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ABSTRACT

Vasilii Makarovich Shukshin was a well-known Soviet artistic figure, for he was a very popular actor and film director as well as a favorite author. My thesis is a study of the artistic genre in which Shukshin was most prolific - the story (rasskaz), but much of what is suggested is applicable to his work in other literary forms as well as to his work in the cinema arts.

Shukshin's personal artistic versatility greatly determined his distinctive prose which borders between literature and cinema. His stories are immediate; one senses the gestures and hears the speech of the characters. The 'cinematic' quality is an essential element of his style and story structure with its great concentration upon dialogue and other direct speech forms.

It is his hero that is Shukshin's biggest contribution to Soviet literature and it is the revelation of the Shukshin hero to the reader which is the essential reason for the story to exist. During the years of development and maturation as a writer, Shukshin proved that he was an expert of the social and psychological processes taking place within rural dwellers who are subjected to the constant influence of urban culture. Such heroes are restless people, dissatisfied with the banality of daily life. They speak of the spirit, of truth, and of the meaning
of life, but because they do not conform to the accepted social norms, they are regarded as 'chudiki', eccentrics.

In all of his artistic endeavors, Shukshin successfully creates his own characteristic and unique world which is an accurate and honest reality. The effective employment of dialogue, monologue and other speech forms enhances the impression of the reality of the world of the hero-eccentric. As well, these speech forms serve as vehicles for the gentle humour which is an important element in Shukshin's stories. This humour is skillfully blended with a tragic quality which results from the meeting of the imagined and concrete realities with which the hero must cope.

As Shukshin's hero-eccentric evolves, the moral position taken by the author becomes more clearly defined. Through his heroes Shukshin condemns and exposes those social phenomena which corrupt and cripple the human soul. The stories bear strong moral overtones, and the last ones, written before Shukshin's death in 1974, are quite obviously social satires which employ more biting irony and sarcasm than Shukshin had ever used in his literary work.

My thesis is comprised of an introduction, two main chapters, and a conclusion. In the INTRODUCTION, a brief biography of Shukshin's work in cinema and literature is presented with attention paid to his critical reception within the Soviet Union. CHAPTER ONE deals with two inseparable facets of Shukshin's art - his style and structure and their role in the manifestation of his unique hero. CHAPTER TWO
treats Shukshin's artistic means of expression as well as his refined use of four distinct forms of direct speech in the revelation of the hero - his ultimate objective. The CONCLUSION summarizes the discussion of the previous chapters in the consideration of the special pathos which exists in Shukshin's stories. It suggests as well, Shukshin's importance as a contemporary Soviet author whose ideas have the potential for a broad, more universal application.
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Vasilii Makarovich Shukshin, (1929-1974), is a somewhat unusual phenomenon in the world of contemporary Soviet art. A talented writer, Shukshin did not publish his first story until he was thirty years of age. Until this time, his energies had been centered upon cinematography in his capacity as director and actor. -Shukshin's untimely death in 1974 at the age of forty-five cut short his work at the height of its creative potential both in his literary and cinematographic careers. Among ordinary Soviet readers, and particularly Russians, Shukshin was a favorite writer and an extremely popular actor. At the same time, he was held in high regard by the Soviet literary critics and political authorities despite the often satirical intonations and themes which are important elements in his stories.

Shukshin's brief literary career was prolific; he produced one hundred and fifteen stories and novellas, many of which were published in six collections of stories, as well as two novels. His career in cinema, so inseparably linked to this literary one is evident even in a preliminary listing of Shukshin's work, for his cinema-scenes (kino-стsenki) and cinema-novellas (kino-пovesti), as well as one stageplay, were published in literary journals and widely read.  

Shukshin's work in literature and cinema sparked tremendous interest in critical circles and it was always a
source of controversy and debate. His death prompted a critical summing-up of his art, and suddenly Shukshin's literature was receiving overwhelming attention and significant acknowledgement from the literary system which had been so guarded in its approach to the works during Shukshin's life. Typical of the glowing praise which was directed at Shukshin's work is the following: "For some reason we were ashamed to apply to the best books of Shukshin the same standards we apply, let us say, to Leskov, Bunin, and even Chekhov. Only now, when Shukshin is not here with us, are we beginning to realize that the highest standards are appropriate and not beyond Vasilii Shukshin's power." In 1975, a two-volume collection of Shukshin's stories and novellas was published as well as Shukshin's sixth collection of stories. Two issues of the popular magazine, 'Roman-gazeta' were dedicated in their entirety to Shukshin's stories. This posthumous recognition culminated in the bestowing of the Lenin Prize, the highest state award in the Soviet Union, upon Shukshin's internationally-acclaimed film, 'Kalina Krasnaia'.

It is both interesting and necessary to speculate about the great attraction of Shukshin's creative work for readers and critics alike. Although his art is a combination of successful literary elements, I propose that his fundamental appeal is emotional. In his stories and films, Shukshin captures the specific pressures and irritations of modern Soviet life through visual, auditory, and situational scenes. These are generally prompted not so much by reason as by spontaneous
reactions, sympathies and antipathies. At a more extended, universal level, Shukshin effectively portrays the atomized existence of man living in urban, technological societies. His means of revealing and conveying these facets of modern life are based on his innate ability to blend the anguish of the situations with a gentle, compassionate humour.

Shukshin's biography before the beginning of his creative career is ordinary and typical of many young men of his generation, yet it served to provide him with numerous life-experiences and a resultant and vital sympathy for people. He was born in 1929 in Srostki, a village in the Altai region of Siberia. As a boy, he worked on a collective farm after quitting school at the age of sixteen, then like many others, he was drawn to the town and the construction sites of Kaluga and Vladimir. After four years of naval service, Shukshin returned to Srostki to direct a school for rural youth where he taught history. At the age of twenty-five Shukshin settled in Moscow and entered the State Institute of Cinematography studying under the director M.I. Romm in the Faculty of Directing. This association was to have a fundamental impact on Shukshin's relationship with literature, for, as he acknowledges: "Romm had an outlook on film that one would hardly expect in a well-known film director: he connected it with literature - good literature. He used to make us write sketches and short stories, sometimes on set themes, sometimes on whatever we liked. I had seen a lot of good in life - a lot of good people...Romm was
pleased with my work. He said, "Vasia, you've got it in you, keep it up!" 

In 1964, Shukshin completed the first of his films demonstrating the organic relationship of cinema and literature which would develop and mature in his works. The film 'There Lives Such A Fellow'/'Zhivet takoi paren' received the Golden Lion of St. Mark award at the 16th Annual Venice Film Festival; but, more significantly, the film utilized a situation Shukshin had taken from one of his first published stories. Subsequently, throughout his parallel literary and cinema careers, Shukshin duplicated many of his literary plots on the screen.

Shukshin's uniqueness in Soviet literature is found in this integral relationship between literary and cinematographic activity. His literary works are remarkable for their visual, concrete qualities. In his stories, as in his films, there is the express desire and ability to render the character above all else, by the spoken word. The trinity of writer, director, and actor combined to produce an artist who created work of unity and completeness. Shukshin's characters appear without fanfare and they act, speak, and live naturally and realistically. Shukshin as author is content with brief remarks in his stories. That which is left unsaid is readily perceived through the gestures and mime of the characters.

Despite the success and innovation of Shukshin's parallel work in literature and cinema, it was an extremely difficult approach with inherent clashes and contradictions. Towards the end of his life, Shukshin was preparing himself
to give up cinema and concentrate upon his writing exclusively. Shortly before his death, he expressed this desire in one of his last interviews:

'I am once again convinced that I am not involved in my element. At the moment, I must think about the fundamental restructuring of my life. I must, of course, part with something - with cinema, with theatre or with acting. Perhaps also with my Moscow residence!...The attempt to embrace all to a small extent - that has guided me...More than anything, I am concerned with the question - where is Shukshin the writer? The writer in the final analysis, is most important to me!...'

In an interview published after his death, Shukshin gives a deprecatory summary of his literary works: "Well, what a result! For fifteen years of work, several slight little books, eight or nine printers' sheets apiece...This isn't the work of a professional writer." It seems that Shukshin was his own toughest critic disregarding as he does all of the writing which he did in the form of screenplays, stories and 'povesti' written for the cinema. In his self-criticism he does what no literary critic either before or after his death has done - he spoke of his literature in terms which isolated it from his other creative work. However, objective criticism of Shukshin's literary work must take into account his activities and contributions in his other artistic endeavors for the important reason that his evolution as a writer is reflected and duplicated in his evolution as a writer for the cinema and as an actor in many of his own screenplays.

Shukshin's writing developed and matured dramatically during his creative career, and this is most evident in an
examination of his stories. Shukshin's first collection of stories, 'Village Dwellers/Sel'skie Zhiteli' appeared in 1963 - a light, tranquil book. It is such stories as 'Stepan in Love/'Stepkina Liubov'', 'Alone'/Odni', and 'Grin'ka Maliugin' which appeared in the collection that led to Shukshin's initial classification within the ranks of the 'derevenshchiki', writers of rural prose. Shukshin's common hero in the first half of the 1960s is a young man, perhaps a driver or a farm worker who is motivated by spontaneous feelings. Such heroes overcome still uneliminated difficulties in collective farm and country life without any special effort. The most remarkable element in the stories was the freshness and sharpness of the language conveying details of daily life with a strong concentration on the psychology of the hero which was somewhat unusual for 'country prose.' Shukshin was welcomed by the literary critics of the two most influential journals of the time, Novyi Mir and Oktiabr', as a 'stern writer of life' (surovyi bytopisatel') and as a singer of moral well-being.

Shukshin immediately rejected the label 'bytopisatel'' and, in 1964, he countered with a story 'The Critics'/Kritiki', which one prominent critic regards as the first appearance of the 'real Shukshin'. The hero was not the usual likeable, trusting lad, but an old man who reacts violently to a situation which would not warrant such behaviour from another type of hero. This story, coupled with Shukshin's indignation that his 'happy hero' was being widely perceived as a strictly humorous figure by literary critics, provoked the comment in Oktiabr' that
Shukshin was now apologizing for the ignorance of the country and its desire not to go in step with the times.

During the mid-1960's, Shukshin became acutely aware that the message he was attempting to convey must be consolidated, concentrated, and made unmistakably clear. His vehicle for this presentation was his hero, and it became increasingly evident to critics, that the essence of a specific Shukshin story lay in the examination of its hero. As Shukshin's work matured and the number of heroes grew, it became clear that the essence of Shukshin's art lay in the evolution of the collective Shukshin hero. Critics began to view Shukshin's stories in relation to each other, a group of stories as a cycle and a collection of stories as a 'book-cycle'. These stories had a generic unity based on 'that which is left unfinished, on the fine points, on the 'wide open' composition of each story' which allowed stories published after a specific collection to supplement and develop the previous works.\[11\]

The change in the attitude of the critics toward Shukshin and his literary work was due to the development of Shukshin himself. In all of his creative work, Shukshin was concentrating his attention on the drama of the soul of the country-dweller. He was investigating how that person could best unite and combine within himself a sense of his history, the immediacy of modernity and the most positive facets of rural and urban cultures.

As individuals with unique historical bonds determining their actions and thought, Shukshin's heroes evaluate, compare
and contrast, ponder and speculate in very specific ways about their circumstances. Through its heroes, Russian literature has always reflected social changes brought about by war, political activism, economic conditions, revolt and revolution. Gifted writers are able to make their heroes synonymous with the existent social conditions. Vasilii Shukshin is one of the contemporary Soviet writers who best portrays through his heroes the consequences of the post-revolution years of social change in the Soviet Union which saw war, urbanization, modern industrialization and the collectivization of agriculture. His heroes are those who have left one environment and have never quite settled into another. They are an ambiguous mixture which is neither urban or rural in its perspectives. If the heroes have settled in the village, then the village begins to change as it is exposed to urban culture through encroaching technology. If the hero is a city-dweller, he fails to feel that he has established himself in that environment. Habits and customs of the urban way of life are incompletely understood by the heroes, and they reflect this in the bitter-sweet hybrid of their thought, actions, and speech.

This is the world of Shukshin's 'hero-eccentrics' who make their appearance in the stories of the late 1960's, but who are nonetheless extensions of Shukshin's initial 'happy heroes'. All of these heroes have experienced one and the same social, historical and spiritual drama which manifests itself in two distinct ways. There is the quiet eccentric who approaches people with goodwill and is bewildered and hurt when
he is rejected or ignored. On the other hand, there is the peasant, choking with bitterness and contempt who lives to disgrace and belittle anyone or anything connected with urban, 'educated' culture.

The divided quality of the Shukshin hero-eccentric results in a quality of ambiguity in most of his stories. The critical debate regarding Shukshin's place in 'country prose' culminated in the late 1960's with some criticizing him for his idealization of the village and others praising him for finding in the country 'man' in the fullest meaning of the word. Shukshin at this time was trying to extricate himself from the classification of 'derevenshchik' altogether. An important and much-cited statement in a 1968 article written by Shukshin reveals how he, as an individual, perceives himself to be in an uncertain position with regard to his society.

'And as I approached the age of forty, I understood that I am neither a city man to the core nor a country man. It's a terribly inconvenient position to be in. It's not even like being in between two chairs, but more like this: I have one foot on the shore and the other in the boat. I find that I must swim, but to swim seems somehow horrifying. -I can't stay long in this condition, I know, for I will fall...But in this position of mine there are certain 'pluses'...Through comparison, from every possible 'from there to here' and 'from here to there', thoughts involuntarily arise not only about 'the country' and about 'the city' - but about Russia.12

The duality of the Shukshin hero-eccentric is merely a reflection of Shukshin's attitude and feelings about his own life situation. He is concerned with the human soul in the process of preserving its identity. Increasingly he compressed
his powers of observation and creative energies at one point and explored that point to its essence. Intonations as well as the system of values changed drastically and the moral ponderings of the heroes were changed in the content of Shukshin's works and not merely at the superficial level.

The appearance of "Characters / Kharaktery," Shukshin's fourth collection of stories became a major event in Soviet prose of 1973. Like much of Shukshin's previous work, it was the subject of lively critical debate which culminated in the conclusion that the new and singular features of Shukshin's stories removed him from the ranks of 'country prose'.

His new work revealed lines of sympathy and contrast which were essentially moral, not typologically urban or rural in their orientation. The new and key contradiction of Shukshin's hero-eccentric, is to live according to the soul, to detach oneself from material values and to leave behind soulless work and mundane daily life. Yet, the hero is almost inextricably bound by all of these tenacious features of modern life. A new intonation of melancholy, of an omnipresent malaise underlies many of Shukshin's later and best works. The hero is at a loss as to what to do about this mood, he doesn't know what is wrong. He reaches the conclusion that a 'holiday for the soul' is needed, a moral decision which motivates all of his actions and thought.

In Shukshin's stories of the 1970's until the time of his death the interest in the restless and nervous relationship of man with his surrounding world is evident. Shukshin considers the questions of daily life with intensity, but he is much more
than a chronicler of this life, a 'bytovnik'. His heroes observe themselves and their inner worlds and find there a void. They become anxious and because of this unusual sensation which prompts activity, they are perceived as 'strange people'. They are separated from others by their constant search for something which is unclear, intangible, elusive, perhaps non-existent, but desperately needed. The search may be an active one, finding temporary solution in the numerous peculiar 'holidays for the soul' which Shukshin's heroes devise for themselves. It also bears a speculative nature; the 'eternal questions' about life and death are asked with intensity and a great desire for answers. Shukshin does not seek to depict the real world through his hero-eccentrics. He portrays segments of it which are chosen and filtered through the consciousness of the hero in its principal and most dramatic moments. The real, external world is presented merely as a supplement to the more essential reality perceived by Shukshin's hero-eccentric.

Among Shukshin's later stories are some of the best, for they contain his evolved, mature hero-eccentric totally absorbed in his search for the human soul. These stories are endowed with a special pathos - they have acquired a fine tragi-comic quality. There is a moving lack of convergence between the complexity of the problems of existence which so torment Shukshin's hero and the concrete, very ordinary manner in which the hero expresses his feelings and thoughts.

The ambiguity and contradiction which Shukshin always carried within himself is a main feature of his art. It manifests
itself in his literary and cinematographic work at many interrelated levels and is especially prominent in the various aspects of the characterization of his heroes.

This thesis is, in large part, a developmental examination of the Shukshin story. Because of the nature of the artistic form, it is also a concentration upon the Shukshin hero, the most vital reason for the story to exist. The contents consist of two main chapters and a conclusion. The first chapter considers the singular qualities of Shukshin's 'story-scene' with respect to the nature of the plot and the structural elements of the story. In the second portion of Chapter One, the discussion transfers naturally to the examination of the Shukshin hero: who he is, who he interacts with, his history and development. Chapter Two treats the characteristic means of expression in the Shukshin story as well as the forms of direct speech which his characters employ. A detailed syntactic and stylistic investigation of Shukshin's use of dialogue concludes the chapter. I consider this chapter to be especially essential to an investigation of Shukshin's stories, for important elements of his style, lexicon, syntax, and semantics have largely been overlooked in literary criticism which has been captured by the content, ideas, and heroes in Shukshin's literary work. The Conclusion discusses the inherent humour in the speech of Shukshin's hero as well as the use which Shukshin makes of irony and satire in his stories. It summarizes Shukshin's place in the Russian literary tradition and his significance as a modern Soviet writer.

Footnotes are to be found at the conclusion of each chapter and are numbered consecutively throughout each chapter.
In Chapter Two as well as in the Conclusion, most of the quotations given to illustrate dialect, style, and the use of satire are transcribed in Russian in order to convey the full meaning of the examples. All excerpts which have been transcribed are noted within the text of the thesis, while translated passages are acknowledged in the regular notes at the end of the chapter. Unless otherwise noted, all translations of Shukshin's stories are my own taken from Soviet publications of collections of his stories or from the *Izbrannye proizvedeniia v dvukh tomakh*, Vol. 1.

A table of the system of transliteration which I have chosen to use in my thesis is provided in Appendix I. Appendix II contains a bibliography of Shukshin's works which have been published in book form as well as information on the contents of each book.
NOTES TO INTRODUCTION

1. Refer to Appendix II for a bibliographical listing of Shukshin's works published in book form.

2. Typical of the ambiguous and diverse opinion of Soviet literary critics are excerpts from two articles published only months before Shukshin's death. Both articles were published in the journal *Literaturnoe obozrenie*, No. 1 (1974).

"Following the example of our critics, even the cinema experts consider him [Shukshin] a specialist of 'eccentrics', of 'strange people'...This feature of Shukshin allows critics to accuse him of a certain unrealistic quality of internal realism, a similarity to life instead of life itself..." (V. Gusev, 'Imenno zhizn', a ne chto drugoe", p.50.)

'The professional 'multi-operative' quality of Vasilii Shukshin, initially so endearing to many evaluators of literature and art, is now looked upon somewhat differently; Shukshin has done so much in varied areas and is so popular, that it isn't clear by what professional code he should be judged...We don't need to 'review' Shukshin's books or texts, but in the sequence of his texts (good, bad, fair, brilliant, profound, superficial...), we must sense the fate and experience of the soul. The critic G. Mitin understood this six years ago when he wrote, that this author...creates not so much a real world, as his own particular Shukshin life filled with his own heroes. Other critics...put their accent on the thoughts...Alla Marchenko even expressed the opinion that in our literature Shukshin creates something in the way of the heavenly myth...I don't know how to prove to Alla Marchenko that this life is real according to texture, empiricism, or the fabric of the description. For this you must simply read. You can sense this in any dialogue: Shukshin is remarkably knowledgeable about modern reality, he has a truly social feeling for people of a definite type; there are in contemporary reality layers, strata, types of which Shukshin is an expert." (L. Anninskii, 'Shukshinskaia zhizn', pp. 50-51).


4. It is interesting to note the quantity (tirazh) in which these publications were issued. *Izbrannye proizvedeniia v dvukh tomakh* was an edition of 200,000 copies; *Brat moi* -
300,000 copies; and the two issues of Roman-gazeta dedicated to Shukshin's stories were editions of 2 million each. These figures bear witness to the official interest in Shukshin's work and to its acknowledgement of the public popularity of the writer.


7. Quoted in Michel Heller, 'Vasily Shukshin: In Search of Freedom', in Snowball Berry Red, p.213. Speculation must take over at this point with regard to Shukshin's projected success at dissociating himself from work in cinema. Only a few months prior to his death, he had been granted permission to make a film about Sten'ka Razin based upon his earlier novel, I Came to Give You Freedom. This was a project which Shukshin had wanted to undertake for several years. It is highly ironic too, that Shukshin's death came on a film set where he was shooting a role in a movie based on M. Sholokhov's work, They Fought For the Motherland.

8. Of these early heroes, Shukshin was later to say, "too happy", (blagopoluchen).


10. Anninskii, p.120.

11. Anninskii, p.123.

12. 'Monolog na lestnitse' quoted in Solov'ev, p.25.
CHAPTER I

STRUCTURE AND CHARACTERIZATION IN THE SHUKSHIN STORY

The fundamental originality of the stories of the Vasili M. Shukshin is to be found in the very form of the works. The first consideration is the structure of Shukshin's plot, the features of which admit the second essential structural element of internal dynamism as part of each and every work. It is this internal dynamism which determines and directs the movement of the plot, for it subtly counterposes the elements of a concise narrative point of view to a concentrated character development using such stylistic and structural devices as direct speech forms, peripetia of plot, and the manner of speaking, thinking, and acting which the characters display. These elements must be considered separately in order to understand the effort which Shukshin expended to produce works of apparent simplicity which, in fact, present a sketch of the complexity of Soviet contemporary life with great clarity.

