

## DREAMS AND REALITY OF THE EVERYDAY LIFE

**ANDREA FELDMAN**

Hrvatski institut za povijest  
10000 Zagreb, Opatička 10

**UDK: 39.001**

Pregledni rad

Primljeno: 25.3.1998.

Prihvaćeno: 25.3.1998.

*This article discusses the development of the study of everyday life as a legitimate branch of historical research. A broader review of Richard Stites' Revolutionary Dreams offered the author the possibility to explore several issues related to everyday life and its changes during the first phase of the Russian Revolution. The change of attitudes toward the rituals of everyday life (i.e. birth, marriage and death), as well as the change of attitudes toward alcoholism, domestic violence and the role of women in society became the focus of this work.*

*Key words: historical research / everyday life*

It remains for me to justify one last choice: that of introducing everyday life, no more, no less, into the domain of history.

Fernand Braudel, *The Structures of Everyday Life*, 1981.

Fernand Braudel, the eminent French historian suggests how historians should try to immerse themselves into past realities. "Indeed it is a journey to another planet, another human universe..." he states and proceeds with how easy it would be for the inhabitants of our century to meet Voltaire. "In the world of ideas the men of the eighteenth century are our contemporaries." To understand the ways in which they moved around their houses and how they managed to heat them, what were the table manners and what the people were eating, all these would be an enormous surprise and obstacle for us (Braudel, 1981:27).

There is an additional requirement to be fulfilled; we have to explain the concept of the history of everyday life. Who are the predecessors that set the path for the study of the history of everyday life? What are its roots and influences? The drive for social history became a dominant one among historians in the sixties and seventies. We can distinguish two major paradigms of history writing in that era, namely the Marxist paradigm and that of Annales School. We may begin with the French tradition, closely connected with the work of Fernand Braudel and the immensely influential Annales school (Hunt, 1989:1-3).

As Charles Tilly, one of the devotees of this school of thought in the United States concluded in one of his essays, there are two main problems to deal with while developing the discipline of history. First is the historical construction of the roots of collective action — in particular the conditions under which ordinary people who share an interest act, or fail to act, together on that interest. The second set of problems for historians devoted to the *Annales* tradition comprises the rephrasing of ideas concerning large structural changes. This touches mainly upon Braudel's analysis of the structures, the processes he termed: *longue duree*, whose findings hold a major place in the social and economic history research performed by the *Annales* school and its followers (Tilly, 1981:215).

E. P. Thompson is a prominent representative of the British Marxist historiography, another faction that gained enormous influence in writing history from a different perspective. The work of these British historians, as presented in major journals of this academic persuasion, *History Workshop* and *Past and Present* focuses on the interconnections of social change and social interaction, based on the category of class as a main agent of historical development.

The main effort on the sides of both schools was to start understanding culture as an agent of social relations. Gerald Sider, in a theoretical introduction to his research on Newfoundland, poses questions about the relationship between culture and class, the main categories of historiographical as well as anthropological research. Culture is not something that is "participated in", but, like the problem of social reproduction in Marxist social history, it is a distinctive mode of social change. Similarly, the latest developments of the *Annales* followers show an advancement towards the research of mentalities which can be understood as a counterpart of culture. Sider explains that the knowledge that people need in everyday communication may or may not be rational, "but it is, more significantly, socially based in its origins and socially expressed - not just in individual activity but in the cycle of festivals, the ceremonies of life passages, the panoplies of power and deference" (Sider, 1986:3).

Sider concludes with the interpretation of the junction between anthropology and history in recent writings. In the past, anthropology was inclined to set culture aside, trying to explain why change happened in the society. With the development of the interdisciplinary approach, anthropology turns to history (even if unjustly understood as a narrative sequence of events) to phrase applicable explanation, and ultimately both disciplines benefit in the process (Sider, 1986:5).

Another British historian who shared Thompson's interest and dedication to social history, but not his political persuasion was Lawrence Stone touches even if not in so many words, upon the subject of this study, namely everyday life. "An Englishman, far more than the resident in any other Western country, does not have to read Pareto to learn about the dominance of the elite. From his earliest childhood he is made actually aware of the horizontal layering of the society in which he lives. This elaborate stratification is displayed even today at every moment by such external features as accent, vocabulary, clothes, table manners, and even physical size and shape" (Stone,

1989:586). While we could argue that the introduction into class stratification is not a privilege of only certain nationalities, the "external features" that Stone refers to will become the center of our investigation.

