poet in *Master and Margarita*, Margarita’s mansion and the characterizations of Ivan and Margarita, the Sandunov Bathhouses as a prototype for the Spring Ball of the Full Moon.

**Further Research**

The results of this analysis suggest that analyzing Moscow space as text in literary works has the potential to facilitate significant discoveries about other “Moscow” works. The analysis of Moscow in Russian literature already boasts a significant secondary literature, but the intentional connection of a poetics of citation and a poetics of *realia* will reveal more dimensions of the interaction between a novel’s setting and its themes, characters, and plots. For example, the monument to Pushkin erected in Tat’iana Tolstaya’s post-modern masterpiece *Slynx* is one of the most important loci in that novel, one that comments significantly on the *topos* of Moscow, but also suggests significant literary connection to the Pushkin monument in *Master and Margarita*. The *realia* of Tolstaya’s post-Soviet Moscow also suggest a wealth of analytical
material for the Pushkin statue in Slynx and its second Opekushin. One of the primary goals of this sort of work is a shift towards how the loci in one novel interact with other texts and realia as opposed to fitting them into some sort of Moscow Text “canon” based on an analysis of Moscow as topos.

There are potential discoveries left to be made in Master and Margarita as well. The loci of Stravinsky’s clinic and Apartment 50 certainly deserve detailed analysis of the sort I have done in this dissertation, a project I plan to undertake as I develop this manuscript for publication as a monograph. In terms of both the study of Moscow as text and of Master and Margarita, I see my primary contribution as conceptual. I have provided a theoretical framework for analyzing urban space as text that can be adapted and adjusted to lead to more discoveries. My analyses of the Pushkin monument, Margarita’s mansion, and the Sandunov Bathhouses serve as proof of the utility of this model, not to prove that the Moscow Text exists, but that analyzing Moscow space as text can lead to new discoveries.
Bibliography


---. “Arkhhiv M.A. Bulgakova: Materialy dlia tvorcheskoi biografii pisatelia.” Zapiski otdela


Etkind, Aleksandr. “Posol i satana: Uiliam K. Bullit v bulgakovskoi Moskve.” In Eros


Florenskii, P.A. Mnimosti v geometrii. Moscow: Pomor’e, 1922.


---. “Ershalaim i ego okresnosti v romane Mikhaila Bulgakova Master i Margarita.” Rossiia i


Horowitz, Brian. “The Tension of Athens and Jerusalem in the Philosophy of Lev Shestov.”


Shingareva, Ekaterina Arkad’evna. Historian and archivist at MKhAT. Interview by Sidney Dement, at Muzei MKhAT, Moscow, Russia, May 6, 2010.


54-64.


[TsK VKP(b.)] O general’nom plane rekonstruktii g. Mosvky. Moscow: Partizdat TSK VKP(b), 1935.


Zabrovskii, A.P. “Osnovnye formy bytovaniia pushkinskoi traditsii v romane M.A. Bulgakova