With regard to plot in the Shukshin story, it is the dynamism of all of these combined components which enables the simplest of plots to be completely sufficient for the evolution of the story. In Shukshin's work, an 'inner action' supplants the external action which is often the motivating power in the plot structure of stories of such brevity. Shukshin does not concentrate his attention on the unraveling of an involved plot of action, but rather on the internal substance of his heroes. Shukshin's works are based upon internalized plots
which are not even plots as much as they are conditions (polozheniia) or situations (sluchai) which capture the moral images of his heros.

Generally, the events in Shukshin's stories can be outlined briefly in one or two sentences for it seems that not very much 'happens'. A few illustrations are typical of the 'retellable' nature of Shukshin's stories:

On a visit to town, a young husband buys his wife a pair of white leather boots and is tormented by the thought of his extravagance and of what his wife will say to reprimand him for his action. ('Boots'/'Sapozhki', 1970).

A lad is convinced that he can invent the first perpetual motion engine and will accept neither friendly advice nor scientific fact to the contrary. ('The Obstinate One'/ 'Upornyi', 1973).

A shop assistant mistakes a customer for a drunk whom she had thrown out of the store the night before, and with the supportive additional comments and insults of the customers waiting in line, she succeeds in upsetting the man she has accused to the point of explosive frustration. ('The Insult'/'Obida', 1971).

The concept of plot as being dependent upon the activity and sequence of events found in a work does not apply to the Shukshin story. The events in his works are always subordinate to the character and the way in which he speaks and acts, responds to others around him, and reacts in a given situation. For example, the fact that Spirka Rastorguev kills himself after being physically ejected from the house of a
gymnastics teacher and his wife when he misunderstands the intentions of the woman toward him, is not the most important part of the story 'The Bastard'/ 'Suraz'. The purchase of the pair of white boots by the husband for his wife is only a means which Shukshin employs to reveal something which he considers to be vital.

Of prime importance to the author are the reasons which lie behind the actions of his characters. In an interview for Literaturnia gazeta in 1974, Shukshin spoke of this interest. "More than anything else, I am interested in the 'history of the soul', and, for the sake of its revelation, I consciously omit much from the external life of that person whose soul agitates me."¹

Thus, Shukshin's plot exists in order to reveal his hero, especially by means of the process which precedes and leads up to a change of consciousness which is significant to the character and to his future mode of thinking and acting. The manifestation of the Shukshin hero is a basic concept which needs to be grasped immediately in an investigation of Shukshin's stories. From this source flows the concentration upon such stylistic features as dramatic and dynamic direct speech and especially dialogue as well as the generally neutral narration which accompanies these speech forms. It also explains the great variety of situations in which Shukshin's hero is placed as well as the moral and ethical overtones found in most of the stories as the character approaches his change of consciousness.
1. The Story - Scene

Shukshin's stories are often referred to in Soviet literary criticism as 'story-scenes' for there is a definite scenic quality to the narrative enhanced by a type of dramatism peculiar to Shukshin's writing which centres around the objective rendering of the speech and the behaviour of the characters. These qualities arouse the senses of the reader for there is a strong property of immediacy to the stories - he is able to watch the action, to hear the exchanges between the personages, and to feel the emotion of a situation.

Much of the power of these suggestions stems from Shukshin's knowledge of and involvement in the cinematographic arts both as an actor and as a director. His training and practical work in this industry influenced his literary style greatly. In his stories one may identify the skill of a director in the arrangement of the characters, and in the construction of setting conveyed in terms of a neutral and omniscient narrative which provides any details needed in a very concise way. The influence of the actor comes through in the portrayal of the characters themselves, in their use of gesture, mimicry, intonational possibilities, and in the overall effectiveness of the spoken word in the stories.

The quality and quantity of dialogue is one of the main vehicles through which Shukshin's knowledge of the cinema reveals itself. The majority of his stories do not depend upon summary or descriptive moments. The dialogue is self-sufficient
and complete to the extent that if all static description was removed from a given story, the actual content would suffer only minimally. This is a quality which is immediately sensed by directors of stage and cinema and which has enabled much of Shukshin's work to appear in the form of plays, films, or simply in an evening of dramatized recitation.

Because authorial text is used sparingly by Shukshin, usually appearing in the form of a neutral narrator, the exact remarks made by this narrator regarding external features of the hero or of his surroundings resemble the form and content of stage directions provided in a dramatic work.

For example, the following scene is from the story 'The Brother-in-Law', *Svoiak Sergei Sergeich*, where two relatives, one a visitor from a nearby town, are steaming themselves in the 'bania'.

'The hot stones snorted viciously and another violent, surging cloud of steam struck the ceiling and swirled downward...The heat took your breath away and boxed your ears for you. Andrei squatted down away from it. Sergei Sergeich underwent wriggling torments on the shelf, his swarthy painted body glistening in the semi-darkness. Finally he scrambled down from the shelf and ran into the dressing room to catch his breath.

Andrei climbed upon on the shelf for a minute and switched himself a little on the legs and waist. He was not a lover of steam. Then he also dropped down to the floor.

"Let's have a smoke," called Sergei Sergeich. They lit up in the cool dressing room. Sergei Sergeich returned to his earlier topic. "So give me an example of what there is to do around here."

"For crying out loud," said Andrei. "Just lie down and spit at the ceiling...Or see a movie when they bring around a film. Or go fishing... 'What is there to do?' he says."
"Have you got any fish in your river?"

"A few. The guys around here fish upstream. There it's probably a little better."

"Do you have a boat?"

"Yes - but no motor."

"What's the matter? No motors around here?"

"Yeah, sure - over in the store...But who's got that kind of money?"

"At home I've got a motorcycle...On Saturdays around four a.m. I'll take off down the highway at a hundred kilometers an hour. What a beast that machine is! We drive out to the lakes to go fishing."

"Do you catch anything?"

"Well, not to lie about it, I usually bring home about half a sackful. Rozka hardly knows what to do with them all. She fries them, pickles them, makes, chowder...But mostly we fertilize our garden with them."

"What?!" exclaimed Andrei.

"Sure. I really like onions --grow them in a hot-house. I use fishmeal for fertilizer...You should see the onions grow! Nobody in our town has onions like that! This big...And sweet, my God...Just recently I got on the waiting list for a Volga. I was advised to wait for a Fiat, but the way I figure, they'll be fooling around with that Fiat for five more years - and in that time I can get a Volga. Hoo boy!...I think I'll go get steam-blasted some more."

After that the women bathed.³

This excerpt is typical of Shukshin's story-scene. The neutral narrator simply reflects the action and then the dialogue, free-flowing and energetic, takes over. It jumps from topic to topic simulating a real conversation, revealing by implication as it progresses, the moral and ethical position
of the characters. Attitudes and values regarding their daily lives are reflected in the topics of conversation and in the different ways in which the two men talk of things which concern them financially, personally, and socially.

The laconicism of Shukshin's work is an element essential to the internal dynamism upon which the stories are based, for it enhances the immediacy of the entire scene through the terseness and conciseness of dialogue and narration. The stories are so succinct that often we are informed of the place of action, and given indications of the conduct of the hero as well as some of his characteristics, within the limits of one or two sentences.

'On Sunday, early in the morning, Ivan Degtiarev's father-in-law, Naum Krechetov, appeared - a peasant not yet old, quick, crafty, and charming. Ivan didn't like his father-in-law, and Naum, feeling sorry for his daughter, put up with Ivan.'

In this story, 'The Wolves'/ 'Volki', the characters will be further developed in conjunction with the narrative, but for the present, in two sentences, the main characters have been outlined and placed in internal conflict. From here, we can also project that a confrontation must inevitably occur for Shukshin would not have provided the information of the dislike between the two men in his sparse narration, if it was not vital to the development of the story.

The Shukshin story is made up of three basic components: the exposition, the body of the story which is actually the development of the hero, and the ending which involves a revelation to the hero or his coming to a change of consciousness.
Let us examine these components separately in order to understand better how Shukshin uses story structure to its best advantage in the creation of his story-scenes.

The exposition of Shukshin's plots determine the initial composition of personages and their links as well as the initial circumstances in which these characters are interacting. Shukshin employs two kinds of exposition, both of which are simple and which proceed immediately to the core of the matter. In both the 'direct exposition' and the 'sudden start' there is immediate presentation of the action with no subsequent drop in pace as the story proceeds.

In 'The Insult/'Obida', Shukshin uses the sudden start and begins his story with already developed action, only subsequently acquainting us with the characters and the hero. The first sentence in the story tells us that 'Sashka Ermolaiev had been insulted.' We know immediately that the story will be based upon this insult. In 'A Storey'/Raskas', the major problem for the hero is the point where the story begins5. 'The wife of Ivan Petin had left him. But how she did it!...Just like in the good old novels - she ran away with an officer.' Through the sudden start in 'How the Old Man Died'/Kak Pomiral Starik', we sense that we will read about the final hours before the death of this character. 'The old man had been suffering since morning. An agonizing weakness had come over him...He had already been feeling weak for a month, but today the weakness was especially acute- such an anguish in his heart, he felt bad enough to cry.'
Other of Shukshin's stories are initiated by a direct exposition introducing the participants within a sentence or two. Often these expositions take on the tone of a tale or an anecdote by their simple language and presentation of the hero. Semka Rys from the story 'The Master'/'Master', is described vividly in the opening paragraph with accounts of his physique, his strength, and his ability as a builder. 'There once lived in the village of Chebroyka a man called Semka Rys, a rake, and also a carpenter second to none. Tall, skinny, with a big nose, he didn't look at all like a hero of ancient times. But when Semka took off his shirt, still wearing his sun-bleached undershirt... The direct exposition also occurs through the presentation of a dialogical exchange involving the hero of the story and a secondary character. In this way, we are immediately introduced to the hero and his temperament. The story 'Mikroscop' begins thus: "It had been necessary to decide on this." He decided. He got home somehow, not himself - yellowish; not looking at his wife, he said: "It's this way...I lost some money." At this, his broken nose (a crooked one with a hump), from yellow, became red. "One hundred and twenty roubles...". Even in his very last stories, Shukshin did not abandon his principle of immediate and concise exposition despite the maturation and increased complexity of the story content. In the 1974 story, 'Greetings to the Grey One!'/'Privet Sivomu!’, we are told directly that 'This is the story of how Mikhail Alexandrovich Egorov, a candidate of science, tall, concentrated, and bespectacled,
almost got married. There was a girl...a woman, who slowly, endearingly named him 'Michel' (Mishel').

Shukshin's method of exposition is brief and purposeful for it leads us directly to the concentration upon the characters and the hero which comprises the most important part of the story content. The largest part of his stories is centred upon the development of the hero and the movement of the plot toward the change of consciousness which inevitably occurs in the hero. There are two basic manifestations of this movement, although these have multiple variations and possibilities.

The first type comes about through a process of trial or test in which an initial false premise held by the hero is challenged and a new comprehensive position is the result. For example, absolutely nothing will dissuade Monia Kvasov, the protagonist of the 1973 story 'The Obstinate One'/'Upornyi', from trying to invent the first perpetual motion machine. After arguing with a young engineer and his mathematician wife to whom he has gone for advice about his endeavor, then visiting a physics teacher for the same reason, Monia goes back to his project damning their scientific facts which say that the machine will not work. The only thing which will change Monia's mind is the machine itself.

'...without any excitement at all, he pushed his wheel with his foot...Then he leaned leisurely against the wall and patiently watched the wheel spinning. But it spun a bit, then stopped...He had to start it again and again and he watched with amazement and a growing feeling of hatred the gleaming circle with bright spokes. It persisted in stopping...He sat there a little longer, then got up, and, utterly deflated and defeated, wandered away not caring where he was going...
... Monia sat by the river until sunrise. He was not a bit worried at his failure any more...Suddenly he thought he ought to marry someone, and have children — say three of them — and watch them growing.'

The story ends with Monia rid of his native obsession and more receptive to the idea of fact and science. Where formerly he had felt that the engineer, physicist, and mathematician were in conspiracy against him, and that they had made a pact to ensure that the wheel must not turn, now when Monia speaks to the engineer, 'it became clear that he [the engineer] was not at all a bad-tempered man, his smile was that of a simple, trusting soul.' When the engineer suggests that Monia study in order to understand his failure, Monia counters: '"Everybody keeps nagging about study — aren't there fools among the learned too?" "There are. But there are more fools among the ignorant..."'

Monia undergoes a type of change of consciousness which demonstrates one of Shukshin's major emphases in his works — the investigation of the psychology of his hero which is governed by social and personal factors. The change which occurs in Monia has moved him in the direction of becoming a person who is prepared to take a broader, more open-minded attitude toward things which concern him and especially toward that which he really does not understand. Shukshin concentrates on what takes place in the minds of his heroes and on what kinds of social and environmental occurrences will initiate and influence the thought process leading to a more actual interpretation of life by the hero.

The second type of change of consciousness which occurs with Shukshin's hero involves his coming to terms with his
situation in life, that is, of seeing his position in a new way. The hero is usually at least partially responsible for the circumstances in which we meet him, and, coming to this realization, he must take some decisive action either to rectify himself or to remove himself. Thus, we meet two Shukshin heroes who commit suicide.

Kol'ka Paratov ('Oh, a Wife saw Her Husband off to Paris'/ 'Zhena muzha v Parizh provozhala...'), sees no other solution to his unbearable position with its unmistakable foundation of social difference between himself and his wife. Spirka Rastorguev, ('The Bastard'/ 'Suraz'), of illegitimate birth, has felt the social pressures of his position as well as the associated expectations throughout his life, and these finally break him down.

Most often in this second type of process to change of consciousness, the hero has been acted upon by others. His own actions do not directly bring about good or bad experiences, but the actions and statements of others with whom he is involved do, as we see in the story 'Two Fingers'/'Bezpalyi'. Sergei Bezmenov is blindly in love with his sensual wife Klara. Despite warnings from his family and friends that she is taking advantage of him, Sergei simply cannot see his situation in that light. When a cousin of Sergei who is a student at a city technical institute comes to a family dinner, he and Klara put on a fine show of intellectualizing. Klara makes such a strong impression on everyone attending the dinner, that Sergei literally explodes with pride.
'His shoulders acquired such breadth that he could have touched opposite walls of the house at once with them: he felt so joyful that he would have liked to embrace and kiss everyone in turn. He was crying, he wanted to sing, to laugh...Then he went outdoors, put his head under the tap in the yard and got thoroughly wet...A rare, wonderful tranquility settled on him: it was as if he were floating somewhere, submitting to the calm, powerful current of time. His thoughts were clear and simple: "See - I'm alive. Fine."'

Sergei's reveries end rudely and suddenly when, from the other side of the partition, he hears his wife and cousin talking intimately and passionately with each other. He goes mad and chases the couple with an axe. Later, feeling the unbearable pain of the realization of his situation, Sergei chops off two fingers on his left hand in an act of transferring his mental and emotional anguish into physical pain. Yet even though Klara's cruel action ends with such an unfortunate result for Sergei, he refuses to blame his wife. He feels that he had needed to suffer like that in his life. '...if such a tempest were to fly at him again he'd fling wide his arms and go to meet her. Say what you like, however painful it had been, that had been a great time. And, of course, you couldn't have great times without a hangover, could you...But he had had times, hadn't he. He definitely had. So there you are.'

As a result of this type of change of consciousness, the hero emerges from his hardship with a greater sense of self-awareness, for he has successfully come through some sort of emotional, moral, or mental trial. As with Sergei Bezmenov, the hero may be fully conscious of his self-worth or he may only sense it and make this feeling discernible to the reader through
the questions which he asks himself and others about life and how best to live it.

The process of change of consciousness in the hero relies upon the literary device of 'peripetia' - the sudden or unexpected reversal of situation or circumstance. It is a feature which is used effectively by Shukshin to enhance the dynamism of his story, for the developments which lead up to the turn in the direction of the story produce a sharp rise in tension endowing the story with a definite dramatism.

Shukshin employs a specific type of peripetia which is conditioned by the brevity of his work and the intensity of characterization and dialogue. Peripetia, as used by Shukshin, occurs in an already complex situation, for he never introduces new characters or circumstances as motivation for the peripetia. In this use of peripetia, it is again the process which is emphasized, for the hero is aware of the facts from the very beginning of the story, and by living, thinking, and working with these facts, he is led to an opinion, attitude, or statement which differs from his original starting point.

Peripetia is generally a feature of Shukshin's story endings. He either concludes abruptly with the device of peripetia, or uses it to engage in a very concise ending consisting of character dialogue or monologue, or of narrative dissertation. Shukshin never develops the hero beyond the point of his change of consciousness; the most he provides the reader with is a hint of how the hero may utilize his new awareness in the future. His endings are as brief as his expositions.
In the story 'The Obstinate One' for example, we have seen how Monia's opinion of his ability to create the perpetual motion machine reverses itself by the end of the story along with his conception of the young engineer. Shukshin's paragraph-long conclusions makes obvious only the fact that Monia is aware of his change in attitude and thought, but does not develop Monia further or project him into the future.

'Monia remained in the front room, sitting by the window. The top of the window-pane was bathed in red—the sun was rising. The village was waking up: gates were banging, cows were mooing asking to be taken to pasture. People were calling to one another, even shouting here and there. Everything was just as it should be. Thank God, at least here everything was clear, Monia thought. The sun rose and set, rose and set, eternal and unattainable, and meanwhile, people went on doing their daily rounds, shouting, hurrying, working, watering the cabbages—people, my dear people—good morning to you!' 14

In the story 'Boots', Sergei's wife is not in the least bit angry that he has spent so much money on white leather boots. Despite the fact that they do not fit her, they are promised to the eldest daughter when she finishes the tenth grade. Ivan realizes that his wife has deeply appreciated his gesture, and that it has meant much to her. With this new realization, the story ends.

'Klavdia was making up the bed. "Aren't you coming!" she called.

He waited on purpose, to see what she would say next. "Sergei, love!"

Sergei rose, spat on the stub of his cigarette and went inside, smiling to himself and shaking his head. But he didn't think, so that's what made her sweet—buying those boots. No, it wasn't because of the boots. That wasn't it. It was because, because...Never mind. It was good.' 15
'The Opinion'/'Mnenie', a 1972 Shukshin story, is one of his typical works. It includes all of the components and structures of the story-scene which have been discussed above as well as the resultant emotional effect produced in the reader by the change of consciousness in the hero and the attached moral implications.

'The Opinion' begins from a definitely stated position. Kondrashin, the hero of the story and a man in an unspecified administrative post, considers an article which has been written by his superior to be empty, pointless, and lacking in new ideas. He is so agitated by this article, a regular 'routine article' (dezhurnaia stat'ia) of bureaucracy, that even his friend and fellow-worker is surprised by his reaction.

The story begins in typical Shukshin fashion with direct exposition. A neutral narrator gives us as much setting and as much information about Kondrashin as we need to know before the action begins.

'A certain Kondrashin, Gennadii Sergeevich, a moderately plump man, blue-eyed, balding, with a haughty even slightly fastidious expression on his face, came through the entrance of a large, bright-eyed building at five minutes to nine, took the key for room 208 from the cubbyhole, and ran to the second floor playing a bit with the tight key-cover, went down a long corridor, unlocked room 208, took the local paper which had been placed in the door handle, entered the room, hung his jacket on the rack, and pulling up his white pressed pants at the knee very slightly, he sat down at his desk. He examined the newspaper. Immediately, he came upon the article of his chief - the little chief (shefunia) as he was called by the young workers. And he began to read. As he read, the haughty expression on his face was intensified by derision.

"My dear God!" he said aloud. He grabbed the phone and dialled the internal three-digit number."
We find out immediately from Kondrashin's conversation with his friend Iakovlev just what his opinion is of the article.

"Well? asked Kondrashin, nodding at the newspaper. "What about it? Not one fresh idea, twaddle with self-confidence." He perhaps may have resembled an American, this Kondrashin, if his nose, an altogether respectable nose, did not end suddenly in such a Tambov bulb, and if this nose did not inopportune reddening, although Kondrashin's face was fresh and complacent.

"You don't say", said Iakovlev, the perfect gentleman. He swung his foot.

"The devil knows!...", exclaimed Kondrashin, continuing to walk about the office and puffing away at a cigarette. "If there's nothing to say, then why write?"

"He responded. Raised questions..."

"But there aren't any kind of questions raised! Where are those questions?"

"What do you mean? There's even the phrases, 'We must strain to the limit...', 'We're bound to a time...'

"Oh sure! It would be better if he strained himself in a restaurant - it's more concrete. And that's it exactly - phrases!"

"In a restaurant - that goes without saying...that comes afterwards."

"And he's not even ashamed", marvelled Kondrashin. "In all seriousness...It's as if he begged someone or something like that. One bit of jabber, another bit of twaddle, they don't even write like that for a district newspaper. No, he sits down to write! That's Doldon Ivanich for you."

"The devil with him! What are you so excited about?", Iakovlev asked sincerely. "It's a routine article..."

"The whole thing is disgusting."

In the narration of the omniscient narrator, the description of Kondrashin is objective, presenting him as he
would look to others with his careless, breezy mannerisms. Throughout the story, the importance of Kondrashin's appearance and habits is emphasized by the narrator's attention to them. However, the narrator passes no judgements and his descriptions are doubled by Kondrashin's active behaviour and speech itself.