To follow up on the geographical dispersal of the history of everyday life, let us take into account Germany. German historiography joined this research due to the period of recuperation that lasted several decades after the World War II. There existed a certain reluctance on the part of German historians to deal with the trauma of the Nazi period from the point of view of political history. As one of the theoreticians of everyday life in Germany, Alf Lüdtke, suggests, everyday life stands for a certain "agency of depoliticisation". Consequently, German historiography had to cure itself from the highly ideologized practice, and one of the remedies was to turn towards everyday life that would "imply the whole totality of social relations in all their many facets" (Lüdtke, 1983:40-41).

In American historiography, a social history that deals with ordinary people rather than with the elite, has become a predominant field and has benefited extremely from the results of all the schools. "History from the bottom up", a phrase coined by British Marxist historians, determines the primary historian's concern for the past experiences of previously marginalized social groups - working class, ethnic groups, women, children, youth and the elderly. The vision of the social historians, however, was sharpened not only by the mere introduction of these groups as the new objects of study but also by taking into account the new set of categories needed for historiographical analysis. To accomplish that, historians acquired new sources or ones that have not been previously widespread in investigations: records of protest, demographic data, diaries, anonymous writings, artistic evidence (Stearns, 1983:3-21).

Additionally, a close connection exists between contemporary circumstances and the direction a certain field of study takes. Current political and/or cultural movements often provide a foundation for intellectual inquiry. Academics, although often blamed for being stuck in the "ivory tower" respond frequently to the stimuli of the outside world. This certainly proved true in the feminist movement of the sixties, which inspired scholarly interest and finally led to the emergence of women's studies and the field of women's history. In the same manner, different ethnic movements (especially in the United States) prompted the questions of writing history oriented towards the experiences of ethnic minorities of different races. In the past decade, the urgent environmental problems are prompting studies in environmental history. Therefore, it is plausible that postmodernism, as a characteristic cultural endeavor of the seventies and eighties, provoked an inquiry into styles of everyday life. The term "everyday life" encompasses a certain fragmentation of experiences, a splitting of life into segments. The everyday experience consists of the little things one hardly notices in time and space as Braudel already noted (Braudel, 1981:29). Accordingly, historians and other social scientists emphasize the research in life cycles, rituals and ceremonies -miniature pieces of human realities that are to be isolated and inspected in precise details. Thus, for a historian taking a particular path in an investigation, nothing is a trivial matter.

Lawrence Stone acknowledges in his autobiographical essay that he, as well as numerous other social historians of his generation, came under the influence of the new school of symbolic anthropology. Anthropologists like Clifford Geertz, (the most distinguished of the school) contributed immensely to the study of history by hinting at the power of "thick description" — "that is how the close and well-informed look at seemingly trivial acts, events, symbols, gestures, patterns of speech or behavior can be made to reveal whole systems of thought; and to draw our attention to problems of kinship, lineage or community structures, whose significance would have eluded us without their guidance" (Stone, 1989:586-590). This became a standard for the studies of family behavior and social change as historical phenomena.

The additional question is: what constitutes a category of analysis for the historian of everyday life? The answer is quite overwhelming: until now virtually any accepted category has its place in this kind of research: class, race, ethnicity, and gender, which is the most apparent.

There is an emerging interest also in fields other than history, particularly in the social sciences and women's studies. For example, researches into specifically women's issues, such as life cycles, are introducing the category of everyday life. In the same vein, previously "neutral" categories, like time have become a focus of research and prove to be socially and historically constructed as well as gendered. This also has raised more specific questions of social, class and gender identities (Davies, 1990).

The problem addressed here is the extent to which this approach has been introduced in the study of Soviet history, particularly the history of the revolutionary period of the Soviet Union. Although the social history of the Soviet Union — dealing with the specific histories of peasants, workers, women and/or soldiers, became an explosive field in the United States just before the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the question remains: what kind of response did it provoke among Soviet and Russian scholars?

Indeed, the study of semiotics of "Russian literary life" flourished in the Soviet Union in the sixties and has been attracting the attention in the West as well. The history of everyday life became an object of investigation among certain persuasion of Soviet scholars in the late sixties. Grounded on the work of scholars such as Iurii Lotman, who in 1968 had organized a seminar on Russian daily life in nineteenth century, this school examines the relationship between a literary work and everyday life. The method of their investigation is considered to be post-structuralist, because although they were intellectually based upon the structuralist poetics of the seventies, the result of their work (as presented in the book *Semiotics of Russian Cultural History*) is a sophisticated combination of social psychology, anthropology and structuralist poetics. The finest example of such technique is Lotman's article on the everyday life of the Decembrists. Everything in the lives of the Decembrists, Russian revolutionary aristocrats, is relevant: the historical facts about them, their own writing, the writing of others, as well as the way they dressed, talked or behaved. All transmits to the inquirer a convincing message about the nature of their existence (Lotman, 1985).

Similar effort was undertaken by Richard Stites in writing his book *Revolutionary Dreams* (Stites, 1989). As another historian once suggested, dreams matter. They matter not only as ideologies, as visions of an ideal world, but also as patterns of thought balanced constantly between politics and economy, between the reproduction and the production of life (Shanin, 1983:227). Stites was entirely conscious of that fact when he decided to write a book on revolutionary visions and utopianism. The leading idea behind the whole project was Stites' profound conviction that the processes of dreaming, inventing, and nourishing visions of the future and superior worlds are simultaneously immanent and pertinent to the understanding not only of the past, but of the present world as well. This book, complimented for its fully expert and highly readable style, attempts to recreate in even the smallest details the introductory moments of the Revolution. The book marvelously entertains showing that the Revolution meant the carnival of laughs, that the political culture of the October Revolution, one of the crucial turning points for the history of the twentieth century, could, in addition to coercion and terror, also display innovation and experiment at different levels of life, from the conductorless orchestras to the community life styles and science fiction novels.

In terms of sources, *Revolutionary Dreams* is an extraordinary book, full of the material not found in archives. This certainly is not a criticism of Stites because the material he has gathered in the Soviet Union is revealing if not previously perceived as a source of historical research. The books, magazines, 1920s popular literature and press clippings from that period vividly document the era of the revolution.

*Revolutionary Dreams* displays an exemplary quality that distinguishes it from standard history books; a seducing piece of historical writing, it fascinates the reader to the point at which it is almost impossible to understand revolutionary visionaries and utopian creators as creatures of this world. However contagious Stites' enthusiasm, it certainly provokes discussion about the respective topic of his analysis.

In her book on the Bogdanov-Lenin controversy, Zenovia Sochor acknowledges the division between Lenin and Bogdanov as a profound division between ideology and utopia. By banning Proletkult and factions, Lenin established ideological as well as political supremacy. He stripped political culture of the revolution of any utopian content and replaced it with ideological orthodoxy (Sochor, 1988:211). This ultimately forced utopianists of all kinds to go underground (and this is where they stayed until the dissolution of the Soviet Union) and prepared the ground for the Stalin's era.<sup>1</sup> As some of Stites' critics stated, Stalinism is regarded in his book as a negative utopia directly opposed to the innocent period of the Revolution. Recent research of the Stalin period tends to suggest that there was no clear-cut division between the Lenin and Stalin eras. The possibility of decoding Stalinism as a form of negative utopianism justifiably intrigues Stites, keeping in mind that the twentieth century world was exhausted by two disastrous utopias envisaged by Stalin and Hitler (Stites, 1978).

<sup>1</sup> One should only recall the Moscow - Leningrad jazz/rock scene to be convinced of that fact. For the historical account of the jazz in the Soviet Union see: Frederick Starr, *Red and Hot: the Fate of Jazz in the Soviet Union*, (New York, 1983).

Lynn Hunt reminds us that "no account of cultural unity and difference can be complete without some discussion of gender," but Stites' book only in passing refers to that important category (Hunt, 1989:18). Nevertheless, the new scholarship on women in Russia and the Soviet Union increases considerably. Much of this scholarship aims to trace women's experiences in these countries' histories and, at the same time, to incorporate feminist approaches in their research. Much has been accomplished that serves to highlight women's contribution to the history of the Soviet Union. Indeed, one of Richard Stites' books discusses the Russian feminist movement of the nineteenth century. Also the scholarship shifts from the investigation of women in the movements (which was the most obvious initial focus) to the research and development of informal women's networks and other instances of social relations.