The conversation of the co-workers continues into a change of topic. Kondrashin and Iakovlev talk of some relatives who are visiting the former from the country. Although this short exchange may at first seem to be a side motif, it does, in fact, concern a main trait of Kondrashin's character make-up. His attitude towards his visitors is symptomatic of his approach to life: he puts these people up at his home, instead of finding a hotel for them, because it makes Kondrashin look good. Although this is never directly stated in the conversation, it is gleaned from Kondrashin's statements and conduct throughout the story.

Kondrashin is then called in to discuss the article with the 'chief' himself. He takes with him his very affected and 'American' manner as well as the expectation that his superior will demand praise for the article. As he waits in the reception room, Kondrashin thinks about the bureaucratic world of which he is a part and we are admitted to his thoughts:

'Kondrashin sat down easily on the chair, threw his arm over the back of the next chair, and began to drum his fingers softly on the smooth wood. During this time, he concentratedly stared ahead, his lips pursed, eyebrows slightly knotted together into a line - and he thought of the secretary and about the pompous comfort with which the 'chiefs', 'little chiefs', 'underchiefs' and 'overchiefs' surrounded themselves. Generally, he liked this appearance of dignity, the breadth and the excessiveness of this cloister but, for example, Doldon Ivanich lacked the knowledge...
of how to use all of this: instead of conducting oneself simply in this bureaucratic luxury, with moderation and taste, he swells out like a turkey, with self-importance. He thought of the secretary in this way: never in his life would he conduct himself with any secretary as if he was in a banal novel. This was also 'doldonish' (doldonstvo): to gallivant with the secretaries without fail. This was squalor, awkwardness. Primitiveness..." 18

This type of direct speech, impersonal direct speech, (nesobstvennaia priamaia rech') is used often by Shukshin, for it gives the impression of knowledge flowing directly from the character to the reader without being filtered through the interpretation of a narrator. 19

The tension and drama surrounding Kondrashin's thoughts, voiced and unvoiced, and opinion about the article increases steadily. The reader already has enough information about Kondrashin to realize what his nature really is. Nonetheless, when Shukshin employs peripetia in the scene in which Kondrashin speaks to his chief about the article, the effect is still powerful.

This scene is rich in satiric humour. Kondrashin is immediately disconcerted by his chief's frankness in asking for some genuinely good criticism. He even momentarily forgets his all-important image.

'Kondrashin was not in the least prepared for the 'little chief' to begin directly with this— with the magazine. He was taken aback...

"I read it," said Kondrashin. And in a short time he pursed his lips. 20
In the ensuing dialogue, Shukshin employs his linguistic and syntactic talents to achieve the effect of irony. He is aware that oral speech is very often determined by social factors and Kondrashin demonstrates this in the vocabulary and intonations with which he addresses his superior. His phrasing and long-winded constructions are those of a man attempting to ingratiate himself and to make a good impression.

"This article is so contemporary. - It is 'today' and necessary."

"That is?" Dimitri Ivanovich didn't understand.

"By it's soul, that is...how can I make this more exact - by it's business-like efficiency, concreteness, by that simplicity, definitely, although in it not everything is simple, precisely in its very soul it is well-timed. And contemporary."

Here the peripetia of action is enhanced by peripetia of language, for Kondrashin himself uses the kind of empty, generalizing phrases which he found so offensive in the article. They are abstract to the point where even the puzzled 'chief' asks for explanation.

Yet, Kondrashin is able to convince his higher-up of the excellence of the article as well as to impress him with his phrases. He leaves the office of 'Doldon Ivanich' with an apparent feeling of satisfaction with himself and considers that perhaps a bit of flirting with the secretary might not be so bad despite his recent contempt for the morals and irresponsibilities of the higher-ups.

Thus, the very abrupt conclusion of the story through the device of peripetia is totally unexpected in view of
Kondrashin's success and train of thought as he goes back to his own office.

'...And he left the reception room. And walked along the carpeted way...On the stairs to the second floor he didn't run, but walked slowly. He walked and sharply slapped his palm along the smooth, thick handrails. And suddenly, not too loudly, angrily, even with rage, he said of someone:

"Cr-retins!"22

'The Opinion' is a story which is very characteristic of Shukshin's form in the majority of his work. Every part of the story is necessary - there is nothing superfluous to the unidirectional quality of the plot movement. The progression from dialogue to dialogue in the story is scenic in the sense that actions, thoughts, and dialogue seem to be occurring as the reader goes along. We are not often told directly by the narrator about the events. The neutral omniscience of the narrator is the most common form in Shukshin's stories, except for a number of stories written during his last years, which employ a much more personal and direct voice with the narration being presented from the first person witness or first person protagonist point of view.

Generally, as in 'The Opinion', Shukshin's narrator informs us only of things which the characters cannot tell us about themselves, such as about their own physical appearance, manner of conduct, speech, dress. Often too, as in the exchange between Kondrashin and Iakovlev where they are talking about their out-of-town guests, the narrator is completely eliminated. We are left to infer the significance of their conversation through the dialogue alone.
In Shukshin's stories there is thus a consistent mixture of a 'dramatic mode' of narration, where the information is conveyed directly through the characters themselves, with that of a neutral omniscient narrator who is always willing to intervene, speaking impersonally. However the image content of the narrator's speech is entirely within the comprehension and experience of the characters, for in his interventions into the dialogue he employs language which the characters would not have spoken themselves but which they would have clearly understood.

Thus one may suggest that a type of dialogicality is created between the author and his characters which bears similarity to the type which Mikhail Bakhtin perceives and elucidates in his work, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*:

'The essential dialogicality of Dostoevsky's works is indeed not limited to the outward, compositionally expressed dialogue carried on by his heroes. Dialogical relationships obtain between all the elements of its structure, that is, the elements are contrapuntally counterposed. For dialogical relationships constitute a much more far-reaching phenomenon than merely the relationship between speeches in a literary composition, they are an almost universal phenomenon which permeates all of human speech and all relationships and manifestations of human life.'

Bakhtin speaks about Dostoevsky's works as a whole, and particularly about his novels, while we are immediately concerned with the considerably different genre of the short story. Still, it is worthwhile to apply Bakhtin's idea of 'contrapuntally counterposed' dialogical elements to Shukshin's
dialogue especially with regard to the relationship between the various aspects of direct speech, internal monologue, the interjections of a neutral narrator, and those of a narrator who is close to the position of the hero.

The device of authorial intervention is used by Shukshin often not to pass judgements or to clarify, but simply to enhance and reflect the dynamic dialogue of the character. In the story 'Veruiu!'/ 'I Believe!', the hero, Maksim Iarikov, himself sets the scene and the mood of the story and increases the dramatism to the point where he and the vivacious character of the priest seem virtually independent of the author whose interventions may almost be considered expendable.

The very unusual priest advises Maksim to live life to the fullest, to weep and dance, and to believe in Life to alleviate his aching soul. He taunts Maksim in order to revive his spirit. Maksim asks the priest:

"And where are we all running?"

"Anywhere. What difference does it make where? The good and the evil are all going the same way."

"Somehow I don't feel I'm going anywhere at all."

"Then you're weak-kneed. You're an invalid. Your fate is to sit in one place and moan."

Maksim gritted his teeth. He glared angrily at the priest.

"Why was I dealt such a miserable fate?"

"You're a weakling. Weak, as a...as a half-boiled rooster. It's no use rolling your eyes like that."

"All right, then, your so-called holiness, and what if I thump you between the eyes, right now?"
The priest burst out laughing in his booming bass voice (lung disease, indeed!). "You see this?" he said, holding up his brawny arm. "It's pretty solid: a process of natural selection would follow." 24

Shukshin inserts his word as an observer watching from the sidelines in order to support the effect that is being produced through the dialogue. Surely we can imagine Maksim's visible anger when he grits his teeth at the insults being hurled at him, or the priest brandishing his arm at Maksim without being told that these actions are occurring. The spoken exchange is sufficient. But the narrator's comments are integrally counterposed to the dialogue in that they reflect it without detracting from it. There is thus a closeness in the position taken by the hero and by the narrator, but this approximation does not mean their sameness. I suggest that quite often Shukshin's authorial interventions may be seen as part of the dialogue. He portrays a non-verbal dialogue, a non-verbal reaction. 'Both of them, the priest and Maksim, were dancing with a kind of grim frenzy, so that one felt it was quite natural: either they must dance, or else tear their shirts, weep and gnash their teeth'. Such non-verbal dialogue which is governed by emotion and intuition calls to mind the citation from Bakhtin which is presented above. It is that kind of dialogical communication which "permeates all of human speech, and all relationships and manifestations of human life". It is also totally in keeping with the story-scene which Shukshin developed as the form which his stories would follow, since it allows possibilities of innovation using the author's knowledge of acting and directing techniques.
Much of the effect of the majority of Shukshin's stories stems from his use of point of view which is a combination of the scenic and the summary. The minds of the characters are revealed freely and at will, yet as an author, Shukshin is in control with the explanatory and omniscient tone of the narrator. However, the moment of revelation, the 'change of consciousness' in Shukshin's hero always belongs to the main personage in the story. It is almost always involved with what the hero immediately says through a direct speech form and the further implications of the verbal reactions may be given through the narrator to end the story.

In 'The Opinion', Kondrashin's cry of 'Cr-retins!' on the stairwell represents the moment of the change of consciousness toward which the entire story has been directed. Yet even though this is the climax and culmination of the story, it is left to the reader to decide for whom this indictment is intended from the development of the hero and the other characters throughout the story.

Because most of his heroes are aware or become aware of their active role in creating the particular situation in which we find them, the stories often contain a tragic element. Combined with this feature is a gentle humour, inherent in the vocabulary which Shukshin chooses for each hero, as well as in the effect of the ironic and satiric implications carried by the narrated descriptions of dress and mannerisms. This presence of a keen humour in Shukshin's stories is an important feature. The sharp and dramatic conflicts which occur in the
works are elucidated to a great extent by the humour since it flows naturally from the situation and the condition and natures of the characters in the stories.

The tragi-comic effect of 'The Opinion' lies in the conscious attitude of Kondrashin toward the hypocrisy which he feels is required of him. We come to understand the hero almost solely through his preoccupation with creating an effect on those around him. However, Kondrashin still has enough conscience remaining to be able to vent his frustrations with the bureaucratic web in which he is caught. Despite the rather ridiculous figure which Kondrashin has cut throughout the story, by his very human display of consciousness at the very end of the story, a good amount of sympathy is directed toward him at this final point.

With the emphasis which Shukshin places on the socio-psychological factors influencing the development of his hero, it is to be expected that the stories have strong moral and ethical overtones. A dominant theme runs throughout all of Shukshin's work. It is the voice of the author asking through his characters that the reader consider the quality of contemporary life. He puts this theme directly into words only in two of his last stories, 'Van'ka Tepliashin' (1973) and 'The Slander'/ 'Kliauza' (1974).

The hero of the slander asks in anguish: "What is happening to us? What is going on? It is disgusting to live - you live without wanting to when we are like we are now!" And Van'ka gives his solution to the state of moral and personal
life when he advises: "You have to be human. (Nado chelovekom byt') You must be human and not chase after a fifty kopeck piece before you are."

Connected with the moral implications of Shukshin's stories is a group of distinct stories mentioned earlier, in which Shukshin uses a much more subjective narrator who gets directly involved in the dramatic reality as the first person witness or the first person protagonist. These stories were written after 1971, well along in Shukshin's literary career. In them, we still find the syntactic means of portayal typical of earlier stories, but the factor which is altered is the author's willingness to intrude in a more direct way.

The syntax and language of his intrusions are always in keeping with the direction and theme of the story and this theme is the same when the first person protagonist appears. The moral and spiritual searching which Shukshin's hero is undertaking in the stories of this time are more subjectivized, so that Shukshin himself is afforded the opportunity to philosophize. Shukshin appears to utilize this first person protagonist when the questions being asked by his characters are not being expressed completely enough for what the author wants to say. It is this protagonist who poses some of the more complex moral and philosophical problems included in Shukshin's work.

In the 1971 story, 'Uncle Ermolai'/'Diadia Ermolai', the first person protagonist carries on an internal monologue, based upon the thinking about life which he has done since the days of boyhood tricks played upon his uncle.
'Ermolai Gregor'evich, uncle Ermolai. And I recall him - as I stand over his grave. I think. And my thoughts of him are simple: always a labourer, a kind, honest person. Just as all here are, just as my grandfather, my grandmother. Simple thoughts. Only, I can't think them through to the end, for all my institutes and books. For example: what was their life, was there any great idea in it? It was precisely in how they lived. Or maybe, there was no idea at all, but only work, and more work...They worked and their children were born. I saw other people later on...Not lay-abouts by any means, but...they understand their lives differently...And I myself understand it differently! -Only...when I look at these mounds, I don't know: which of us is right, which is wiser?' 25

The language and syntax of the protagonist who stands so close to the author is wholly reminiscent of Shukshin's objectivized dialogue in its realistic and natural flow. This is not idle philosophizing but an urgent parley with the reader. It is absorbing and demanding of an answer.

Thus, the Shukshin story is a composite of many elements. These elements are the key to the ability of the author to produce so many stories without falling into a repetitious mold. He reduces certain elements while expanding others, keeping as his focal point in each story his hero, caught up in what is an episode from the overall pattern of his life. In some stories, the subject matter will deal with seemingly trivial occurrences such as an argument with a shop clerk, the observation of neighbours, the buying of a pair of boots. At other times, the material will deal with philosophical yet universally human questions of how to live, how to 'be human', and how to find 'a holiday for the soul.' Shukshin effectively freezes this moment and transforms it into an event, paying
special attention to the social and psychological factors which influence the hero.

2. **THE SHUKSHIN HERO**

Shukshin should not be considered a writer of 'byt', of the daily mode of life, and classified with the 'derevenshchiki', a group of contemporary writers whose main concentration and sympathies are associated with the Russian village and country-folk in an ethnological, moral and historical sense. His stories extend well beyond the limits of this trend, centred as it is in the portrayal of the village, the dialect and the mores of the Russian countryside as being a source of traditional goodness and wisdom pitted against the evils of technology and urbanization.

Shukshin deals with a world of complex socio-psychological processes which recur in the lives and minds of his typical character— the rural dweller whose occupation or other activities and relationships orient him toward town or city and a world and life-style which is not well understood. In the developed, technological world which often encroaches upon village life, Shukshin is able to describe the psychological atmosphere produced by and associated with technology.

Shukshin shows how the country person, or the newcomer to the city is not totally comfortable in his new urban surroundings. The author sets the limits of the primary moral elements which have persevered through all of the technological and social
advances. These qualities are the most basic of human values and are usually attributes of the hero—there is Chudik's honesty when he returns a fifty-rouble note he has found, Sashka Ermolaiev's anguished thoughts about the lack of respect which people show for each other, Sergei Bezmenov's compassion toward his unfaithful wife, and the persistence and hard work of Monia Kvasov which are generally needed to get through life. These values are portrayed by Shukshin in his characters; and next he goes on to investigate the conditions and circumstances which change them, deform them, and replace them.

Although Shukshin's stories and style are oriented toward general trends and problems, the socio-psychological concentration endows his work with great possibilities of individualization. His heroes think, express themselves and behave in very personal ways. Each development of a hero is individualized while remaining a portrayal of the contemporary social reality. Shukshin's subject matter, plots and characters are never directed toward the depiction of what an ideal person or situation might be. He is totally engrossed in what an ordinary man might become through his potential for making a choice or a decision which will be either positive or negative, helpful or injurious to his personal growth. Unlike most authors of 'country prose', Shukshin does not find the focus of goodness, conscience, and humanity in either the city or the country, but only in the soul of man.

A theme running throughout Shukshin's stories as he concentrates intently on his characterization of the hero is
the implied question: "What is an educated (intelligentnyi) man?" Again, it is the moral virtues which are central in an answer to this question that Shukshin himself provides:

'This is a restless conscience, intelligence, the complete absence of logic when it is necessary to sing in a mighty bass, the bitter discord within oneself from the cursed question: 'What is truth?'. It is pride and...the compassion for the destiny of the people.'

Shukshin's characters and hero reflect this restlessness and this search for truth in every story, for they represent a broad spectrum of ordinary Soviet people—mainly but not exclusively rural dwellers and workers whose occupations as truck drivers, casual labourers and varied craftsmen, construction workers, tractor-drivers and collective farm workers place them in constant contact with urban culture. The social, cultural, and historical traditions of these people are somewhat ambiguous, for they represent that segment of the Soviet population which had been uprooted by the post-revolutionary years of rapid social change. This social uncertainty is reflected in Shukshin's hero, for he is very susceptible to thoughts and notions provoked by his tightening relationship with urban culture and its technology. These thoughts often manifest themselves within the hero as an 'idée-fixe'—a possessive, all-embracing idea which is perhaps the most important feature of Shukshin's hero. He always has a definite perception of the world which is very clear and logical to him despite the fact that his idea has little to do with practicality or even common sense. The hero's idea often leads him to speak about truth, the spirit, and the meaning of life as he feels increasing dissatisfaction with
the triviality of daily life. Thus, in an attempt to find some answers to the questions which he begins to ask himself, the Shukshin hero devises his own methods. One, a truck driver for a local state farm, becomes obsessed by the idea of inventing a perpetual motion machine. Another is determined to understand why people treat each other so badly and disrespectfully. A third, a part-time painter and disabled veteran, spends a great deal of energy behaving in a manner which is designed to have strangers believe that he holds the rank of 'general'. The list of motivating, propelling ideas and pursuits goes on endlessly, always unique in the way that the various characters handle their idea, but yet always basically the same and rooted in the same source.

In this feature there is a strong parallel to the works of Dostoevsky and their similar depiction of the possession of the character by an idea. Dostoevsky's hero is more philosophical and reflective than the early Shukshin hero, who with maturity attains a deeper level of reflection. In keeping with the philosophizing and intellectualizing bent of the times, Dostoevsky's hero sees and understands the world and its formulation from the viewpoint of a given, all-encompassing idea.

In his work on Dostoevsky, Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics, Mikhail Bakhtin proposes that..."The idea becomes in him [the personage] an 'idea force' which omnipotently defines and distorts his consciousness: it is in fact not he who lives, but the idea, and the novelist describes not the hero's life, but the life of the idea in him..."27
In the stories which Shukshin wrote from the mid-1960's on, this element of 'idea-force' reveals itself more strongly and more consistently, changing only in specific emphasis but not in essence. Of course, in comparing this common aspect of the heroes of Dostoevsky and Shukshin, we are speaking only of the common factor of motivation and particularly motivation of dialogue. The ideas which drive the heroes of the two writers derive from totally different sources and conditions, but as a thematic device and in their influence on the dialogue of the characters compositionally, they have much in common.

In Shukshin's stories, the 'idea-force' finds an ideal place for its manifestation as a component part of the diminished plot. It is always connected with the change which the protagonist undergoes, for the 'idea-force' itself may motivate the hero to conceive of things in a 'better' way (such as Maksim Iarikov's realization that his soul was aching and his search for how to relieve the pain), or it may act in a more negative way by deluding the hero into forgetting that the idea is just a product of his own imagination (as with the part-time painter Malafeikin, who becomes General Malafeikin to impress strangers when he speaks with them.)

One of the most graphic examples of the idea actually living and speaking through the mouth of the hero is the 1968 Shukshin story entitled, "Mille pardons, madame'. The hero, Bron'ka Pupkov, time and time again tells the story of how he was chosen to assassinate Hitler. In the excerpts which follow, one can clearly see how the idea progressively and totally
consumes the conscious mind of the hunting guide.

'It was on the last day of his trip, when they held a farewell party, that Bronka would launch into his favourite story. He could scarcely wait for the day, and he used to prepare carefully for it. When at last it came, he felt a pleasant tingle in the pit of his stomach and held himself gravely aloof...

..."Were you ever at the front?" he asked casually...
"Have you heard about the attempt on Hitler's life?"
"Of course."
"No, no, not that one. The other one."...

"Who fired at him?"
Bronka did not hear the question. He sat smoking and staring into the fire.

"Where was this attempt?"
Bronka did not answer. Everyone exchanged surprised glances. "I fired at him," he said suddenly...

"...Are you serious?"

"What do you mean? Do you suppose I don't realize that distortion of history is a serious matter?..." 28

After a detailed monologue about how it had happened that he was chosen for the mission, Bronka tells of the way in which he was admitted into Hitler's inner circle, the whole time increasing the tension and suspense with his use of short sentences, questions, and gestures.

'My heart was in my mouth. Where was Hitler?...I saluted, "Heil Hitler". I was holding a large package with an automatic inside, loaded with poisoned dum-dum bullets. A general came up and reached for my package, but I brushed him politely aside. "Mille pardons, madame - for
the Fuhrer in person." I was speaking perfect German, mark you..."

The culmination of the entire monologue and the climax of the plot comes when Bronka describes the shot.

'...He smiled. And then I burst open the package. "So you're smiling, you rat! Well then, take this for our sufferings." Bronka was shrieking, holding his arm as if about to shoot..."Well, now you can bathe in your own blood, you crawling vermin." This was a heart-rending howl. Then followed complete silence and a hurried, almost imperceptible whisper: "I fired". Bronka looked down wept silently... When he raised it, his face was furrowed with tears. Then quietly, very quietly, he said, with horror in his voice: "I missed."

No one said anything.