Following this line of study, a question remains almost unrecognized, e.g. the concern about the existence of a female utopia. Was there a recognizable female utopia that can be identified in these early days of the Soviet revolution?<sup>2</sup>

The work of Alexandra Kollontai confirms that point, that there truly existed a female utopia. Various interpretations argue that point exclusively on the basis of her essay *The New Woman*, published in Berlin in 1920. In this essay Kollontai argues for the novel type of woman that emerges out of the revolution. What is new about our "new woman"? Kollontai was very much aware of the fact that feminism in Russia did not start with the revolution. On the contrary, some have argued that feminism or "a very strong bourgeois women's movement" actually ended in Russia when the Bolsheviks established their power (Kollontai, 1971:13). Richard Stites himself provided a trustworthy record of the scope and diversity of women's movements in Russia in his earlier work. While still not firmly in power, the Bolsheviks needed women as a traditionally mobilizing force to strengthen their position during the Civil War period. Women did take part in revolutionary activities. The first years of the Revolution were, in Kollontai's words:

"... so rich in magnificent illusions, plans, ardent initiatives to improve life, to organize the world anew, months of the real romanticism of the Revolution..." (Kollontai, 1971:35).

The idea of the New Woman, as represented by Kollontai, was introduced in accord with proletarian traditions to represent the independent, free and heroic woman who is totally capable of ruling her life and participating in the life of the community. Kollontai, herself an ardent feminist and libertarian, emphasizes the point of separate male and female identities and tries to compromise the ideas of sexual liberation with the idea of female emancipation as proclaimed by socialist state tactics. Her dreams and visions about the ultimate liberation remained utopian, indeed.

<sup>2</sup>This question formed the topic of a workshop discussion chaired by Richard Stites at the AAASS conference in Washington D.C. in 1990.

One observer of Soviet life commented cynically:

“Soviet life is a theatrical spectacle in which the entire population takes part, from the rulers to the ruled. The rulers set tasks and express aims in heroic slogans, in the full knowledge that the tasks cannot be fulfilled and the aims cannot be achieved. The ruled have this knowledge too, yet they accept the tasks and the aims, and neither the rulers nor the ruled show any desire to refuse to cooperate in the endless spectacle” (Bokov, 1975).

Even though Soviet ethnologists and folklorists took a conservative and ideologically biased approach to studying Soviet rituals, Western cultural anthropologists expanded the field of research with a thorough investigation of rites of passage, as the term goes for the customs accompanying births, marriages and deaths. One of the few existing studies of Soviet civil ceremonies explores the variety of the invented rituals of the new Soviet State. The author separates them into private and public ceremonies and states that the split was a creation of the ruling elite (McDowell, 1974:265-279). In support of that, Trotsky states in one of his articles:

“The worker's State has rejected Church ceremony, and informed its citizens that they have a right to be born, to marry and to die without the mysterious gestures and exhortations of persons clad in cassocks, gowns and other ecclesiastical vestments” (Trotsky, 1924:62).

Indeed the new elite in the Soviet Union felt the urge to introduce new customs in place of the archaic ceremonies of the Russian Orthodox Church. This was certainly not an easy task and, as Stites asserts, communist rituals of the 1920s did not become a mass phenomenon (Stites, 1989:114). Still, “red baptisms” were introduced in place of the church christenings during and immediately after the Civil War. The description that we get from McDowell indicated a strong symbolic link with religious baptisms. Actually, except for the revolutionary iconography introduced by red banners and the name of the ceremony “Octobering” that indicates its roots in the October Revolution, the whole ceremony quite resembled the church baptism, except that it lacked the spiritual strength that Church ceremonies certainly have. This poses another question to which a current study of the rituals in Soviet Union do not offer an explanation, e.g. the prevalence of State baptisms and weddings. Were there, at least, in the first years after the revolution, “parallel” or attempted parallel ceremonies? Trotsky's note, in passing, reassures us that there were many “misunderstandings” and exclusions from the party on account of the Church weddings (Trotsky, 1924:66). By comparison, the case of Yugoslavia suggests that, citizens divided their loyalties between church and state, regardless of their faith, whether in Croatia and Slovenia, the areas with the traditionally strong Roman Catholic influence, as well as those under the jurisdiction of the Serbian Orthodox Church, or in areas of historically strong Islamic tradition. This indicates that the State did not encourage its people to conduct religious ceremonies, but had also never officially outlawed them (Sklevicky, 1990).

Stites gives a revealing account of the naming of babies and the utopian quality that these new, revolution-inspired names held. He concludes that the diversity of the revolutionary names and the desire of the people who imagined that even by simply naming babies *Elektrifikatsiya* could contribute to the creation of the new world, is fascinating.

A witness of the revolutionary period in Moscow, Rene Fueleop-Miller reported that it was far more difficult to find an adequate substitute for the traditional forms of marriage (Fueleop-Miller, 1965:195). Traditionally, elaborate wedding ceremonies continued for several hours in the Orthodox Church. The new revolutionary wedding was to be performed in front of the police authorities in less than an hour. This did not offer many opportunities for habitual festivities. One of the various proverbs connected with the wedding ceremony proves that:

“It is a sin to come from a wedding sober” (Alexander, 1975:121).

As Fueleop-Miller notices, “the red weddings” performed in such colorless official businesslike manner did not satisfy people’s needs, the authorities began to introduce a kind of festive spirit, arranging dances and feasts. The contemporary Soviet wedding, as McDowell discusses, is performed in the Wedding Palace, the wedding rings and other wedding paraphernalia are available at specially reduced prices at the wedding shops. The wedding march is performed over the tape and the ceremony led by a male or female official. She or he addresses the couple and describes the duties they have to each other and to their future children. The only deviation from the traditional church ceremony is a part of the speech devoted to responsibilities toward the Soviet Fatherland and the construction of Communism (McDowell, 1974:275). The secular beliefs in the building of Communism and defending the Soviet Union replaced religious rituals, but did not win popular support, especially as Stites argues, among the peasants. They liked the Church decorum, and more than that, they appreciated the feasts that took place afterward (Stites, 1989:112).

Problems between spouses may have arise after the wedding, and division along the lines of the different convictions is probably one of the most obvious. Trotsky suggested such a possibility in the article “From the Old Family to the New” where he invents a story about a husband who is a Party member whose wife is religious and does not obey the order of the Party to remove icons from her home (Trotsky, 1973:24). This *chastushka* voices the sentiment in such situation:

“My husband is a Communist,  
And I am an Independent;  
That is why our love  
Is not getting anywhere” (Sokolov, 1950:642).

The intrusion of the Party into the private lives of people would obviously not worry Trotsky, but this is precisely what interests historians of everyday life. The insistence on the change of gender roles and social behavior is grounded deeply in the concept of revolutionary change. How did people react to the change that was imposed



“from above” and what did they themselves do to contribute to change? Their emotions and inmost thoughts were altered and daily routine shattered. How did they react to it? These remain important issues for the history of everyday life.

During the first phase of the revolution (1917-1921) the emancipation of women was legalized and publicly proclaimed as one of the basic revolutionary achievements, marking the attitude towards women and their “proper place” as one of the emancipating ideas and utopias of the Revolution. The possibility of legal divorce became one of the most engaging:

“Now with Soviet rule  
I have a recourse  
If the man is bad  
I'll get a divorce” (Alexander, 1975:390).

The collectivization of the Thirties was ridiculed in popular culture. Emancipation theories and egalitarianism did not penetrate deeply into the sensibility of ordinary people; rather, they decided to make fun of it:

“Oh, kolkhoz, oh, kolkhoz,  
Yes the name is new:  
The men will milk cows,  
The women will rule” (Alexander, 1975:390).