"Another drop if you please." Bronka said quietly but insistently. He drank it and walked off to the water. And there he sat for hours, alone on the bank, in the grip of his traumatic experience."

"Mille pardons, madame" is a good example of how the many elements which Shukshin uses in his seemingly simple plots come together to produce a piece of literature. The plot is a tragic one for Bronka is so totally possessed by an 'idea-force' that it motivates all of his speech, action and emotions. He is so helpless against this obsession that at times he really believes that he once did make an attempt on Hitler's life. The typical characteristic which often accompanies a pervasive idea is that of a consequent incongruity with reality, and this is certainly the case with Bronka. Shukshin's hero reveals this disharmony most often and very effectively through his
language. Bronka displays this feature of incongruity when he utters the phrase 'mille pardons, madame'. This simple statement is a multiple error to which Bronka is totally oblivious - he is not aware that he has used a French expression addressing a woman when he was supposed to have excused himself before a German general. Worse, Bronka assures his audience around the camp fire, that he spoke perfect German.

The plot of "Mille pardons, madame" is moved along by the monologue which also sets the scene and the mood and increases the tension of the story through the use of syntactic and stylistic devices. The dynamism of the monologue and the functions which it serves creates the impression that the plot actually evolves from the direct speech form, an impression which is common to his stories with their simplicity of plot.

The extreme unidirectional quality of Shukshin's hero is rooted in the same quality which is found in the plot. Just as no 'side events' occur in the plot, with every occurrence having a bearing on the direction in which the story moves toward the point of emphasis, so too is this reflected in the heroes. Shukshin portrays his heroes through one feature - the most important and demonstrative. Thus, the hero is held in the grip of an idea and is imbued with a singleness of purpose from which he will not be swayed.

It is important to distinguish the Shukshin hero from the other personages in his stories. Because of the brevity and laconicism of the Shukshin story there are rarely more than two major characters and never more than three. One of these
characters is the hero and the others are individualized only to the point of serving a particular function within the framework of the plot. It is these background characters who motivate the hero to take some sort of action, to think something out, or to defend a position.

Shukshin's hero constantly interacts and contends with two groups of people. The first is his urban counterpart, often well-educated, who appears in the stories as the teacher, professor, student or candidate. The second group with which the hero must come to terms is his female counterpart, usually the wife. The typical structure of the stories counterposes the hero to the secondary personage in a clear opposition of opinion, attitude, or point of view.

Shukshin always portrays the educated character positively if that character uses his knowledge in a constructive way and is patient and understanding of the naivete and, at times, ignorance, of the hero. The hero is placed in an incongruous, humorous position when he either competes with or ignores the intelligence of the other personage. Monia Kvasov stubbornly disregards all learned opinion which says that a perpetual motion machine cannot be built. Gleb Kapustin ("Cut-Off"/"Srezal"), pretentiously assumes an educated vocabulary and a concern with academic 'problems'. Naum Evstigneeich, from the story 'Outer Space, the Nervous System, and Slab of Fatback'/'Kosmos, nervnaia sistema, i shmat sala', is convinced that his young boarder is wasting time going to school, until he is decisively moved to a changed outlook about learning when he is told how Academician
Pavlov recorded his own death up to the final minute. In such an arrangement of characters — the hero facing his educated counterpart — it is the hero who must change or else suffer the consequence of looking the fool.

Shukshin depicts a good number of educated personages who, through their self-importance, ambitions, and airs, have lost the capacity to 'be human'. These he does not tolerate and the hero-eccentric stands out as morally superior to such characters. Semka Rys, the hero of the story 'The Master'/ 'Master', has fallen in love with a little church outside his village and is obsessed by the desire to restore it to its original beauty. But he is told coldly and unfeelingly by a young specialist that the church is not special and is merely a copy of older, more beautiful northern churches. When Ivan Petin's wife leaves him for another man, Ivan writes not only of his grief, anger, and hurt, but also of his indignation that the pair had no conscience. He takes his story to the local newspaper, where the editor at first takes the composition as a joke. When he comes to realize that Ivan is absolutely serious, the editor explains that the story cannot be printed in its original form and suggests that they sit down together to rewrite the appeal to conscience. Ivan simply takes his story and leaves. In the story, 'The Oddball'/ 'Psikopat', the hero-eccentric is the village librarian who has been prescribed injections but who physiologically has great trouble accepting them. As a result of the incompetence of the nurse who is administering
the injections, the hero upbraids a young doctor for his lack of concern and complacency.

'..."You don't know anything, young man."
"On what do you base that statement?", the doctor asked with an air of irony.

"On everything. "The odd-ball looked simply and directly at the doctor...."You're a doctor', he calmly continued to assess...."Your nurse doesn't know how to do injections, but you ...that doesn't disturb you one bit..."...I'm amazed at your...your...doltish self-complacency. You sit there with a dead soul, no troubles, no sorrows - and you write prescriptions..."

The doctor, dumbfounded, looked at the man. He was silent.

"How can you live like that? Eh? How can you?...I'm not quarreling with you, I really want to understand: surely you can't live like that? The man doesn't even know his own work...He doesn't even want to know it, to love it, but just sits scowling with importance..."31

The educated, urban personage is essential in Shukshin's stories both to the plot, and to the development of the hero's character. Such secondary characters facilitate the depiction of contemporary ongoing social issues concerning the moral debate about the favourable aspects of education, greater awareness and understanding, and the changing spiritual values and mores of an educated, modernizing population.

The constraints which Shukshin's hero feels upon his search for his soul and truth, do not come only from external social circumstances. To a great extent, they come from a more personal source, from the female character of the story who is usually the hero's wife. Although there are no female heroes in Shukshin's stories, women are always present as the
antithesis to the fanciful hero. Shukshin's female character is a realist and thus she does not at all appreciate the hero's talk of such intangibles as the importance of coming to an understanding of life, or the value he places upon reviving and expanding the human soul. Her concern is only to get on with daily life and to cope with new conditions of urbanization and material well-being.

The role of the woman is more than a down-to-earth, practical voice in the world of the hero-eccentric. She is beguiled by the new luxuries and conveniences more readily than is the hero, and thus the woman is depicted as being extremely materialistic. In her desire for social position within her immediate environment, Shukshin's female character becomes an unsuspecting representative of the 'status quo.'

It is the wife of Bronka Pupkov who constantly nags that he will be charged with distortion of history one day if he continues to tell his tale about Hitler. Filipp Nasedkin's wife, in 'Bird of Passage'/'Zaletnyi', complains to the collective farm committee that her husband has taken to drink because he has befriended a man whom the village wives consider to be a bad influence. Again, it is a female storeclerk who rudely and unfairly accuses Sashka Ermolaiev of having come into the store when he was drunk and she refuses to serve him.

The basic opposition between the outlook on life held by the hero and that held by the female character is a constant throughout Shukshin's work. The hero is humanistic - he is searching for his human spirit. The woman is materialistic
and extremely susceptible to the values and morals of a newly technological society. This dichotomy between the basic moral philosophy of the hero and the female character was originally stated in a very early Shukshin story, and it remained unchanged to the end of his literary career. Antip, an elderly harnessmaker in the 1963 story 'Alone'/'Odni', tries to talk to his wife about how good it is to have a sensitive and kind soul, but over the years, her answer to him has always been an unchanging indifference.

"You, Marfa, although you're a strong old woman, you're muddle-headed."

"And why's that?"

"Well, because... What do you want? That day and night I sewed and sewed? Well, I also have a soul. It wants to have a good time too, this soul."

"I spit on your soul!"

"Ekh..."  

In some of Shukshin's stories, the female does appear in a more positive light. In 'Boots'/'Sapozhki', Sergei's wife does not reproach her husband for buying a pair of expensive white boots for her. In 'Petia', the wife Lial'ka seems to put up happily with her demanding and spoiled husband. Still, these women are developed against the dominant characterization of the hero. Sergei expects that his wife will be furious if he buys the boots and this fear plays a major role in the story. Lial'ka puts up with Petia and his antics for the simple reason that she loves him.
Those women in Shukshin's stories who are not wives of the heroes are often depicted as being young and selfishly concerned with themselves and the impression they are making on others. Another element of this characterization is the fascination with which these young girls view Western culture. Kate ('Ket') in 'Greetings to the Grey One!/'Privet Sivomu!', drinks whiskey, thinks the book *Airport* is great literature, and calls all of her acquaintances by the Western equivalents of their Russian names. Similarly, there is a young salesclerk in 'Post Script'/'Postskriptum' who treats foreign tourists who come to her counter with the utmost respect. However, when two Soviet tourists ask to be shown a souvenir cigarette lighter, she answers them rudely and proceeds to ignore them.

Shukshin's female character is rather superficial and static with few variations. This depiction and portrayal of 'typical' Soviet women allows for a deeper concentration on the psychological development of Shukshin's hero. In 'Two Fingers'/'Bezpalyi', Klara has been unfaithful to her husband Sergei, yet he is able to consider it as only one of life's many trials, which, despite the temporary pain, is necessary to experience. When Ivan Petin's wife abandons him in 'A Storey'/'Raskas', Ivan uses the incident to expound on the fact that people should have a conscience and should be kinder to each other. Mikhail (Mishel') in 'Greetings to the Grey One!' comes to realize the powerful hold which 'Ket' and her pretensions have had on him. As he leaves her apartment after fighting with another of her male friends, Mikhail senses that: 'The
feeling he had was strange: it was bitter and nasty, yet at the same time, with relief, he thought that now he need not come here again. That which was left there behind him - 'Ket's' loving, the contemporary humiliation - had been like a hospital, -dangerous, delirious, and now-quickly away from here without looking back.'

The woman personage in Shukshin's works represents that within society from which the hero is attempting, through his fantasies, to find some relief. She is the unquestioning absorber and reflecter of the new Soviet consumer society, while the hero is selective and wary. He accepts some features such as educational opportunities and a chance to understand life better (this is reflected, in part, by his expanded vocabulary) and, as a consequence, he questions and usually rejects some of the other aspects such as bureaucracy, boorishness ('khamstvo'), and the lack of human soul.

All of Shukshin's secondary and background characters are included in the stories to serve the important function of representing and typifying the social pressures and trends which are necessary to the accurate portrayal of the hero. These personages provide a concrete quality to the environment or society in which the hero must act. Thus it is the hero whom the reader follows with the greatest interest and tension and who receives the sharpest emotional colouration evoking joy, compassion, sympathy, or sorrow.

The diminished characterization of secondary personages does not mean that character development is impoverished in
Shukshin's stories, for it is the 'idée-fixe' of the hero and the way it is developed which leads to great plot dynamism and the revelation of the all-important character of the hero. The heroes of most of the stories from Shukshin's middle period, 1967 to 1972 (and overlapping somewhat even into his last works), appear as 'eccentrics' or in Russian, 'chudiki'. The impression of eccentricity is created through their total psychological and emotional involvement in pursuing their 'idea' which leads them into situations and encounters whose comic or humourous consequences are simply not consistent with the actions and behaviour of people with more 'normal', more accepted standards of behaviour and thought. It is important that Shukshin's use of sub-standard Russian in the form of dialect and jargon in its linguistic and syntactic capacity parallels this incongruity of the hero with the community around him. This point will be discussed in greater length in the following chapter.

It is the element of definite 'strangeness' which makes Shukshin's heroes memorable. The common features in all of these personages are revealed in the spontaneity of action and emotions springing from their passionate natures and their love for and insistence upon truth.

An early story, 'The Critics'/'Kritiki' written in 1964 introduces one of Shukshin's original 'chudiki' who was to evolve greatly by the end of Shukshin's writing career. An old man living in a village is watching a show on television in which an actor is portraying a carpenter. It is obvious that the actor is totally inept and unknowledgeable of this
skill and the old man, not being able to bear the charade, kicks in the television screen.

From the mid-1960s to about 1970, Shukshin's heroes were interesting and unique in that their decisiveness of action, governed by the particular motivating idea of each, led them to genuinely humorous encounters with others around them. The hero was frank and honest, smart and reflective by nature, and despite the circumstances he would find himself in through the combination of these qualities with his 'idea-force', he is never presented to the reader as a comic figure. In this period appeared such stories as 'Chudik', 'Mille pardons, madame,' 'Mikroskop', 'Grin'ka Maliugin', 'Klassnyi Voditel', and 'Vania, ty kak zdes?'. These stories are all based on various types of 'plots' of fortune and the hero in each case has developed an unorthodox way of dealing with the world. He puts his beliefs, concepts and emotions to the test in his interactions and reactions.

Pron'ka, in 'Vania, what are you doing here?'/Vania, ty kak zdes?', is visiting a nearby town when he is approached by a young girl who is looking for a certain 'type' of person to fill a small role in a film. Pron'ka has the look she wants - that of '...a simple lad who is visiting the city for the first time.' He agrees to do the part until he realizes that the director is totally misinformed as to how the country lad, Vania, should speak, act and think. After several humorous exchanges between Pron'ka and the director in which Pron'ka challenges the misconceptions of the director, Pron'ka decides against taking the part.
Grin'ka Maliugin is the hero of a story which bears his name. He is a young man who is considered 'strange' by his fellow villagers and workers. Instead of working for extra pay on a Sunday, Grin'ka would always comb his sandy forelock accurately to the right side, put on his good black pants and zippered jacket and walk about town to the admiring glances of the girls.

The main action occurs when Grin'ka jumps into a gasoline truck which has caught fire and drives it toward the river. He jumps free just before the truck goes off the bank and breaks his leg in the process. Two questions capture the essence of the remaining events of the story. Grin'ka is asked by several people what it was that made him want to risk his life by leaping into the truck and why he had waited until the very last minute to jump clear. Grin'ka simply cannot answer these questions - he just did it. When a young woman comes to interview him for a newspaper, he simply asks her to make up a reason which sounds good.

These early heroes do more acting than pondering. If they do not understand something, they ask, and then state their opinion. If they are 'moved' to do something which seems sudden and inexplicable to the reader, they do it naturally, without thought. They simply do not question why or how they, as individuals, have come to think and act the way they do.

During the early 1970s, Shukshin's hero develops perceptibly. He becomes aware of himself and of his 'oddity'. He realizes that he needs to behave as he does in order to relieve an emptiness, a melancholy, a dissatisfaction which
he senses within himself. He feels good when he is engrossed in his own particular 'fancy.'

Two embodiments of this more mature hero-eccentric present themselves chronologically and developmentally in the stories. The eccentric now becomes a hero who explains his strangeness to himself (and sometimes to others), as being a 'holiday for the soul' - a chance for spiritual freedom unhindered by the constraints of a sophisticated and progressing technological society. He is happy in his temporary, imagined world and refuses to relinquish this time which he has set aside for his soul.

Aliosha Beskonvoinyi will not give up his weekend ritual of the steambath ('bania') to go to work or even to a meeting on the collective farm. He is a model worker for five days a week and no matter how he is begged, regaled, or enticed by the chairman and the council of the kolhoz, he will not work on the weekends. This is because, in the 'bania', something wonderful happens to Aliosha each week.

'God, what a fantastic peace there was in his soul! The children weren't sickly, he had no argument with anyone, he had even been able to lend some money...

...Here life went on - wholly concrete, but also entirely inexplicable - dear and beloved to the extreme...Every unhealthy tendency was completely dismissed by Aliosha, petty thoughts abandoned him, and in his soul settled a feeling of completeness, strength, clarity - life became understandable. That is, it was alongside him, just outside the little window of the 'bania', but Aliosha became unattainable to life, to its hubbub and malice, he became larger and even condescending.'

.......Aliosha came out of the 'bania' when it began to grow dark. He was new and well-steamed...'
The complexity of the hero-eccentric exists only in the response of the reader toward him for the eccentric himself is not always aware of it.

Shukshin's eccentrics find their own outlets in a multitude of ways. A city shopkeeper goes regularly each Saturday to the train station and asks the country folk who are waiting there for trains about a good village which he might move to. But in reality the man has no intention of leaving the city.

A man is temporarily obsessed by the possibility of reconstructing a beautiful old country church as an architectural monument. When he is informed that the church is merely a copy of even older churches in northern Russia, his disillusionment is so great, that he cannot even bear to look at the church when he has to pass it.

The outlet or idea of Shukshin's hero-eccentric need not be profound, long-lasting, or even necessarily of benefit to others. Some of these heroes display less sympathetic qualities in their search for spiritual space.

Gleb Kapustin from the story 'Cut-Off'/ 'Srezal' feels absolutely wonderful when he is debating and verbally battling young students and academics who are natives of his village and have returned for a visit. He savours the precision of his infamous attack on the unsuspecting victim as well as the moment he grabs to close in for the verbal and intellectual 'cut-off'.

'Around the table the conversation was going along in a very friendly manner - it was almost as if Gleb had been forgotten... And here he chose to start the attack on the candidate...'
The 'debate' continues as the candidate gets more and more exasperated with Gleb's bookish phrases and learned clichés. He glances meaningfully at his wife as he passively acknowledges something which Gleb has said.

'And it was pointless, for the glance had been intercepted and Gleb rocketed upwards... Every time in the conversations with knowledgeable people from the village, this moment ensued - when Gleb soared toward the heights. He obviously always awaited such a moment and was joyful when it came.'

Gleb at this point literally bombards the candidate with criticisms and sarcasms and allows no opportunity for the candidate to defend himself.

'... "You may write the word 'narod' hundreds of times in various articles, but your knowledge about it does not increase. Because you do not want to get any closer to this 'narod'. And when you leave this village, you'll have a series of meetings. You've become an expert on the topic, right? Well, it's easy to be made a fool of, right? Good-bye. Spend your time-off pleasantly... amongst the 'narod'.'

Gleb grinned triumphantly and left the cottage. He always left in this way.'

Gleb has found a release for himself by attacking the very thing against which he has a personal grudge, - the younger, well-educated generation, which to Gleb seems to be quickly forgetting or ignoring what he deems to be one of the mainstays of life - the country people and their values and morals. In this vengeful attack, Gleb finds his 'holiday'. These then are Shukshin's heroes who are able to arrange their 'holidays for the soul' and successfully make it fit into the framework of their more 'normal', daily lives. Shukshin's
hero-eccentric may be free in his captivity (like Bronka Pupkov who is a captive of his fantasy to be recognized as Hitler's assassin), or captured in his freedom (like Aliosha Beskonvoinyi in his apparently perfect method of finding a holiday for his soul.) One of the two conditions prevails depending upon the emphasis of the plot and the degree of constraint which the hero feels in his daily life. Shukshin's hero-eccentric does not deal with life's truths in sober, realistic terms. Rather, he deals with the truth of his imagination.\(^{39}\)

Shukshin releases his hero as the eccentric through the vividness and energy of intense realism. Yet, there is a second reality for Shukshin's hero which comes about through elements of process and complexity rather than through imagination and fancy. Such matured heroes represent a further development and sophistication of Shukshin's ability to present a convincing socio-psychological portrait of contemporary Soviet man.

The hero-eccentric now essentially devotes his life, upon occasion even sacrificing it, in search of that 'holiday for the soul', that temporary release from everyday pressures and tensions. Most important, this hero proceeds beyond the search for this release actively and passionately to question why he should need it at all and what it is that is bothering him. From 1971 on, the hero makes increasing reference to the soul in his dialogues and monologues and, coupled with this heightened self-awareness, he appeals to the consciences of others to 'be human' (byt chelovekom).

More often, these hero-eccentrics infringe upon areas
of daily life which are more personal and fundamental than accepted standards of speech and behaviour. They begin to question the accepted lifestyle and the values and morals which are a part of it. These heroes make those around them feel a certain discomfort and guilt at having let their values of good and honour become so easily distorted.

The mature Shukshin hero fully engages our emotional response in a more steady and complex way than the earlier hero-eccentric. This increased complexity lies basically in the fact that this hero is as aware as the reader of his internal conflict. Shukshin's mature eccentric raises or evokes extremely interesting questions concerning life which actually embody the moral vision of the story. This is mainly because the hero now looks for his spiritual freedom in a less active way than did the earlier heroes. His search is of a speculative, philosophical nature.

Shukshin's mature hero frequently asks the 'fundamental questions' with great intensity: questions about the meaning of life, about what death is. He asks these timeless questions in innumerable ways, directly and indirectly, through his actions and his thoughts.

Shukshin's heroes poignantly yet insistently express their need to discover the answers to these secrets. Some, like Maksim Jarikov, feel a physical pain.

"Every Sunday a mood of depression would descend upon him. Real, deep-down, gut-rot depression. Maksim could feel it physically... "...a man has a soul too! Here it is, here, and it aches!" Maksim pointed to his chest. "I'm not making it up. I can feel it elementally - it aches.""

If the hero does not feel a physical pain, then he feels nothing - an oppressive, depressing emptiness in his
present life situation. Despite his questionings, he cannot discover what to do in order to help himself.

In the 1967 story, 'In Profile and Full Face'/'V profil i anfas'), this type of hero appears early and alone in Shukshin's works of that period. Ivan, the hero, cannot be satisfied with his modest and sufficient living as a collective farm worker because he wants more than anything else for his work to have some meaning beyond the material. He does not state this need directly but he is painfully aware of it, and this is seen clearly in his frustrating conversation with an elderly fellow villager which comprises a full half of the story structure. Ivan tries to make the man understand what he himself cannot fully comprehend.

"But I don't know what I'm working for. Do you understand? I was taken on, I do my bit. But if you ask me why, I don't know. Just to stuff myself? Well, okay, then, my belly's full - now what?"