Death and funeral ceremonies were from the point of view of revolutionary officials, the most difficult either to break or establish in the secular form. The idea of burying a member of the family without any ceremony at all was for a Russian as Fueloep-Miller states “perfectly ridiculous”. Even Trotsky admits that “in cases where the standing of the dead has called for a funeral of the political character, the stage has been set for the new, spectacular ceremony, imbued with the symbolism of the revolution - the red flag, the revolutionary Dead March, the farewell rifle salute” (Trotsky, 1924:66). Contemporary Soviet funerals seem to be far less powerful than traditional church ceremonies. The farewell speeches contain no idea of an afterlife or “immortality of the soul”, thus being of little comfort to grieving relatives. The idea that “life continues, and everything that the deceased had time to accomplish, continues; his deeds are alive in our deeds; everything remains to the people”, is too rudimentary even for the nonbelievers (McDowell, 1974:276). It is precisely in the face of the death that people meditate on the profound loss, and while they themselves cannot answer questions of substantiality, the Church usually has the last word. Exactly on this point the Soviet revolutionary leaders felt their weak spot, competing with the Church for the souls of their people. Customs and ceremonies that revolve around births, weddings and deaths, three major rites of passage in human life, play a decisive role in constructing identities, developing sense of community ties and belonging to a wider social domain. In Stites' opinion the effort to replace old rituals with new ones was not only a fascinating experiment, but an effort deeply rooted in the proletarian tradition of a

certain social strata. It was, however, not widespread among peasants, and other strata of the population who, as Stites suggests, missed the customary glass of vodka at the end of the Orthodox funeral (Stites, 1989:114).

Alcohol consumption holds a specific place in the popular culture of Russian, and later, Soviet society. As Trotsky mentions, "a small flask contains a whole world of images" and ordinary people are not particularly keen to part with these images (Trotsky, 1924:62). Moreover, not only proverbs, but poems, rhymes and ultimately novels were written in praise of drinking, arguably the favorite pastime of working people. The following sayings provide an insight into the nihilistic mentality of the drinking masses.

"One may drink or abstain, in his grave he'll be lain."

"Bottoms up today, bottoms up tomorrow  
and all that is left are tears and sorrow."

"Let us drink,

Have a ball,

Death will come -

We'll die all" (Alexander, 1975:124;397).

Investigating life in Moscow in the Twenties, William J. Chase recognized drunkenness and excessive alcohol consumption as one of the crucial problems, especially among the new workers. The new migration that brought peasants to the cities did not result in change in their customs or drinking habits. On the contrary, the tavern remained the center of social life for many of them, especially due to the desperate social conditions in which these people were living. The state reacted in banning the sale of alcoholic beverages immediately after the revolution. In one of his comments on the problems that arise in everyday life, especially in that of the working class, Trotsky pressed the problem of alcoholism:

"The liquidation of the vodka monopoly, for which the war was responsible, preceded the revolution... The revolution inherited the liquidation of the vodka monopoly as a fact; it adopted the fact, but was actuated by considerations of principle. It was only with the conquest of power by the working class which became the conscious creator of the new economic order, that the combating of alcoholism by the country, by education and prohibition, was able to receive its due historic significance. The circumstance that the "drunkards" budget was abandoned during the imperialist war does not alter the fundamental fact that the abolition of the system by which the country encouraged people to drink is one of the iron assets of the revolution" (Trotsky, 1990:106).

Regardless of prohibition and major anti-propaganda efforts on the part of Soviet rulers, alcohol remained the chief source of comfort for many workers as well as peasants. On the other hand, alcohol consumption resulted in crime-related activities, the number of which raised constantly (Chase, 1987:181).

Closely connected with alcohol consumption is domestic violence, which was not indicated in studies of Russian village communities and urban areas. The influence of women's studies, especially women's history and its preoccupation with the problems of power relations and the construction of gender roles in given societies, prompted awareness of the problem of domestic violence:

**“To the custom quite contrary,  
Listen girls, do not marry!  
Your good looks you will lose,  
Gain no happiness, but abuse.  
May be bad the single life  
But early grave awaits the wife”  
(Alexander, 1975:395).**

Quite obviously the Bolsheviks, once established political power and revolution, came to deal more closely with the problems of everyday life. Domestic violence, along with alcoholism and crime, considered pathologies of everyday life, were dealt with on different levels. From the Party congresses to newspapers and workshop discussions, the introduction of the New went on:

**“My husband drove me away, 'and my father beat me,  
My stepmother was not kind to me.  
But in the collective farm I became  
Like all the others, a free woman”  
(Sokolov, 1950:646).**

Concluding his prophetic article about the revival of narrative as a form of historical writing, Lawrence Stone asserted that, for history itself, there is nothing as perilous as the predominance of one school of thought because it would necessarily mean the closing and the entropy of the discipline. In that respect, we see the possibility that the history of everyday life may become one of many ways in the attempts to grasp the past, real or imagined.

## LITERATURA

**ALEXANDER, Alex E.:** *Russian Folklore, An Anthology in English Translation*, Belmont, 1975.

**BOKOV, Nikolay:** *Nobody*, London, 1975.

**BRAUDEL, Fernand:** *The Structures of Everyday Life, The Limits of the Possible*, New York, 1981.

**CHASE, William J.:** *Workers, Society and the Soviet State*, 1987.

**DAVIES, Karen:** *Women, Time and the Weaving of the Strands of Everyday Life*, Aldershot, 1990.

**EROFEEV, Benedict:** *Moscow Circles*, London, 1981.

**FUELOEP-MILLER, Rene:** *The Mind and Face of Bolshevism*, New York, 1965.

**HUNT, Lynn:** *The New Cultural History*, Berkeley, 1989.

**KOLLONTAI, Alexandra:** *The Autobiography of a Sexually Emancipated Communist Woman*, New York, 1971.

**LOTMAN, Iurii M.:** *The Decembrist in Daily Life: Everyday Behavior as a Historical-Psychological Category*, in: *The Semiotics of Russian Cultural History*, Ithaca and London, 1985.

**LUEDTKE, Alf:** *The historiography of everyday life: the personal and the political*, in: Raphael Samuel and Gareth Stedman Jones, (eds.), *Culture, Ideology and Politics*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1983.

**McDOWELL, Jennifer:** *Soviet Civil Ceremonies*, *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 13 (3), 1974, pp.265-279.

*The Semiotics of Russian Cultural History*, Ithaca and London, 1985.

**SHANIN, Theodor:** *The Peasant Dreams: 1905-1907* in: Raphael Samuel and Gareth Stedman Jones, eds., *Culture, Ideology and Politics*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1983.

**SIDER, Gerald:** *Culture and Class in Anthropology and History, A Newfoundland Illustration*, Cambridge, 1986.

**SKLEVICKY, Lydia:** *The New Year or How Tradition Was Tempered*, *East European Politics and Societies*, 4(1), 1990.

**SOCHOR, Zenovia A.:** *Revolution and Culture*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London, 1988.

**SOKOLOV, Y.M.:** *Russian Folklore*, New York, 1950.

**STEARNS, Peter, N.:** *New Social History: An Overview*, in: James B. Gardner and George Rollie Adams, (eds.), *Ordinary People and Everyday Life*, Nashville, 1983.

**STITES, Richard:** *Revolutionary Dreams*, Oxford University Press, New York and Oxford, 1989.

**STITES, Richard:** *The Women's Liberation Movement in Russia, Feminism, Nihilism and Bolshevism, 1860 - 1930*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1978.

**STONE, Lawrence:** *As Seen By Himself*, in: Beier, Cannadine and Rosenheim, (eds.), *The First Modern Society*, Cambridge and New York, 1989.

**TILLY, Charles:** *As Society Meets History*, New York, 1981.

**TROTSKY, Leon:** *The Family and Ceremony*, in: *The Problems of Life*, London, 1924.

**TROTSKY, Leon:** *Women and the Family*, New York, 1973.

**TROTSKY, Leon:** *Vodka, the Church and the Cinema*, in: William G. Rosenberg, (ed.), *Bolshevik Visions*, vol.2., Ann Arbor, 1990.

## SNOVI I ZBILJA SVAKIDAŠNJEGA ŽIVOTA

### Sažetak

Ovaj članak daje kratak pregled etabliranja pojma svakidašnjice kao grane istraživanja u historiografiji. Predstavlja francuske, britanske i američke povjesničare i njihove pristupe koji su tijekom 20. stoljeća legitimirali istraživanja svakidašnjice. Na primjeru djela Richarda Stitesa o ruskoj svakidašnjici razmatra promjene koje nastaju u prvoj fazi nakon Oktobarske revolucije u stavovima prema ritualima te u stavovima prema alkoholizmu, nasilju u obitelji te ulozi žene u društvu. Prikaz Stitesova rada proširuje se zanimljivim znanjima o suvremenim povijesnim istraživanjima utopije.