"When you've got enough to eat, you start getting choosy," the old man explained.

"You don't know how it is with us. You had no horizons in your day, so you were satisfied. You were cavemen. I could live the way you used to, but I need something more."

"You can't be bothered to earn fifteen hundred roubles a month, while I used to break my back right through the summer for a few miserable kopecks."

"But I don't need that much money," said Ivan as if to provoke him. "Don't you see that? It's something else I need."" 41

The conversation continues with the two characters talking at cross purposes. The next day, Ivan leaves his village for the town to see if he can find his answers there.
Other of Shukshin's mature hero-eccentrics are able to explain things to others. Sania Neverov is loved by his friends because, as one of them says, he made them "...feel better, more clear in your head, as though you had become an immense, free being, able to fathom the beginning and the end of your life, or as though you had taken the measure of priceless things and understood them all."^42

Yet, this hero has not discovered the truth for which he is searching. When he begins to die, in desperation he tries to find an answer for the last time and for himself.

"I'm not afraid," whispered Sania hastening with his failing strength, "I can face it...But if I could have another year, then I'd accept death. After all, one has to accept it anyway. But it can't happen just like this...This isn't an execution, so how can it just happen like this?"

"Have a little vodka, Sania."

"Another six months! This summer...I don't need anything, I'll just gaze at the sun. Do you know I can't remember a single blade of grass? Who needs my death, when I don't want to die?"... Sania was weeping.

"Fillipp..."

"Yes, Sania."

"Who needs my death? It's so stupid, so stupid. Like a great mindless wheel rolling over you."^43

In one of the last of Shukshin's stories, published in 1974, the hero comes to acknowledge that reflections about the meaning of life and death are agonizing and fruitless in the sense that no definitive answer is ever reached. The narrator of the story is a patient in a hospital, and one night he looks on as the man in the next bed dies.
"A man had ceased to be. After that I lay all night, my heart empty; I wanted to concentrate on some kind of central thought, I wanted - not to understand, no, I'd tried to understand before and couldn't - just to feel, even if only for a moment, only briefly, like that faint little track, so that in my heart or mind just a tiny bit of light should be thrown on what it was, then - there was a man living... Say, we must live; but in that case, why hasn't this damned gift been taken from us, the eternal, tormenting, and useless attempt at understanding: "Why all this?"... But why all this? Why? Ah, well, one just has to go on living without looking back, to go on for the time allotted you: it seems there is nothing so frightening in dying after all."

This hero, the first person narrator in the story, has completed the process of realization and self-consciousness as much as any human being realistically can. He emerges from his tormented questioning with a clearer concept of what he needs to do. He accepts the fact that he is alive and will die and thus should live as best he can for himself and for others.

Shukshin's hero-eccentrics do develop and mature noticeably as the stories themselves progress. On the one hand, this hero is able to resort to fancies and flights of imagination in order to survive. On the other hand, the extension of this character learns how to cope with his reality in a logical and rational way. However, Shukshin does include in his repertoire of heroes two young men, whose immediate social environments and personal circumstances clash with their fancies making it impossible for them to cope. Kol'ka Paratov ('Oh, a wife Saw Her Husband Off to Paris') and Spirka Rastorguev ('The Bastard') commit suicide. Just as Shukshin depicted 'closed' characters who have found the particular answer for which they are searching
only a few times, so he depicts only two characters at the other extreme—those who have completely lost hope in attaining any contentment or satisfaction from life, even of the temporary sort.

It is worth noting too, that any negative characters which we meet in Shukshin's stories reflect social evils such as 'khamstvo' (boorishness) and bureaucracy and the demands which these elements place upon the hero and those around him. His negative heroes and characters fall into social types and generalizations which are readily identified rather than being characterized by any individual or personal negative traits.

Shukshin's hero-eccentric is striving to understand himself as he is simultaneously trying to understand the world around him. He is fragmented and often contradictory. But Shukshin develops an important hero in that he realistically portrays the functioning, malfunctioning, and even the breakdown of an individual within one particular social reality. The Shukshin character is the Soviet man standing some six decades removed from the revolution of 1917. He is also the contemporary man living in a technological, urbanized, and modernized society facing many of the problems which his Western counterpart faces. He is bewildered by urban civilization, but he tries to find a place in it. If he cannot accomplish this, he looks for some sort of exit or release which is of a temporary nature. This modern man has no material need, but this does not compensate for the 'aching soul' which he suddenly becomes aware of. He realizes his dissatisfaction and unhappiness with life and he feels an emptiness which he tries to fill with imaginative, yet
very human escapes, eccentricities, fancies. His reactions and methods of approaching this problem are, of course tempered and coloured by the peculiarities of Russian and Soviet history and modernity, and especially by considerations dealing with the city and the country where there has long been a distinction made between lifestyles, morals, and philosophy. Through his heroes, Shukshin does much more than simply reflect the confusing and often painful transition from rural to urban values. He depicts a universal searching - a part of the total reality made up of a complex of hopes, fears, decisions and desires which are encountered by everyman.
NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

1 V.F. Gorn, 'Nado chelovekom byt', Literatura v shkole, No. 5 (1976), p. 10

2 'rasskaz-stsenka'. The form is a loose combination of several elements. It combines within itself features of the literary genre 'rasskaz' as well as aspects of the dramatic 'stsena' of which 'stsenka' is a diminutive term. As well, 'stsenka' has its own definition: 'A small dramatic work or story depicting episodes of daily life.' S.I. Ozhegov, Slovar' russkogo iazyka, (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Russkii iazyk, 1975).


5 Attention should be paid to the intentionally incorrect spelling of the Russian word 'story' (rasskaz) in the title of this work. The incorrect Russian 'raskas' and the English rendering of the mistake 'storey', serve to initiate the characterization of the hero.


7 V. Shukshin, Izbran. proiz., t.1, p. 163.

8 V. Shukshin, Izbran. proiz., t. 1, p. 409.


10 Sov. Lit., No. 10, p. 16.

11 Sov. Lit., No. 10, p. 17.


13 Sov. Lit., No. 9, p. 20.

14 Sov. Lit., No. 10, p. 17.

16 V. Shukshin, Izbran. proiz., t. 1, p. 304.
17 Izbran.proiz., t.1, p. 305.
18 Izbran.proiz., t.1, p. 308.
19 'Impersonal direct speech' is my own tentative translation of a technical term which is later discussed in detail. Refer ahead to Chapter Two, p. 112—, footnote 7.
20 Izbran.proiz., t.1, pp. 307-308.
21 Izbran.proiz., t.1, p. 308.
22 Izbran.proiz., t.1, p. 309.
25 V. Shukshin, Izbran. proiz., t.1, p. 216.
27 Bakhtin, p. 19
29 Snowball Berry Red, p. 47.
30 Snowball Berry Red, p. 47.
31 V. Shukshin, Izbran.proiz., t.1, pp. 399-400.
32 V. Shukshin, Izbran.proiz., t.1, p. 23.
33 V. Shukshin, Izbran.proiz., t.1, p. 416.
34 'Chudik' is a word of popular parlance which bears the same meaning as the contemporary standard Russian word, 'chudak'. The definition of both is that of 'a strange person, with strange qualities; an unusual person.', Slovar' russkogo iazyka.
37 V. Shukshin, Izbran.proiz., t.1, p. 176.
38 V. Shukshin, _Izbran.proiz._, t.1, p. 178.

39 Shukshin's 'chudik' has a counterpart in Western literary criticism - a character whom W.H. Harvey suggests be called the 'card' in his article 'The Human Context' in _Theory of the Novel_, ed. P. Stevick (New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1967), pp. 231-261. The similarity is increased by Harvey's suggestion that the 'card' desires a 'holiday from existence' which parallels the search of Shukshin's 'chudik' for the 'holiday for the soul'. For both characters, the fantasy which provides this 'holiday' is as real as the limitations placed upon them in their daily lives. The 'card' and the 'chudik' both enjoy a particular type of freedom which stems from the fact that they are triumphantly themselves and that they seem to be immune to the knocks they take as they assert their natures.

42 Geoffrey A. Hosking, trans., in _Snowball Berry Red_, p. 79.
43 Geoffrey A. Hosking, trans., in _Snowball Berry Red_, p. 84.
CHAPTER II

DIRECT SPEECH FORMS IN THE SHUKSHIN STORY: LANGUAGE AND DIALOGUE

- 1 -

Just as in the structure of his story-scenes Shukshin subordinates stylistic and structural elements of plot and narration to the manifestation of his hero-eccentric, so he chooses and utilizes dynamic, dramatic speech forms which will best reveal this hero successfully. The direct speech forms and the lexicon employed in them mirror not only the personal multifaceted development which the hero undergoes, but the changes occurring within Soviet society itself, changes which initiate and influence the spiritual, emotional, and psychological growth of the hero. Thus the forms of direct speech which Shukshin works with are of interest not only from the standpoint of linguistic structure and literary style, and because of their social-historical origins, but also in order to see how Shukshin selects, constructs and parallels them to the thematic structure of the stories.

In Shukshin's stories, it is the quantity of direct speech forms and the resultant conversational quality which are the most obvious stylistic and structural elements. The predominance of direct speech is totally in keeping with the structure of the 'story-scene' which Shukshin adapted and developed for his work as it facilitates the direct depiction of the hero and of the process of change which he experiences. Shukshin acknowledged the emphasis upon direct speech in his work when, during
an interview, he said: 'Direct speech allows me to diminish the descriptive section a little: what kind of person? How does he think? What does he want? In the end we certainly establish an understanding of the person - having listened to him. Thus he could not tell a lie - he doesn't know how, even if he would like to.'

What initially appears to be a simple and straightforward usage of direct speech by Shukshin deserves to be examined in greater detail in order to determine how or to what extent its usage is peculiar to Shukshin's writing as compared to other writers of short stories. In this Chapter I will examine the ways that Shukshin employs direct speech. These forms give his work its realistic quality, for through the syntax and lexicon an illusion of objectivity and authenticity is created.

A first impression made upon the casual reader is that dialogical exchanges constitute most of Shukshin's writing style. Upon closer reading and investigation of the works, it becomes clear that, while dialogue is indeed the dominant and most important direct speech form, there are other forms which perform vital individual functions within the story while supplementing and enhancing the dialogue. Thus, in the first part of this chapter, I will discuss the structural and stylistic features of four direct speech forms most common in Shukshin's work. I will reserve a more concentrated study of Shukshin's dialogue with respect to the distinctive lexicon and syntax which composes it for the second part of the chapter.

From the general linguistic material with which Shukshin
has elected to work, he creates speech forms which have become identified with his stories and their heroes, for his means of expression is individualized and singular. Important aspects of Shukshin's unique mode of expression lie in the relationship which exists in the remarks exchanged between the characters, as well as in the peculiarities of the movement of thought which manifests itself in the direct speech forms. For example, in a dialogical form, a conventional way of developing an idea is to have an assertion followed by a response of some nature with the construction displaying a binominal unity. One of the characteristics of Shukshin's dialogue is that it displays a polynomial unity in that the relationship between statement and response is tightly bonded to the narrative. In the story 'Shtrakhi k portretu', the movement of the hero-eccentric Kniazev's thought is an example of Shukshin's characteristic dialogue structure:

"Rest is rest, it's all the same how you spend yourtime."

"There does exist an active rest," Kniazev interrupted this absurd attempt to instruct him, "and a passive rest. -Along with rest, the active type suggests some sort of wholly-conformable arrangement".

"Your head can spin from these 'arrangements'", chuckled Sil'chenko.

"I'm not talking about 'these' arrangements, but about wholly-conformable ones", emphasized Kniazev. And he looked at Sil'chenko sternly and calmly. "Do you understand the difference?"

Sil'chenko didn't like it either when people talked with him as if they were teaching him.

"No, I don't get it. Explain it please."
"What's your profession?"

"What has that got to do with it?"

"Well, it does..."

"A make-up artist."

At this, Kniazev grew bolder; his blue eyes gleamed with a merry mocking light; he became insolently condescending.

"Have you ever been told how burial mounds are filled in?", he asked. He felt very satisfied when it came to giving an account of his ideas.

Sil'chenko was completely unprepared for these 'burial mounds'; he was baffled. "What's this about burial mounds?"

"Have you ever seen how they are filled in?"

"Well, have you seen how..." 

The exchange continues, but from the above segment, one can see just how tightly the dialogue is bound to the narrative. If one were to read the dialogue only, Kniazev's train of thought would be incomprehensible as it jumps around from rest to activity, profession, and burial mounds. Even with the supplementation of the narration, the idea which Kniazev is attempting to elucidate is obscure. Obviously, the point which he is making is motivated by the'idée-fixe' which lives within him.

Shukshin's monological forms display a unity which is likewise tightly bonded to the narrative. In fact, the monologue is more dependent upon the narration to inform the reader of mood and movement, both of a stylistic and of a conceptual nature. In Shukshin's stories, it is very common to find a dialogical situation which almost imperceptibly passes over
into a monological one, a task accomplished by brief, subtle narrative remarks. In 'Zaletniy', Sania is discussing the circumstances of his life with his friends from the village, but this conversation ends as a monologue with an intonation which is searching and at times almost desperate.

"...My brother sends me money. He's rich. Or at least no, not exactly rich, but he has enough to live on. And he gives me some."

That the two peasants could understand: his brother pitied him.

"If only I could start all over again!" On Sania's thin, dark face his muscles and sharp cheekbones stood out in ridges. His eyes shone feverishly. He was worked up. "I would explain what I know now: that man is an accidental, beautiful, and agonizing attempt on Nature's part to understand itself. A fruitless attempt, I assure you, because in nature along with man there lives a canker. Death! And death is unavoidable, but we will ne-e-er take in that fact. Nature will never understand itself. So it gets angry and takes vengeance in the form of man. Like an evil...mm..." Sania's further words were inaudible. In effect, he was talking to himself, for the peasants got tired of straining to hear him and began to discuss their own affairs.

"Love? Yes," Sania muttered. "But love only complicates and confuses everything..."'

The narrative interjections into the dialogue/monologue thus reflect the changes in the direct speech environment as well as the mood of the characters. In Shukshin's writing then, semantic and stylistic devices are as important to the effectiveness of the direct speech form as the actual linguistic portrayal of the remarks. These features are often ignored in the concentration on examining the lexical and syntactic elements of Shukshin's work.
Shukshin's direct speech form, and particularly his dialogues and monologues, are dramatized. Through them, he attempts to convey the dramatism, tension, and contradictions of a situation. The individual remarks of his heroes and characters are definitely laconic and elliptic despite the length at which some may speak. Because in structure, syntax, and form Shukshin's monologues and dialogues simulate the typical features of real forms, the remarks of the characters are intensified in their expressive capacities, and the thoughts and feelings of the characters are uniquely but authentically communicated.

As Shuksin's work developed and matured from the early stories to those of the late 1960s, he began more frequently to develop his heroes in such a way as would promote a need in them to question and to assess the circumstances and events which affected them in their daily lives. A reflective quality appears in the heroes' dialogues and monologues, a quality which is sometimes expressed thoughtfully, gently, or quietly, as opposed to other times when it comes forth loudly, emotionally and aggressively. When Shukshin's hero begins to meditate upon experiences which have been evoked by the immediate dialogical situation, it is typical that his interlocutors are only able to supply brief remarks or simple confirmation that they agree, disagree, or are listening. In 'Sluchai v restorane', the nameless hero-eccentric intently tries to convince a young man who has sat down at his table, that the young female singer in the restaurant must be saved.
"Ah, what an empty life I've lived, Vania!
What a waste... I haven't even loved. Been afraid to love, I really have."

"Why?"

The old man wasn't listening to him, he just went on talking.

"Ah, once there was a girl like that, and she used to sing too... It was heart-rending. And I used to sit like this and listen. She needed to be saved too."

"...Better if I'd done something silly, better to have been a drunkard. Perhaps I'd have been a bit bolder."

"...Never once did a rash thing. Can you believe it?"

"What's so bad about that?"

"Not one offence. It's revolting. It's terrible!"

In 'Veruiu!', Maksim Iarikov's ponderings about why he feels an ache in his soul lead him to the breaking point in an exchange with his wife.

"...You won't understand."

"Why not? Explain and I will understand."

"Well, look, you've got all the normal parts of the body - arms, legs... and what not. What size they are is another question, but they're all more or less in the right place. If your leg hurts, you feel it. If you're hungry, you get something to eat. Okay?"

"Well?..."

"But a man has a soul too! Here it is, here, and it aches!"

Maksim pointed to his chest. "I'm not making it up. I can feel it elementally - it aches!"

"Have you got any other aches?"
..."Ask me who I hate more than anyone in the world, and I'll tell you: people who have no soul. Or a rotten one. Talking to you is like knocking my head against a brick wall."

"Huh! Windbag!"

"Oh, get lost!"

A similar, meditative element is common to Shukshin's monological forms and especially internalized monologues, which are found in the stories of his later period with more frequency. These internal monologues consistently bear great similarity to an uttered direct speech form, for the lexicon and syntax is not altered. An example of Shukshin's internal monologue is to be found in the story 'The Bastard'/'Suraz' in which the hero, Spirka Rastorguev, discusses alternatives with himself after he has twice been driven out of the home of a gymnastics teacher and his young, pretty wife.

'Well chump... You're trash, aren't you? Thrown out like some mangy creature, and you... Well, now! ... How I was beaten! Laughing and playing... I was dragged out, trampled. But what kind of person are you? After all, people will laugh at you. And the teacher will be the first one to laugh. What are you? Not a single old woman would allow herself to be treated like that.'

With his internal monologue, Shukshin is able to portray both the emotion and the process of rationalization which occur in Spirka's mind. The syntax is elliptic in the extreme, jumping from one thought to another and leaving thoughts incomplete, which serves to indicate the mental and emotional activity which the hero is experiencing. Thus, the thoughts of the hero are structurally and stylistically represented as direct speech even though not a word is uttered to anyone. However, it is typical of Shukshin's
direct speech style that while employing internal monologue on one level, he also includes a good amount of actual dialogue between characters at another level within the same story. His works 'Thoughts'/'Dumy' and 'Uncle Ermolai' illustrate this feature well. Both involve flashbacks in the hero's mind (which are revealed through the use of internal monologue), while the story is set in the present with the hero acting and conversing with others around him.

Shukshin employs two other types of direct speech forms in his works which are neither as discernible nor as tangible as the direct speech types of monologue or dialogue. These forms have been identified by various Soviet critics as 'impersonal direct speech' and 'free direct speech'. Their regular usage by Shukshin enhances and enriches the overall impression of the conversational, concise quality created in the works. The basic distinguishing feature between 'impersonal' and 'free' direct speech forms and the forms of dialogue and monologue, lies in the fact that the former are not uttered remarks although they do bear close resemblance to such remarks.

Next to the dynamism of portrayal afforded a character by his use of dialogue and monologue, 'free direct speech' accounts for the easily perceived conversational and intonational qualities of Shukshin's work. Morphologically and syntactically, the 'free' form of direct speech corresponds to uttered forms and is differentiated largely by its graphic presentation. Shukshin's most common method of employing 'free direct speech' is in combination with a narrative introduction of one or two sentences. Thus,
indirect and direct speech forms are enclosed together within one paragraph. In this way, the 'free' form of direct speech is especially effective since it appears to continue the monologue or dialogue into the text of the narration, but without the aid of formal markers such as quotation marks or paragraphing. In 'The Insult'/'Obida', Sashka Ermolaiev's mental state is vividly depicted as he waits to talk to an elderly stranger who has been an accomplice to the insult hurled at him by a shopclerk.

'He decided to wait for that one in the raincoat. To talk a bit. How? To ask: how long are we going to aid boorishness? Why should he jump to such toadies? What's it for? Why the accursed desire to encourage that rude, boorish saleswoman, the office clerk, simply boors - to oblige whatever comes along? Surely, we ourselves breed such ill-manners...us. Nobody delivered them to us, they weren't dropped in parachutes...' 10

'Free direct speech' frequently acquires a rhetorical quality in many of the stories. Along with the type of questioning found in the above excerpt which urgently demands an answer, the 'free' form can also take on a reflective quality to which neither answer nor comment is necessary. Fillipp Turin, the hero of the story 'In the Autumn'/'Osen'iu', goes through emotional anguish and mental turmoil when he learns that the woman whom he has loved all his life, has died. We are able to sense his agitation directly, through the use which Shukshin makes of 'free' direct speech.

'The ferry was approaching this shore. Again the chains clinked and the motors set up a howl...Fillip again stood at the scull and looked at the closed car. It was unfathomable...Never in his life did he think: what if Mar'ia was to die? Not once did he think that. If there was something he wasn't ready for, it was her death. When the closed car began to drive off the ferry, Fillipp felt an unbearable pain
in his chest. He was seized by an uneasiness. What should he do? It was time to leave. Definitely. He shouldn't be like this: he'd follow with his eyes, and that would be all. What to do? The uneasiness all the more commanded him, he did not move from the spot, and he felt completely unlike himself.

In confusion, indecision, and emotion which the hero experiences are accessible to the reader. The immediacy which the 'free' direct speech form gives to a scene is vital to Shukshin's character portrayal, for the intonation and mood created by the usage of such a form substitutes for the possibilities of movement and gesture suggested by an uttered speech form. 'Free direct speech' is an essential speech form for the demands of the brevity which characterizes Shukshin's story-scene. Shukshin consciously uses the form as a means of extending the dynamism of fast-moving, strong dialogue into the spheres of narrator commentary and authorial point of view. It is especially important to Shukshin in the latter areas since 'free' direct speech is devoid of the dryness of indirect speech and commentary and is able to maintain the emotion and authenticity found in the uttered speech of Shukshin's characters.

In Shukshin's story-scenes there is a strong relationship between the actual dialogue or separate uttered remarks in a given story, and the direct speech form identified as 'impersonal'. 'Impersonal direct speech' contains within itself a reproduction of the actual speech of the hero as well as the barely perceptible speech of the narrator which is conveyed through the prism of the hero's consciousness. The types of 'impersonal direct speech' vary in complexity within the Shukshin story-scene depending
upon a number of stylistic features such as the degree which the hero's speech penetrates that of the narrator, the extent of correspondence between the point of view of the narrator and the hero, and the degree of mutually-shared experience between that which is conveyed in the narration and that conveyed in the form of 'impersonal direct speech'. For example, in the story 'Petia', the narrator does not participate in the dialogue but comments on what he sees and hears from the side.

'Late at night, Petia and Lial'ka return home. Petia is a bit under the weather. He sits down on the porch steps and doesn't want to go any further.

"Come on, Petia! Petia dear." Lial'ka calls him.

"Don' wanna!" says Petia. "Don' wanna!"

"Petia!" Lial'ka is almost in tears. "You've tired me out as it is. You're so heavy dear. Come along, Petia darling? Come on, dear. Have some pity on me! Come on, my darling, you'll just roll into bed and be off to sleep in winking... Won't you now?"

"Don' wanna", grunts the lead-heavy Petia...

Somehow she manages to get Petia up the steps...

And all of a sudden I am struck by the realization that she actually loves him, does Lial'ka. She loves her Petia. Why the devil should I sit here making surmises? She loves him...'

The entire excerpt is conversational and as dynamic and real as if we are actually hearing the dialogue between Petia and Lial'ka without the mediation of the narrator. There is a clear separation between the narration and the element of 'impersonal direct speech' found in the comments of the first
person observer even though both are modes of conveying information about what has occurred.

In the story 'Fading Blossoms'/'Vianet, propadaet', another variation of the 'impersonal' form of direct speech is utilized. A character who is not participating in the immediate dialogue but is passively observing, makes an evaluation of the behaviour and speech of one of the speakers. All comments are presented through the eyes of the little boy who is watching the scene.

"Raining, is it, Vladimir Nikolaievich?"

"Drizzling. It's the time of year for it now, is it not?" Uncle Volodia spoke very neatly somehow, placing his words like toy bricks, first in one position, then - after due consideration - in another. "Yes, the season...What is it today? The twenty-seventh? In three days...we shall be in October."

"We shall that", mother sighed.

Slavka was surprised that his mother, usually so clamorous and sharp-tongued, should always quietly agree with everything Uncle Volodia said. She was hardly herself. She blushed and dithered...

"Still playing are you, Slavka?", Uncle Volodia asked.

"He plays", mother shot back. "He's at it as soon as he comes home from school. I'm tired of it - ringing in my ears."

This was a whopping lie and Slavka marvelled inwardly.

Because the narrator and the little boy Slavka share the same point of view regarding the behaviour of Slavka's mother and the characteristics of Uncle Volodia, the conversational exchanges which occur can be presented directly to the reader in combination with the immediate reaction of the observers.
Narrative intervention does not impose itself but instead fits appropriately and concisely into the dialogical structure of the story.

Shukshin is able to use the devise of 'impersonal direct speech' to its full potential in the portrayal of the psychology of his hero-eccentric. Just as reality and the reality of the imagination are counterposed in the revelation of character as well as in theme, the same dualism is strengthened by Shukshin's use of direct speech forms. A favourite method of characterizing his hero-eccentric, is to use 'impersonal direct speech' in combination with an actual uttered remark. The remark is divided into two forms, the pronounced and unpronounced, and thus has an important impact at the interior and superficial levels of the hero's consciousness. For example, the hero in the story 'The Odd-Ball'/'Chudik', turns in a fifty rouble note which he has found lying on the floor of a produce store. He tells the cashier with pride that: "Where I'm from, for example, we don't toss around this kind of money." As he walks away, he feels good, and the sentence which he has uttered embodies his pride. "Chudik repeats the situation mentally; he thought it all over - how easily and casually he had said it: "Where I'm from, for example, we don't toss around this kind of money." In such a speech combination of uttered remarks and 'impersonal direct speech', the hero is shown imagining the effect and impact of what he has said upon those around him.

From this combination of the real and the subsequently subjectivized reproduction, Shukshin proceeds with his hero-eccentric
farther into the realm of the imagined reality. Using the form of 'impersonal direct speech', Shukshin's hero responds in his imagination to an event or conversational exchange which has actually taken place. The following excerpt from the 1972 story 'How the Rabbit Flew in a Balloon'/'Kak zaika letal na vozdushnykh sharikakh', demonstrates how Shukshin employs this technique. In his imagination, Egor produces a retort to the uncooperative remarks of a ticket-seller with whom he had earlier had a conversation. He goes to the ticket office himself, to kiosk number three but he finds that '...it wasn't her when he approached the wicket. If it had been her, Egor would have said to that woman in the little window...He would have said. "It seems that one ticket has been found after all, eh? Oh, you...Well, how did that come about, my dear one? And you sit looking so stern and just. "I've already told you, no tickets!" But one call - and a ticket, it turns out, is available. That means that you should say: "For you - there is none". And the look, the look - one can't get near you! There isn't anything like it except in a military cap." Well, perhaps, he wouldn't have said it so sarcastically...'"

Such usage of 'impersonal direct speech' successfully adds to the portrayal of the hero and to the elucidation of his perspectives on the world around him. Frequently, such forms take on strong satirical overtones as the excerpt above.

Shukshin treats as reality a situation or an event which the hero-eccentric has imagined for himself in its entirety. The use of the 'impersonal direct speech' form is typical of
the stories in which the fantasy of the hero-eccentric is especially deep-rooted. The hero further reveal the incongruity between their reality and the accepted reality in a direct way, for Shukshin exposes the psychology of the hero at work. This is evident in 'The Operation of Efim Pianykh'/'Operatsiia Efima Pianykh' as the character mentally sets the scene for himself and for the reader.

'The closer Efim got to the hospital, the more unnerved and cowardly he became...Well, let's say they admitted him without having to wait in line.

The doctor. A young, imposing woman.

"What's the matter with you?"

"A splinter."

"Where?"

"There."

"Where's 'there'?"

"Well, there..."

"Show it to me.

My God! Why was I given such a sentence?! Couldn't the scoundrel have got him just a bit higher!' 16

This excerpt anticipates the lack of congruence which can occur between an imagined situation and the situation which really does occur. But Shukshin makes this non-coincidence between actual and imagined more precise by counterposing the imagined flow of a situation to the way in which it occurs in reality.

"I've begun to write my work, Anna Afanasyevna. 'Letters from the Hinterland. Notes of a Doctor'... Solodovnikov turned toward Anna Afanasyevna...Anna
Afanasyevna, the head doctor was a considerate, mother-hen type...who, having read the 'Notes' in their manuscript says in amazement:

"It's just like a novel!" - "All right, but as a doctor does this interest you?" - "Very much! There are simply the most wonderful things in it!" - "And as for yourself...you don't take offence at the author?" - "Well, of course not, what is there to be offended about? It's all true..."

"...So you've already begun to write?" asked Anna Afanasyevna. "Some kind of notes. Is that why you're late?"

Solodovnikov was offended by the head doctor: a martinet in a skirt. Only one thing, the sheet iron was on her mind."

The flow and direction of the dialogue which the hero Solodovnikov imagines will take place is completely opposite to the form which the dialogue does take between himself and the head doctor. Several elements are repeated in both the real and imagined versions. The reaction of Anna Afanasyevna to his literary endeavor is quite the opposite to that which the doctor-author had dreamed it would be. The 'mother hen' image which Solodovnikov projects for the head doctor is not upheld in his estimation of her in real life as a 'martinet'.

Shukshin's use of the 'impersonal' direct speech form allows him the freedom to create situations and conversations which exist only within the mind of the hero, yet are very realistic to the reader. 'Impersonal direct speech' as used by Shukshin may be considered as direct speech which has forfeited its conventional stylistic and graphic form and has taken on the function of being a facet of the hero's consciousness. The support which this form gives Shukshin's socio-psychological
emphasis on the development of the character of his hero is vital for he is able to delve into the consciousness of the hero and find there a dynamic world which at times reflects and at other times distorts the real world.

It is the composite structure of the Shukshin story-scene which concerns us. The mutually complementary and supplementary features of the forms and variations of dialogue, monologue, 'free' and 'impersonal' direct speech are responsible for the critical and public success of Shukshin's stories. Through the application of such speech forms, Shukshin creates the linguistically diverse and conversationally agile quality with which his stories have become associated.

I would now like to investigate briefly the stylistic means by which Shukshin developed an individualized means of expression from the general linguistic materials with which he chose to work and which became characteristic of the author and of his type of hero. Because Shukshin's direct speech forms are all designed specifically to represent the concrete speech and thought of the hero, Shukshin's figurative system is not extensive. The images which Shukshin does create are expressed largely in terms of the simile, metaphor, personification, and the epithet, all of which represent the figures of speech most common to and widespread in popular and regional dialectical lexicons.

Generally, the images are vivid and concise and are offered to the reader either through direct speech forms or through a descriptive narration. The brevity of the image is concurrent with the elliptic nature of Shukshin's conversational
exchanges and with the type of dialect which Shukshin employs. The basic figures of speech, simile and personification are present in his works in large amount reflecting the propensity of popular language and conversation toward these devices.

"Dovol'nyi-to. Zhmurissia,kak kot na solnyshke..." (1:335)

"Priroda nikogda sebia ne poimet...Ona vzbesilas' i mstit za sebia v litse cheloveka..."' (1:183).

'Po voskresen'iam navalivalas' osobennaia toska... Maksim fizicheski chustvoval ee, gadinu: kak esli by neopriatnaia, ne sovsem zdroviaa baba, bessovestnaia s tiazhelym zapakhom izo rta, obsharivala evo vsevo rukami...' (Besedy:120)

"Biurokratizm, on, znaete, raz'edaet ne tol'ko uchrezhdeniia, - sochuvstvenno zagovoril starichok. -Vot zdes'...zdes' on proiavliaetsia v naibolee urodlivoi forme."' (Besedy:47)

In those stories in which Shukshin's hero is actively engaged in dialogue and monologue, there is generally a synecdochal image included representing one of the secondary characters. These personages pass through the hero's consciousness and are revealed to the reader by their strongest, most vital quality.

'Plashch ostanovilsia, nedobro ustavilsia na Sashku.' (1:209)

'I opiat' vskochil i khotel skol'znut' pod c chudovishchnyi shatun - k gorlu fizkul'turnika. No vtoroi shatun korotko dvinul evo v cheliust' snizu...' (1:195)

'A small neat head appears round the door. Two clear eyes, their lids still slightly puffy from sleep... He's in love with that neat little head and never tells her about it.' (Sov. Lit,9 (1975);38-39)

A figurative device of which Shukshin is fond is the use of names which characterize the essential features of a
personage in one word. These are more revealing of character than a simple nickname and may be considered as a type of synecdoche since they are applied only to 'anonymous' characters. Because we know nothing about the personage other than what the connotation in the characterizing name provides, the image that we have of these characters is based on the name alone. In the satirical story 'Three Graces'/ 'Tri Gratsii', Shukshin uses his name-characterization effectively.

'Sperva korotko opishu ikh.
Nomer odin. Tikhaia s vidu, v ochkakh, korotkonogaia...
Budem nazyvat' ee Tikhushnitsa.
Nomer dva. Za sorok. Krupnaia, s vishnevoi borodavkoi na shee. Govorit gromko, uverenno...
Budem nazyvat' ee Deiatel'.
Nomer tri. Ryzhevolosaia... Stremitel'naia
v mysliakh, master zamochnykh skvazhin...Budem nazyvat' ee Letiashchaia po volnam. Mozhno prosto Ryzhaia.'

(1:255)

Such characterization-by-name is found in several stories and is often included in the title of such stories as 'Chudik', 'Psikhopat', 'Khmyr', 'Ryzhyi'. The character of these heroes is set at the beginning of the story, and because the hero remains constant, with his actions and interactions with others around him proving the accuracy of the appellation, the characterization found in his name makes him akin to the heroes of the Russian folk-tale, the 'skazka'.

In fact, another level of imagistic vocabulary in Shukshin's work does find its source in Russian oral folk-art which extends a tremendous influence over Shukshin's work. Not infrequently, his narrative is enhanced by lexical and structural elements of the 'skazka', the most popular form of oral folk-art.
Such inclusions are evident from the titles of several stories such as 'Kak zaika letal na vozduzhnykh sharikakh' and 'Do tretikh petukhov'. They are also seen in the opening lines of many of his works.

'Zhil-byly v sele Cherbrovka nekto Semka Rys'...' (1:244)

'V raigorodok N. priekhali eti, kotorye po vertikal'noi stene na mototsiklakh ezdut.' (1:362)

'Davno-davno eto bylo! Tak davno, chto vspominat neokhota, kogda eto bylo. Eto bylo davno i prekrasno.' (1:403)

Shukshin is sensitive not only to the role and potential of the spoken word, but also to the effect and mood which the use of folk songs and poetry can create. Songs are present within the structure of several of Shukshin's stories and he uses them to attune the reader emotionally to the theme of his work.

'Potom Antip zaigral veseluiu...
Oh, tam, ri-ta-tam,
Ritatushen'ki moi,
Pokhodite, poguliaite,
Po-ba-lui-tisia!
"..Kakuiu zhelaete, mademuazel' frau?"
"Pro Volodtsiu-molodtsa."
"Ona tiazhelaia, nu ee!"
"Nichevo. Ia poplachu khot' malen'ko."
Oh, ne veiti-sia chaiki nad morem
- zapel Antip,-
Vam-nekuda, bednen'kim, sest'.
Sletaite v Sibir', v krai dalekii,
Snesite pechal'nu-ia vest'.
...Marfa zakhlupala.
"Antip, a Antip!.. Prosti ty menia, esli ia chem-nibud' tebia obizhaiu," progovorila ona skvoz' slezy.
"Erunda", skazal Antip. --"Ty menia tozhe prosti, esli ia vinovatyi."' (1:29)

The above scene is from the early story 'Alone'/'Odni'.

An elderly couple tries to come to terms with their differing views about what is important in life. The songs, happy and sad, reflect
their many years of life together and reconcile the situation between them to one of compromise and understanding.

Words from folk songs are found in Shukshin's story titles throughout his literary career. The words to the songs either appear within the text of the story itself ('Vianet, propadaet', "Zhena muzha v Parizh provozhala", V voskresen'e Mat'-Starushka') or are included as an epigraph to the story, ('I razigralis' zhe koni' pole'). The songs thus become leitmotifs of the stories in which they appear. In 'A Wife saw her Husband off to Paris', the use of the song is especially poignant for it is the hero's temporary release from the pressures in his daily life and it also reflects the tragedy of his inevitable suicide.

"Kazhduiu nedeliu, v subbotu vecherom, Kol'ka Paratov daet vo dvore kontsert. Vynosit trekhriadku s malinovym mekhom, razvorachivaet ee, i:
A zhena muzha v Parizh provozhala,
Nasushila emu sukharei...
...Molchat vokrug, budto dogadyvaiutsia: paren'
vypliasyvaet kakuiu-to svoiu zataennuiu gor'kuiu bol'.' (1:232-234)

But Kol'ka's life is not as gay as his song, and just as the words of the song begin the tragic story of Kol'ka Paratov, so they are recalled just before his suicide.

"'Tak?", sprosil sebia Kol'ka. "Znachit, zhena muzha v Parizh provozhala?". Zakryl okno, zakryl fortouchku...Vzhal karandash i krupno napisal na belom kraeshke gazety: 'Dochen'ka, papa uekhal v komandirovku.' (1:232-234)

A feature also of Shukshin's titles is that many of them are symbolic and more organically interwoven into the narrative
of the story than is usual. 'Suraz' for example, is a typically Siberian word which is not found in any dictionary of the Russian language. It is a powerful word with multiple meanings, embracing the notion of illegitimate birth as well as that of a mischievous event, a distress. The hero, Spirka Rastorguev, is 'suraz' and the application of the word to him is appropriate. It foretells the twisted fate of the young man which we come to learn during the course of the story.

'Kalina Krasnaia', the name of another of Shukshin's works, is a popular epithet and an image bound up with folk belief. The guelder rose is the folk symbol of a belated, often tragic love which is unrealizable.

In his attempt to depict the characters and their circumstances realistically, Shukshin turns to the words, expressions and figurative speech which are found in the vocabulary of the characters. These lexical and semantic elements are used spontaneously by the characters, for Shukshin tries, whenever possible, to speak about the subject in the large of the subject itself.
A detailed discussion of Shukshin's dialogue has been placed at the end of my investigation of the author's use of direct speech forms because his dialogue, more than any other of the forms, is greatly dependent upon the lexicon from which it is constructed. Whereas other direct speech types are essentially psychological and revelatory of mood, state of mind and emotion because of their subjectivized natures, dialogue depends upon the objective reproduction of thought and verbal exchanges with all of the subtleties and nuances inherent in these forms. Through the externalized quality of dialogue, the internal, sometimes spiritual process of change which is occurring within the hero, comes to the surface.

It is, in fact, the dialogue which is the driving force behind the manifestation of the hero in the majority of Shukshin's stories and is a compensating factor for the generally diminished role of plot.

In some ways, the use of dialogue to reveal effectively a hero is more difficult than to simply allow the reader into the mind of the personage as one might with internal monologue or other direct speech types. The hero must be understood through his verbal relations, reactions, and communications with others. Because Shukshin's dialogic forms are characterized by their laconicism, they contain only those thoughts, emotions, or feelings which are essential to the story. Such syntactic features of conversation as exclamations and the omission of verbal forms, as well as the utilization of stylistic elements such as the
pause or a sudden change of topic or thought, attest to the elliptic quality characteristic of Shukshin's work.

The individual words which Shukshin's characters and particularly his heroes use to express themselves become symbols and indicators of their portrayed environments, for often, if the words do not convey facts and events, they do create an internal and subjective reality. Bronka Pupkov, Hitler's would-be assassin, is a prime example, for through Bronka's dialogue we come to understand him as a complete person who possesses needs and desires no matter how strange these may seem to us.

The Shukshin dialogue is never abstract despite the eccentric and fanciful ideas propounded by the various heroes and despite the often difficult vocabulary which is drawn from the little-known Siberian dialect, or a socially-rooted dialect. Shukshin takes this concrete vocabulary and expertly reconstructs the colloquial daily speech of the Russian countryside, or the conversational or technical speech of various strata of Russian society. He does this with great skill, transferring the shape, expression, and naturalness inherent in these lexicons into his literary dialogue. Through the use of dialects in his work, Shukshin accomplishes an important task—he introduces and familiarizes the reader with the unique thought, philosophy, and disposition of the segments of the Soviet population which use the distinctive lexicons.
Shukshin has a natural and informed command of all of the vocabularies with which he works in his stories. The particular Siberian dialect which is so often used, is, in effect, his 'first language', while some of the social dialects were subsequently acquired through personal contact and experience. Shukshin thus possesses the advantage of being able to supplement his use of dialect with a conscious application of literary devices. This combination of elements accentuates both his talent as a writer and the unusual, often beautiful properties of the language of his dialogues.19

On most occasions, the logical construction, clarity, assurance, and emotion of the speech of the Shukshin hero so captures the attention that the external uniqueness of the speech is hardly perceived. Regionalisms, coarseness, and even at times obscenities may be included in the language, but they have all been accepted into the bounds of the literary vocabulary for they are necessary to the emotional and moral effects which Shukshin is striving to create.

Let us now briefly examine the aspects of the term 'dialect' before looking more closely at the dialect types and conversational style in Shukshin's stories. In Teoriia Literatury, the classic work of the formalist Tomasevskii, the question of dialect is addressed.20 Tomasevskii delineates two types of dialect occurrences within the literary milieu, both of which are found regularly in Shukshin's writing. The first involves the use of the vocabulary, grammar, or pronunciation of an ethnic or regional group. Such forms,
termed 'regionalisms' or 'provincialisms', are the most obvious occurrences of dialect which appear in a literary work. As such, they have also been the forms most criticized by literary critics. Shukshin wrote very few stories in which all of the occurrences of direct speech are written in the dialect of the Siberian village, contrary to the picture which is put forward in some negative criticism of Shukshin's work. The stories in which this does occur ('Odni', 'Vianet, propadaet', 'Volki') are found in his earlier, pre-1970 works.

The second type of dialect occurrence found in Shukshin's stories involves the use of that category of speech identified with separate and definite social groups, including that lexicon which is commonly termed 'jargon' or 'slang'. Shukshin uses social dialects constantly and with good effect particularly in the works written after 1970. This increased emphasis on the reproduction of social dialects reflects the thematic maturation of Shukshin's work of this period. Shukshin shows himself to be familiar with bureaucratic jargon, demonstrating his proficiency with 'officialese' in such satires as 'The Opinion'/"Mnenie" and 'General Malafeikin'. He is similarly effective in his use of technical vocabulary in 'The Obstinate One'/"Upornyj", the 'elevated' jargon and speech forms of the intelligentsia in 'Cut-Off'/"Srezal", and in the use of the slang of the small town big-shot in 'The Brother-in-Law'/"Svoiak Sergei Sergeich".

The social lexicon predominant in Shukshin's dialogues written after the mid-1960s is one which combines pure 'regional' elements with those possessing a 'citified' or 'intellectual'
coating. These components are inserted into the general structure of Contemporary Standard Russian, the accepted conversational form. Such a combination of the speech of various social groups into one lexicon is termed 'meshchanskii govor' - a type of speech which occupies an intermediate position between the strata of literary and educated speech and those of pure 'regional' dialect. The most distinctive feature of the 'meshchanskii' lexicon is that, as an intermediate layer, it aspires to create the effect that it has mastered urban, educated, intellectual speech forms. Having adopted these forms, often without completely comprehending meanings or connotations, the linguistic 'meshchanin' distorts the vocabulary and gives it new meaning. The 'meshchanskii' lexicon manifests itself in many of Shukshin's stories and in countless dialogical exchanges, many of which carry strong social overtones and implications due to the nature of the lexicon itself.

In the majority of his stories, Shukshin uses Contemporary Standard Russian as the standard against which other dialects may be perceived and identified. In a given story, we may find any combination of dialects counterposed one to another. Numerous stories are constructed around two main characters, one speaking standard Russian and the other the Siberian dialect. ('Sel'skie zhitele', 'Chudik', 'Na kladbishche'). Others involve the use of 'meshchanskii' speech counterposed to standard Russian ('Srezal') or to a Siberian village dialect ('Svoiak Sergei Sergeich'). Shukshin is also able to create various hybrids of dialect within his works, such as when
standard Russian absorbs into itself—technical, medical, or bureaucratic jargon ('Upornyi', 'Psikhopat', 'Mnenie').

Shukshin employs various regional and social dialects for reasons which obviously extend well beyond an aesthetic value which may be attributed to such inclusions. The lexicon which Shukshin chooses for his stories is integrally paralleled to the themes. An effective illustration of this tight relationship between the lexicon of Shukshin's dialogue (and direct speech forms in general) and the thematic structure of the stories is seen in the story 'Sel'skie zhiteli'.

The two main characters, a grandmother and her school-aged grandson, are separated by more than just their difference in years. They live in two different worlds. Babka Malania has decided to fly to Moscow to visit her son. In order to find out what steps she should take to make this journey, she talks with a neighbour who has done some travelling, at least in comparison to his fellow villagers. The grandson Shurka listens with great skepticism and growing dismay to the stories of the neighbour, for he sees his grandmother getting visibly more and more frightened by things she cannot understand. Inevitably, the voyage is postponed and an excuse sent to the son in Moscow that his mother will come by train in the summer.

The gap which separates Babka Malania from her grandson is expressed linguistically as well as thematically. For example, Shurka interrupts and corrects her several times as she constructs a telegram to Moscow.
'"Dorogoi synok Pasha, esli uzh ty khochesh', shtoby ia priekhala, to ia, konnechno, mogu, khotia mne na starosti let..."'

"Privet!" skazal Shurka. "Khto zhe tak telegram pishet?"

"A kak nado, po-tvoemu?"


Babka dazhe obidelas'.

"V shestoi klass khodish' Shurka, a poniatia nikakogo. Nado zhe umnet' pomalen'ku." (1:17)

Babka does not understand a world of new conveniences and modes of communication and she demonstrates her total lack of comprehension time and again in her speech, either through words which she has newly acquired but has not fully understood or in her reactions and questions to the information which her neighbour gives her about the flight.

'"Gospodi, gospodi!" vzdokhnula babka. "Davai pisat' Pavlu. A telegrammu anulirovaem"...'

"Anachit, ne poletim?"

"Kuda zhe letet' - strast' takaia, batiushki moi! Soberut potom trista gramm..."' (1:21)

Shurka, on the other hand, handles new words and expressions with complete freedom as we see in the personal portion of the letter which he sends to his uncle.
'Babon'ku napugal diadia Egor Lizunov... On, naprimer, privel takoi fakt: on vyglianul v okno i vidit, chto motor gorit. Esli by eto bylo tak, to letchik stal by sshibat' plamia skorosti'iu, kak eto obychno delaetsia. Ta predlagaiu, chto on uvidel plamia iz vykhlopnoi truby i podnial paniku...' (1:21)

In 'Sel'skie zhiteli', the differing levels of vocabulary and means of expression utilized by Babka Malania and Shurka are indicators of social processes occurring in the Soviet Union. Largely through the use of linguistic forms, Shukshin is able to depict objectively the discrepancies in segments of the population which modernization and access to education inevitably create. As a general rule, Shukshin's early hero, like Babka Malania, speaks in the language of the country folk and the naive, straightforward, and honest qualities of the hero's character and of his view on life are reflected in the similar nature of his spoken language. Such correspondence is illustrated in the following scene from the story 'Chudik' in which the hero pens a telegram to his wife in order to inform her that he as safely arrived at his destination.

'V aeroportu Chudik napisal telegrammu zhene: 'Prizemlilis'. Vetka sireni upala na grud', milaia Grusha menia ne zabud'. Vasiatka.'

Telegrafistka, strogaia, sukhaia zhenshchina, prochitav telegrammu, predlozhila:

"Sovtav'te inache. Vy vzroslyi chelovek, ne v detsade." 'Pochemu?' sprosil Chudik. "Ta ei vsegda tak pishu v pis'makh. Eto zhe moia zhena!...Vy, naverno, podumali..."

"...Eto otkrytyi tekst." Chudik perepisal:

'Prizemlilis'. Vse v poriadke. -Vasiatka.'
Telegrafistka sama ispravila dva slova: 'prizemlilis' i 'Vasiatka'. Stalo: 'doleteli', 'Vasiliy'.

"'Prizemlilis'...Vy chto, kosmonavt, chto li?"' (1:107)

The social difference which exists between Chudik and the telegraphist is immediately evident in the speech of the two characters. It is typical that Shukshin should depict these differences through the effective use of a dynamic, self-revealing dialogue rather than turning to static, descriptive narration.

As Shukshin's stories mature thematically, words typical of the 'meshchanskii govor' become more frequent in the dialogues. Generally, it is not the Shukshin hero who employs the vocabulary of the 'meshchanin' for Shukshin reserves it to depict the negative qualities of that secondary character with whom the hero must interact. Shukshin's maturing hero uses an unpretentious form of speech which has evolved naturally from social circumstances in that it is a standard Russian with elements of regional dialect coming to the surface. When a Shukshin hero does use 'meshchanskii govor', he is characterized as being either very disagreeable or a pathetic victim of the social demands which have been placed upon him.

One of the most vivid scenes using the 'meshchanskii govor' is found in the story 'Cut-Off'/'Srezal' in which a village 'intellectual' delights in embarrassing those fellow villagers who have gone to the city for a higher education and have returned for a visit. Gleb Kapustin tries linguistically and mentally to get the better of them. These attempts often
backfire much to the amusement of the bewildered visitor, but
Gleb and his admiring villagers are totally oblivious to the
ignorance which he manifests.

'I tut on poshel v ataku na kandidata.
"V kakoi oblasti vyiavlaete sebi?", sprosil on.

"Gde rabotauiu, chto li?"

"Da."

"Na filfake."

"Filosofiia?"

"Ne sovsem."

"Neobkhodimaia veshch. "Glebu nuzhno bylo, chtob byla
filisofiia. On ozhivilsia. ' (1:174)

Instead of simply asking the candidate what his
academic interest or specialization is in common, standard
Russian, Gleb invents the construction, "In what area do you
reveal yourself?" The form is not only awkward and unnatural,
but poor Russian. Similarly, Gleb interprets the acronym
'filfak' as referring to philosophy and he is completely unaware
of his mistake. Both instances detract greatly from the intel-
lectual tone which Gleb is trying to establish.

Those personages in Shukshin's stories who employ
the 'meshchanskii lexicon, whether the hero or a secondary
character in a particular story, reveal one common feature.
They feel dissatisfied and frustrated with themselves. This
feeling of insufficiency is upheld by the themes which run
throughout Shukshin's work, but it is most graphically mani-
fested in the speech of the characters. These characters, like
Gleb Kapustin, are usually country people living in small towns who feel an intense need to make an impression. They choose to do this through their speech, but instead of producing the intended effect, the person to whom their efforts are directed perceives their speech as being false and pretentious. The humorous, ironical, and satirical results which such lexicon can create through its incongruity and inconsistency with accepted usages will be discussed at greater length in the final chapter.

Artistically, the most powerful and effective application of dialect in Shukshin's work is found in those forms and devices which concentrate upon conceptual and constructive elements. As the stories progress and the writing matures, they less often employ the superficial forms of phonetic dialectism such as substituting 'chavo' for 'chavo' and 'toper' for 'teper'. They become less reliant as well upon the use of distinctive lexical elements which further characterize a regional dialect with such expressions as 'mnogon'ko vas', 'pomal'en'ku', 'boiiazno malen'ko'. In his constant search for new methods of depiction and portrayal of his hero, Shukshin was able to represent the complexities of his hero with greater linguistic insight as his writing developed. Shukshin's best stories introduce semantic idioms of dialect, that is, unique and specific idea-meaning constructions and combinations.  

The most important feature of the collective effect of Shukshin's direct speech forms combined with the lexicon and the figurative system composing item is that they are conducive
to the creation of a story structure based upon hyperbole. The unusual and unorthodox quality of the hero's speech and perceptions mirrors the exaggerated and extreme ways in which the hero searches for his 'holiday for the soul'. The hyperbole usually stems from a dialogical scene with a narrative description extending the effect. Beginning in the early 1970s, the fact that hyperbole was a characteristic feature of Shukshin's stories was made more obvious by the author himself. His stories after this time contain powerful dialogue which vividly portrays the complexity of his hero through his reactions to the oppositions and frustrations of his daily life. The 'dialogical clash' is a main hyperbolic form, for the hero explosively and emotionally expresses himself to those personages who, to him, represent the problems confronting him. Kol'ka Paratov in 'Zhena muzha v Parizh provozhala' reaches the breaking point when his wife accuses him of being a 'petty-bourgeois'-element - a 'meshchanin'.

'*...Vletel v kvartiru. Zhena Valia, zachuiav nedobroie, skhvatila doch' na ruki.

"Tol'ko tron'! Tol'ko tron' posmei!..."

Kol'ku bilo krupnoi drozh'iu.

"P-polozh' rebenka", skazal on, zaikaias'.

"Tol'ko tron'!..."

"Vse ravno ia tebia ub'iu sevodnia." Kol'ka sam podivilsia - budto ne on skazal eti strashnye slova, a kto-to drugoi skazal obdumanno. "Dozhdalas' ty svoei uchasti...Ne khotela zhit' na belom svete? Podykhai. Ia tebia etoi noch'iu' 

(1:238)

There are numerous hyperbolic scenes and images called forth in the dialogues of Shukshin's heroes which illustrate
the surprising and unique releases which the hero-eccentrics find for themselves. For example, Bronka Pupkov, whose name is as absurd as the tale he has invented, gives himself a drastic ultimatum. "'Ia govari: esli ia promakhnus', ia budu poslednii predatei' i vrag naroda! 'Ili, govari, liagu riadom s Hitlerom, ili vy vyruchite Geroia Sovetskogo Soiuza Pupkova Bronislava Ivanovicha.'" (1:120)

Sergei Sergeich, one of Shukshin's most unpleasant heroes, is convinced that as a 'city' man, he lives better than the village folk, especially his relatives. He 'generously' buys a boat motor for his brother-in-law Andrei, and as Andrei stares at the motor in disbelief Sergei Sergeich '...vdrug zaprygnul emu na spinu i zakrichal veselo: "Nu-ka - vmakh!... Do kryl'cta. Videl kinokartinu 'Vii'?" "Bros'!..." Andrei peredernul plechami. "Nu?" K schasti'iu, nikto ne vyshel iz doma.' (Novyi Mir, No. 10 (1969):94).

There is a beautifully hyperbolic scene in 'Veruiu!' in which Maksim Iarikov, in talking with a very unusual priest, has finally found an answer to the tormenting questions he asks about his soul. He and the priest begin to celebrate their belief in a sort of vivid pantheism by breaking into a wild dance and chant.

'Maksim pristraivalsia v zatylok popu, oni, pripliasyvaia, molcha sovershili krug po izbe, potom pop opiat' brosalsia vprisiadku, kak v prorub', raspakhivaiia ruki...Polovintsy gnulis'.

"Ekh, veruiu, veruiu! Ty-na, ty-na, ty-na - piat'! Vse oglobel'ki - na iat'! Veruiu! Veruiu! A gde shest', tam i sherst'! Veruiu! Veruiu!"
Oba, pop i Maksim, pliasali s takoi-to zlost'iu, s takim ostervenieniem, chto ne kazalos' i strannym, chto oni -pliasht'. Tut - ili pliasat', ili uzh rvat' na grudi rubakhu i plakat', i skripet' zubami.' (Besedy: 128)

In general, the language of the Shukshin hero has been accepted as a part of the contemporary literary language, although in its semantic composition as well as its lexicon and structure of the phrase, this language is quite different from the Russian of the classics. The most essential element, however, is present in Shukshin's work - the unified artistic construction of the verbal material by which the reader is able spontaneously to sense the expression, and which is so vital a part of the literary language. For Shukshin, it is essential that direct speech and particularly dialogue forms play the major and initial role in the creation of the whole artistic image of his hero. Throughout Shukshin's work there is a unity and completeness which is rooted in the tight interrelationship which exists between his structure, theme, and style. Shukshin developed his unique means of expression in order to ensure the creation of a distinct and clearly understood representation of Soviet man in contemporary Soviet reality.
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9 There is some uncertainty amongst theoreticians as to whether 'nesobstvennaia priamaia rech' and 'svobodanaia priamaia rech' should be classified as forms of indirect or direct speech. For the purposes of this thesis, I have chosen to regard them as the latter despite their complex internal combination of features common to both direct and indirect speech forms such as elements of portraiture, landscape and biography of the character. My rationale for considering them as forms of direct speech with regard to Shukshin's work is the important role they play in extending and developing the illusion of the prominent position of the spoken word in the stories. This illusion is vital to the dynamic structural and stylistic requirements of Shukshin's story-scene.
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14 V. Shukshin, Izbran.proiz., t.1, p. 104.
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18 I consider it essential when dealing with syntax and lexicon that citations from Shukshin's works be transcribed in the original Russian. For the sake of brevity, they are documented within the text itself using the abbreviated forms of the books which have been noted earlier. (1:335) represents Izbran.proiz., t.1 followed by the page number of the citation.

19 This is a facet of Shukshin's use of dialect which has been largely overlooked by critics due to the emphasis they place on Shukshin's use of regional dialect in his work.
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The essence of a literary language is not found in the combination into unified, artistic constructions of verbal material which leads the reader to sense spontaneously the expression. The emphasis must be placed on expression to a large degree, for, unlike conversational speech, literary expression is devoid of means of communication such as gesture and mime. The Theory of Literature (Letchworth: Bradda Books, 1971).

Shukshin was at times criticized for his linguistic position, and was charged with abusing dialect forms and words of popular speech, and even with exceeding the bounds of good taste. The following critique is typical of the objections to Shukshin's use of popular speech:

'Certainly nobody would protest against the attempt of the writer to convey the very structure and colouring of the speech of his heroes, but when the author, clearly sympathizing with the personality, speaks of him...as he does in the story 'Sud': "shel Efim na sud, kak kurva s kotelkom - nervnichal"... this is witness to the fact that, unfortunately, at times, his taste betrays him...

Despite this directness of the story about life, the frankness, even earthiness doesn't weaken the poetic quality... Rather it allows us to sense more acutely the beauty of people of positive potential...'. Alla Ovcharenko, 'Rasskazy Vasiliia Shukshina', Don No. 1 (1976), p. 159.

Such criticism, which contradicts itself within the two paragraphs, attests to the confusion of some literary critics as to how they should accept Shukshin's work into a world of set literary standards including those of vocabulary.

Typical examples of such constructions are the neologisms which occur in Shukshin's stories. Many times they are 'all-purpose' expressions, -malapropisms which are used very imaginatively. In 'The Brother-in-Law', Sergei Sergeich uses forms of the word 'melankholiia' in different ways.

"...ty vse-taki malakhol'nyi!"  
"...ty sovsem kakoi-to malakhol'nyi muzhik!"  

The forms of the foreign-sounding word 'melankholiia' which Shukshin's hero invents for himself are used to express his opinion of his country brother-in-law as a 'simple jerk' or a 'poor yokel'.
In the story 'Chudik', the hero is preparing to visit his brother in the Urals which involves a long journey of thousands of miles. However his '"Na Ural! Na Ural!"', otvechal on na vopros: kuda eto on sobralsia?..."Na ural! Nado -Proshvyrnut'sia."' (1:103), is a totally inappropriate expression indicating that he is-going to 'nip over' to the Urals.

While on the airplane, Chudik attempts to carry on a conversation with the man sitting next to him. He tells him a story about a son who almost kills his mother yet the mother forgives him out of love. Chudik ends the story by asking the man to consider: '"Predstavliaete, kakim nado byt' grubym, bestaktnym."' (1:105). He again chooses an inappropriate expression when he refers to a man who comes close to murdering his mother as 'tactless'.
CONCLUSION

In the discussion of the previous chapters, I have referred to the unique pathos which exists in Shukshin's work. Whether considering the character of the hero, his active or passive methods of seeking for solutions to his questions, or the dialogic and other direct speech forms employed by the heroes, one is always aware of an element of incongruity. The reality of a situation as perceived by Shukshin's hero is always to some degree inconsistent with the actual reality of the very human situation in which he finds himself involved. A dual emotional response is evoked in the reader by most of Shukshin's stories, one wants to laugh but senses that this is not a totally appropriate response. Thus a finely developed tragi-comic quality is the foundation of Shukshin's pathos in all of his creative work.

As Shukshin's heroes progress and develop, so too does the type and quality of the humour found in the stories. From the dialogically-based, good-natured humour of his early stories in which there is a certain playfulness, and an unguarded smile, the humour perceptibly alters and matures in later works. In most of Shukshin's stories from the late 1960s onwards, our smiles, as reactions to a hero's predicament or his response to it, are increasingly tempered by our awareness that something is fundamentally amiss within the hero.

Shukshin's gentle linguistic humour plays a fundamental and constant role in all of his work. But, as Shukshin's hero
evolves and begins to think about himself and about his values and place in the world around him, a carefully controlled irony and subsequent satirical element appear as integral components in Shukshin's knowledgeable and pungent transcription of ordinary speech, with its substandard constructions, archaisms, neologisms, and malapropisms. Such linguistically-rooted satirical humour is reminiscent of the social satire of the early Anton Chekhov and of Mikhail Zoshchenko. The vocabulary which their heroes employ is of primary importance to the socio-psychological bent of the stories, to the characterization of the heroes which is a result of this emphasis, as well as to the artistic creation of a humorous, ironic effect. The choice of vocabulary for the various characters found in Chekhov's, Zoshchenko's and Shukshin's stories, parallels the internal, mental states of these characters. Shukshin's linguistic humour bears a good deal of similarity to that of Zoshchenko despite the fact that the latter is the overt satirist and 'funny man'. As a means of social characterization both authors make use of the 'meshchanskii govor', the semi-educated speech of Zoshchenko's urban bourgeoisie and of Shukshin's newcomer to the city.

Shukshin's predominantly rural heroes are being drawn into a tightening relationship with urban culture, technology, values and morals. Two types of humour result from their language: the satire is distinct when a pretentious display of incompletely understood new vocabulary is made by a character. A lighter, more compassionate humour is applied to a sympathetic hero who makes an honest attempt to adjust to new social conditions but
who confuses a word or a concept. In Shukshin's work, the major portion of both types of humour stems from the dialogical exchanges in the stories.

A good example of Shukshin's non-satiric broadly-applied humour is found in the 1967 story 'The Classy Driver'/\'Klassniy Voditel\'. The humour is based primarily on the use of two words which the hero, Pashka, has invented and added to his vocabulary as a result of his period of stay in a town which he initially tells people had been Moscow. To add to the comic effect, Pashka uses the words so freely that their meaning is never constant.

In one exchange, both of his neologisms occur in close proximity to one another.

"Klub est?" - sprosil Pashka.
"Klub? Nu kak zhe!"
"Sfotografirovano."
"Chto?"
"Soglasen, govoriu. Piramidon."

It is up to the imagination of the reader to guess what Pashka is trying to say. 'Sfotografirovano' here probably has the connotation of 'I see'. The other expression, 'piramidon', is likely his own version of 'pardon', but it gains in humorous effect since it is actually the name of a sedative which Pashka has heard and confuses with the non-Russian 'pardon'.

The verb 'sfotografirovat' is also invented by Pashka and is used in its own very expressive way throughout the story, constantly changing its meaning as well as its grammatical aspect. During a chess game with the fiance of a girl to whom
Pashka is attracted, he taunts the young man saying that there are still plenty of chances to beat him before he finally wins the game.

'...Tut eshche polno shansov sfotografirovat' menia - sniskhoditel'no skazal Pashka.' (Chistye prudy: 158)

When Pashka and the fiance sit down to the game of chess, Pashka is extremely intent upon impressing the man who is, in fact, from Moscow. He attempts to make his impression both by his clever chess moves and with his intellectual wit.

'...Pashka poshel vtoroi. "Sdelaem nekotoryi piramidon, kak govoriat frantsuzy."' (Chistye prudy: 157)

In his use of 'piramidon', this time as a noun, Pashka shows only his total ignorance of the French language made all the more evident by his unnatural use of vocabulary with which he is uncomfortable but which he feels is necessary to him as a vehicle of acceptance into a broader, contemporary social reality. Evidence of this desire is seen all through the story as Pashka intersperses his dialogue with phrases which he has acquired on his recent trip to 'the city'. We find such expressions as 'pogovorim kak zhel'tmeny' (Chistye prudy: 155)'predlagaiu na tur val'sa' (Chistye prudy: 152) - phrases which are almost correct except for their pronunciation. The incorrectness of such phrases coupled with Pashka's carefree personality and the happy abandon with which he throws them out, do indeed make us laugh. But even in the comparatively comical circumstance of the story, through his omniscient narrator, Shukshin is able to
convey feelings of compassion for the young man so eager to impress, and he is able to make the reader feel the same sympathy.

Even in this happy-go-lucky character, we can see signs of the impending clashes which Shukshin's future heroes will undergo with the surrounding social order. Pashka, through some of his newly-acquired vocabulary, is showing his desire to model himself, with unquestioning enthusiasm, on the new social goals and demands. Yet, he is completely artless, naive, and ignorant of some of the negative features of the rules by which he must play if he is to find peace in this new environment. As part of the development of his hero, Shukshin has determined that the underlying factor of the many tragi-comic scenes which occur in his stories, is the emptiness which the hero consciously feels or unconsciously senses within his soul. The lack which his hero comes to sense is brought to the surface through his actions and his vocabulary, both of which are usually incongruous with the standards and accepted behaviour of the social reality.

Inherent in the conclusions which each of Shukshin's stories draws about its heroes is a judgement upon the society in which the hero lives. This is directed toward the reader through the author's use of various devices of satire. Although only the very last of Shukshin's works have been critically acclaimed as works of excellent social satire, this element has always been present, although not prevalent in Shukshin's stories. It has been a concealed but constant support of Shukshin's strong psychological creation of complex characters. In his stories, Shukshin's attention to satiric innuendo is evident
in the ironic situations in which the heroes find themselves as well as in the overt parody of social types. Although Shukshin's satiric devices are typically those associated with characterization, he always complements them with linguistic elements which supplement the parody or irony he is aiming at. It is the language in which Shukshin's heroes speak which gives the humorous illusion to a situation which is far more serious from a psychological, sociological, or moral point of view.

For example, Shukshin utilizes the verbal error effectively as a device of parody and a source of humour. With this element, he is able to reveal the unpleasant qualities of Gleb Kapustin, one of Shukshin's most unsympathetic heroes from the story 'Cut-Off'/'Srezal'. Kapustin's semi-educated speech and the pretension and ignorance with which he pronounces his words and phrases make them humorous despite the definite social characterization which runs alongside the humour. Gleb gets great satisfaction in belittling and embarrassing academics and people of position who pass through his village on a visit. During evenings of discussion which inevitably occur with these people, Gleb is renowned for his attacks on the visitors. In the situation which provides the basis for the story 'Cut-Off', Gleb's victim is a young candidate and his wife, natives of the village who have returned to see the young man's mother. Gleb begins the expected attack on the candidate but understands the man's specialty to be philosophy instead of the actual philology, a result of Gleb's misunderstanding of the acronym, 'filfak'. This linguistic error is crucial to the course of
the remainder of the story, for Gleb proceeds to 'interrogate' the candidate on various 'philosophical questions'.

"How does philosophy define the concept of weightlessness at the moment?"

"Like it always has. Why 'at the moment'?"
"Well, there was an occurrence not long ago, and that's why I ask. Natural philosophy, let's say, defines it one way, strategic philosophy, completely differently...

"But there isn't such philosophy as strategic!", chuckled the candidate...

"...Alright. Second question. How do you personally feel about the problem of shamanism in the far regions of Siberia?"...

"...Are you serious?", Valia asked incredulously. "With your permission". Gleb stood and bowed with restraint. "The question of course, isn't global, but from the point of view of our brother, it would be interesting to know..."

"But what question then?!" the candidate exclaimed:

The candidate and his wife continue to be hounded by Gleb until they reach a point of utter exasperation. Finally, after an especially vindictive outburst in which Gleb attacks the candidate and all his knowledge in set phrases and clichés, the candidate exclaims in wonderment: 

"Tipichnyi demagog-kliauznik! Ves' nabor fraz, vse priemy i ukhvatki..."

"Ne popali. Za vsiu svoiu zhizn' ni odnoi anonimki ili kliauzy ni na kogo ne napisal." Gleb posmotrel na muzhikov: muzhiki znali, chto eto pravda. "Ne to, tovarishch kandidat..."

(1:178)

The play on words is again based on one single word, 'kliauznik' with its double meaning of a person as a trickster
(the meaning the candidate had intended), and of a person being a slanderer (the understanding which Gleb took). Insulted at being called a 'slanderer', Gleb turns to his fellow villagers for support.

The irony of the entire story lies in the verbal error, for Gleb misunderstands two key words, 'filfak' and 'kliauznik'. Nonetheless, he carries on a totally outrageous and pretentious philosophical discussion upstaging everyone else with his audacity. His conclusion that he has got the better of yet another candidate produces a strong hyperbolic, comic effect. Yet, it also serves to satirize the mentality of the contemporary 'meshchanin' and exposes some of the more negative features of social processes which have taken place and are presently occurring. A similar irony is achieved in the story 'General Malafeikin' when the hero assumes the speech style and attitudes of the 'higher ups' when talking with people who know nothing about his real life as a semi-retired painter. There is Kondrashin from the story 'The Opinion'/'Mnenie' with his affected and Americanized mannerisms and habits, and there is Roza, the store clerk who, with impoliteness and disrespect, insults the hero of the story, 'The Insult'/'Obida'.

Shukshin uses the interesting mixture of colloquial, semi-educated and newly acquired 'intellectual' vocabulary to portray the millions of Russian people who are non-humorously and intensely caught up in the process of consolidating a position for themselves in a modern, technological society.
Shukshin's word is his main vehicle for satire and parody. In a given instance, a word, intonation, or phrase may have a double or even triple significance. For example, when Bronka Pupkov's wife upbraids him for telling his tall-tale about the assassination attempt on Hitler's life, she threatens him with, "...you'll find yourself up before a judge one of these days. -For distorting history..." But Bronka simply retorts, "They can't do anything. It's not a published work. Don't you understand?" The irony centres around the issue of the distortion of history, which is recognized as being a serious offense when propagated individually, but which exists, in many instances, at the official, mass-level.

Any authorial or narrative intervention during a satiric section is usually perceived by the reader as being of the most necessary sort, never imbued with forced comically or artificiality. The psychological exactness of Shukshin's satire doubles the psychological emphasis on the character development of the hero, for a main objective of his satire is to single out the moral vices and anti-social occurrences which essentially contradict the social reality of a professed socialist society.

Shukshin's characters as vehicles of his satirical devices may be divided into two types. There are those who are enraptured with the relatively new material conveniences of that part of society which has been integrated more fully into the new social order. The others are those who have realized the principles of a 'developing society' to their own
advantage. Thus, 'meshchanstvo', the petty-bourgeois mentality in all its multi-faceted forms, is one of the main objects of Shukshin's satire.

The first type of characters are, like Pashka, Shukshin's country folk who, for the time being, have preserved their more humanistic values, but whose soul is temporarily blinded by the apparent well-being of their counterparts in the more technological, urban portion of their society.

In the 1972 story 'Postscript'/'Post Skriptum', written in the form of a letter, two countrymen journey five thousand kilometres to Leningrad. The biggest impressions made upon Ivan, the author of the letter, are the venetian blinds and the bed in his hotel room.

'I am struck by the windows here. As soon as you walk in, you face a window the length of the entire wall. To the left hangs an iron bar, to which is attached a thin rope, and this rope goes up somewhere into the depths...And if you go up and turn the bar to the left, the room falls into semi-darkness. Turn it to the right—it is light again. It all has to do with the venetian blinds which are on the window...If they sell some like this, I'm going to put them up at home...I'm also definitely going to make a bed like the one here. It's an amazing bed. I and Ivan Deviatov drew a sketch of it...I wash, play with the venetian blinds, lie on the bed and think: this is how to live! You could live a hundred years and not be bitten by any necessity since everything has been invented already...'

However, the two Ivans think nothing of the way in which they are moved out of their original hotel room in order to accommodate tourists. Nor does the author of the letter take much notice of how he is rudely ignored by a salesclerk who is giving all of her attention to the foreigners at a souvenir counter.
And Ivan continues that:
'I was with Ivan at the bazaar - nothing special there!...
But in the store, what there is! True - not venetian blinds. But in general, the city is somewhat closer to communism than our mother countryside!' 6

In this story, there is no side intervention from Shukshin. The main character himself exposes all that needs to be exposed, including a naive ideological observation which equates the attainment of communism with material goods and a consumer orientation. Ivan is the type of character who is very impressionable and susceptible to the inviting aspects of material well-being and consumerism. He is also an object at whom Shukshin's sarcasm is directed.

The satire in 'Postscript' also exists at the linguistic level, for not only does Ivan admire and envy the possessions and comforts found in the city, he actively adopts and utilizes some of its vocabulary. In the short three-page letter of which the story is comprised, there is a mixture of 'cultured speech' as perceived by Ivan, as well as bureaucratism and colloquialisms. For example, the adjectives 'colossal', 'amazing', and 'chic' are noticeable in their over-usage within the letter. As well, they are used in unusual ways. The nouns which they modify are not commonly modified by such adjectives, and thus, a humorous effect is produced when Ivan writes of an 'amazing bed' (porazitel'naia krovat'), that the bathroom is 'simply amazing' (tualet prosto porazitel'nyi), and that the hotel is 'simply chic' (gostinitsa prosto shikarnaia).
The second group of characters which Shukshin uses within a satirical milieu are those who embody the social vices themselves, consciously and without embarrassment. These are the self-interested individuals often portrayed as the bureaucrat, the shopclerk, or as a member of a type of petty-bourgeois sector which exists in the Soviet Union. This character is shown as a debased and deformed result of the 'consumer psychology' which is part of the modernizing society.

In the story 'The Brother-in-Law'/ 'Svoiak Sergei Sergeich', such a psychology is revealed in the character of the brother-in-law who unwillingly comes to visit his relatives in a small town, boasting all the while of city conveniences, of the salary and possessions which are his, and of his getting the better of the system. The basic irony of the story lies in the pretensions of Sergei Sergeich to being an 'urbanite', for his 'city' has, at most, a population of fifteen thousand people. His superiority complex therefore, is comical.

"Where I work we get a long vacation. We're in a privileged position." Again -- arrogance and pride. There wasn't a modest spot on his entire body. He was like a quilt, with every patch bragging and swaggering. "Special privilege."

"Special how?"

"With respect to salary and vacation."

"What, a real high salary, huh?"

Sergei Sergeevich chuckled at Andrei's ignorance.

"For example, up to four hundred roubles!"

Andrei was amazed: "Oho ho!"

"Do you know how much a professor gets here?"
"Where?"

"Why here — in the middle of Russia!"

"And how am I supposed to know that?"

"Look, the highest-paid professor gets five hundred roubles. Maximum!"

"Well, and so?"

"Well, so I never made it through grammar school!"

Again Sergei Sergeich laughed his little laugh.
"That's the way we live...I've already got one foot in Communism, you might say."^7

However laughable the airs and pretensions of Sergei Sergeevich may seem, his comfortable position is truly a comment on his society. It tolerates such self-seekers and the justification of their social circumstances by means of ideological concepts which have been adapted and maneuvered by them to suit their purposes.

Sergei Sergeevich's comment about 'one foot in Communism', identifies and satirizes the view which equates communism with material possessions. This theme is singled out by Shukshin for especially severe criticism, since it runs parallel to other moral themes in his stories — the problem of how to live properly, of how to 'be human'. The consumer-oriented view of communist society, whether uttered naively and innocently as Ivan states it in 'Postscript', or callously and pompously as Sergei Sergeevich's pronouncement, is seen by Shukshin as a main moral vice from which flow many human and social problems.

Our final evaluation as readers regarding a facet of social life or a character representative of it, results from the attention which Shukshin pays to the psychology of the
characters. Shukshin's simplicity of plot ably reveals the daily life and morals of such a person as Sergei Sergeich, the 'meshchanin'. The author consistently and exactly recreates the authentic speech and manner of thought of the brother-in-law with the evident aim of making this character an object of his satire.

'Sergei Sergeich... had begun to brag again about how terrific everything was turning out for him in his life... Then he began to accuse Andrei of not knowing how to live. "Not even a television set, huh?"

"Nope."

"Well, listen... You're nothing but a mangy muzhik. Do you mean to say you can't afford a television set?"

"...What do I need one of those things for. And I don't need a Fiat either. Understand?... Who the hell do you think you are?... You no sooner arrive than you start spouting off - this is no good, you don't like that... I didn't ask you to come here, hold your tongue. Act decent."

"In other words, even if I see something that's inferior I still have to say it's okay? Is that it?... But a television set is an absolute necessity! Suppose you've got a son growing up. Instead of scratching around in the garden in the evenings, he could be looking at T.V."8

Sergei Sergeich's values and conceptions are presented directly to the reader, yet the tone of the authorial satire is evident even in Shukshin's objective re-creation of this conversation. The importance that Sergei Sergeich attaches to owing a television set and his impatience and utter intolerance of those who have less than what he considers proper, are the main objects of Shukshin's sarcasm. But Sergei Sergeich's opinions and Shukshin's satiric intonations are objectivized to the point where one may assume that such views are widespread.
and common in the real world. In this presentation, the irony lies in the discrepancy between Sergei Sergeich's reality and the type of social reality which is professed to exist. Shukshin does not let this discrepancy escape our notice in his literature.

Shukshin's interest in such characters as Sergei Sergeich lies in the unification of their qualities of ordinariness, soullessness, and greed into a caricature—a device of comic reduction. His caricatures are marked by their conceit and arrogance which is founded in an ignorant concept of their self-worth. The entire image which Shukshin creates tells of the true unoriginality and internal depersonalization of such characters. We meet such personages consistently throughout Shukshin's work. There is the man in the overcoat in 'The Insult'/'Obida', the bureaucrat in 'The Opinion'/'Mnenie', and the salesclerk in 'Postscript'/'Post Skriptum'. All are vehicles for Shukshin's satirization of those factors in society which he feels are morally harmful—bureaucracy, boorishness (khamstvo), and a petty-bourgeois mentality (meshchanstvo).

In his satire and satirical overtones, Shukshin's organic humour in his characterizations and in the linguistic portrayals, transforms what could be a potentially severe accusatory narrative into a complex weaving of emotion, including anger and grief, with a good deal of compassion. Far from reducing the effect of the sarcasm and irony in Shukshin's works, this emotion conveys instead a special depth and strength to the satire.
It is the presence of irony and satire and the devices which are utilized by Shukshin to achieve these effects which present difficulties for critics who would classify Shukshin as a writer of 'country prose'. The social, psychological and moral implications of his stories, his belief in the necessity of depicting people with their flaws, and his refusal to create an 'ideal type', involved him in almost constant controversy with some literary critics. The 'derevenshchiki' reconstruct their knowledge of daily life in the Russian countryside and small town in ways very different from Shukshin's. Some, for example, utilize intense description of country people and their habits, while others concentrate upon poetic, aesthetic landscapes. Noticeably absent from Shukshin's prose, as opposed to that of authors of 'country prose', is the opposition of the city to the country and the attempt to depict the country as superior. Despite the fact that most of Shukshin's characters and heroes are country folk from small villages and towns who are trying to deal with encroaching modernity, Shukshin does not create an image of the city as being stagnant, squalid and narrow. Shukshin's themes of moral emptiness run parallel in both city and country settings. In most instances, his work is dominantly ethical and psychological before it is dominantly social.

Based on the subject matter of his stories, Shukshin may be grouped with such other recent Soviet writers as Vladimir Tendriakov, Vasilii Belov, and Evgenii Nosov. These authors all portray Soviet village and rural life from the point of
view of the historical processes which have occurred there in the past decades - collectivization, post-war economic hardships, and the mass movement of youth to urban centres.

Shukshin's singular form of the story-scene and his unique, modern hero-eccentric, separate him from these other fine writers. It is true that in some of his stories, such as 'In the Cemetery'/'Na kladbishche', 'In the Autumn'/'Osen'iu', and 'How the Old Man Died'/'Kak pomiral starik', the dominant lyrical intonations and hero provide Shukshin with much in common with his contemporaries. But stories such as 'Cut-Off'/'Srezal.', 'Psikhopat/'The Odd-Ball', and 'I Believe!'/ 'Veruiui!', and many others could only have been created by Shukshin with their concentration on the requirements for the moral health of the ordinary man and their examination of the complexity of the contemporary spiritual process. The innovation of Shukshin's style in its developed, matured form, was acknowledged by Vasilii Belov. Of Shukshin's work he said that, in his last years, Shukshin had worked out a completely new literary style consisting of such features as a psychologism and brevity of scenario characteristic of 'long' prose, an intimate emotion, and a dynamic *siujet*. Several elements are combined with striking success in Shukshin's style: satirical intonations are compatible with more lyrical ones and these in no way interfere with the philosophical reflections of Shukshin's heroes. Shukshin's major contribution to Soviet literature is, in fact, his hero. He has innumerable faces, but is always one and the same psychological type, acting in various circumstances and environments.
Shukshin possesses the ability to perceive keenly and convey in his art the history and moral idea of the Russian people as they see themselves. The epigraph to the two-volume edition of his collected works—a letter written by Shukshin in 1974, attests to this perception.

'During their history, the Russian people have selected, preserved, and elevated to a high degree of respect such human qualities which need not be subjected to reconsideration: honour, diligence, conscientiousness, kindness... In all sorts of historical catastrophes, we have endured, and preserved in pure form, the great Russian language, which has been passed to us by our fathers and grandfathers... Believe, that all of this was not in vain: our songs, our tales, our victories attained by tremendous hardship, our sufferings—don't give this up for a pinch of snuff. We know how to live. Remember this. Be human.'

While his concerns are deeply national, Shukshin's main ideas are not so specific to Soviet society that they lose the quality of universal application. His concentration on the honest representation of the human predicament in modern, industrialized society is relevant to the attempt at the assertion of individuality which is occurring in many societies. Shukshin's best stories will likely be read and cited for many years to come as indicators of the social and moral condition of the 1960s and 1970s within the Soviet Union. His singular character, the hero-eccentric, while not a new hero, will continue to assert himself in the sphere of contemporary world literature in ways which will make him synonymous with our fast-moving, materialistic, technological time.
NOTES TO CONCLUSION

1 V.M. Shukshin, in Chistye prudy (henceforth referred to within the test as Chistye prudy), (Moskva: Isdatel'stvo Russkii iazyk, 1977).

2 The works which were acknowledged as satirical pieces are the story 'Kliauza', Avrora, No. 8 (1974); 'Do tret'ikh petukhov (skzka pro Ivana-duraka,kak on khodil za trideviat' zemel' nabirat'sia uma-razuma)', Nash Sovremennik, No. 1 (1975; 'A poutru oni prosnulis', Nash Sovremennik, No. 6 (1975); and the stageplay 'Energichnye liudi', Literaturnaia Rossiia, (7 IV 1974), (14 VI 1974), (21 VI 1974).

3 V. Shukshin, Izbran.proiz., t.1, pp. 174-175.

4 V. Shukshin, Izbran.proiz., t.1, p. 122.

5 V. Shukshin, Izbran.proiz., t.1, p. 262.

6 Izbran.proiz., t.1, p. 264.

7 Snowball Berry Red, p. 50.

8 Snowball Berry Red, pp. 53-54.


10 V. Shukshin, Izbran.proiz., t.1, epigraph.
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APPENDIX I

Transliteration Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>А а</td>
<td>А a</td>
<td>П п</td>
<td>П p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Б б</td>
<td>В b</td>
<td>Р р</td>
<td>R r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>В в</td>
<td>V v</td>
<td>С с</td>
<td>S s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Г г</td>
<td>g g</td>
<td>Т т</td>
<td>T t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Д д</td>
<td>d d</td>
<td>У у</td>
<td>U u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Е е</td>
<td>E e</td>
<td>Ф ф</td>
<td>F f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Е ё = Е о</td>
<td>E e</td>
<td>Х х</td>
<td>kh kh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ж ж</td>
<td>zh zh</td>
<td>Ц ц</td>
<td>Ts ts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>З з</td>
<td>z z</td>
<td>Ч ч</td>
<td>Ch ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>И и</td>
<td>I i</td>
<td>Ш ш</td>
<td>Sh sh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Й й = Й й</td>
<td>I i</td>
<td>Щ щ</td>
<td>Shch shch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>К к</td>
<td>K k</td>
<td>Я я</td>
<td>Ia ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Л л</td>
<td>L l</td>
<td>Э э</td>
<td>E e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>М м</td>
<td>m m</td>
<td>Ю ю</td>
<td>Iu iu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Н н</td>
<td>n n</td>
<td>Я я</td>
<td>Ia ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>О о</td>
<td>o o</td>
<td>Ь Ъ</td>
<td>Ь Ъ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Russian letters e, е, and ё are not differentiated in this transliteration system; the distinction is left to the reader's knowledge of stress in and pronunciation of the Russian language.