nales or E. P. Thompson, it is less successful. The "total history" perspective of classic social history consciously attempts to relate the particulars of everyday life to large-scale social and political structures. Consequently, the construction of *Alltagsgeschichte* and cultural history as separate subfields results not from a meaningful theoretical distinction but from the gap between the research agenda of social history and the reality of what scholars have achieved in practice. Beginning with environment, demography, and other deep structural changes of the long duration, classic social history has always aspired to work up from underlying conditions through conjunctures and immediate events to subjective experience and mentality. In principle, if not always in practice, social history also has recognized the interactive nature of the relationship between the conceptualization of social reality and concrete historical facts. At no time has individuality, mental life, subjective experience, community relations, or local culture been excluded from the framework of social history. In the actual work of social historians, the idea of what researchers would like to know is often at odds with what the available sources allow them to know. For this reason, scholars repeatedly falter before the mighty barriers of questions that the sources simply cannot answer. Whether the recent emphasis on "cultural" sources and the "cultural" dimension of everyday life will permit historians to answer the questions of inner experience implied by the concept of *Alltag* remains unclear. To date, in the field of Russian history, this approach has produced interesting anthropological vignettes but no breakthrough in the use of problematic sources and no innovative analytical framework that addresses broad-ranging questions.

*Elise Kimerling Wirtschafter  California State Polytechnic University, Pomona*


This seductively entitled book, *Alleged Sex and Threatened Violence*, by Stanford University Russianist Terence Emmons, recounts the lurid story of a three-and-a-half-year conflict that unfolded in San Francisco’s small Russian immigrant enclave between the medical doctor cum Russian revolutionary, Nicholas Russel (a name chosen to evade tsarist police), and Russian Orthodox cleric, Bishop Vladimir. Commenced with the epigraph, "L’histoire est un roman vrai" (Paul Veyne), Emmons's tale bespeaks truth-in-packaging (p. xi): In April 1888, Vladimir, Bishop of Alaska and the Aleutians, arrived in San Francisco, the headquarters of his vast diocese, accompanied by a twenty-two-person entourage (including eight clergy and eleven boys, most of them seminarians). Affairs in the tiny Orthodox (though largely non-Russian) community had been convoluted, with one of Vladimir’s predecessors ostensibly a murder victim and another an apparent suicide. Though given to economizing on staff salaries, the bishop also had a penchant for showy church architecture. After a fire consumed the church, Vladimir's critics in
the lay benevolent society demanded Vladimir's ouster, while the bishop called the former "nihilists." Leader of the lay opposition was San Francisco's somewhat dreamy (somewhat slippery) Russian physician, Dr. Russel, who himself (together with his utopian idealism) had migrated to America only a few years earlier and soon became Vladimir's bête noire.

With "charges rang[ing] from arson, theft, perjury, conspiracy, and bribery to attempted assassinations (three), bigamy, adultery, sodomy, and child abuse" (p. 4), what followed (if accounts are to be credited) was part tragedy, part farce, and "un roman vrai," to be sure, but not a particularly climactic one (or, as Emmons notes, one without "a satisfying dramatic conclusion"). (p. xiv) Russel was anathemized (excommunicated) by Bishop Vladimir, but the order eventually was annulled. As for Vladimir, despite the graphic nature of the allegations against him, these never proved his undoing. So as not to give away the ending of this Russian fable, suffice it to say that, by 1892, both Vladimir and Russel had left San Francisco — the former, re-assigned to a see in Russia; the latter, off to Hawaii (and later Mindinao, Japan, and Tientsin in China, where he eventually died). Thereafter the teapot-tempest subsided, but Russel's fascinating adventures continued in the Far East while scandal still stalked Russian affairs in San Francisco.

Emmons readily concedes that the episode "involv[e]d no major historical events or important people" and that "[i]ts outcome was inconsequential in the larger scheme of things" (p. xi). On the one hand, Emmons is indeed quite correct; and, as he portrays it, the brouhaha was largely a clash of egos and personalities (although the author perhaps does not appreciate the likely role both of yellow journalism and of nativism in inflating the particulars). On the other, advantaged by a story layered with complicity, Emmons has coaxed several intellectual strands from its telling which allow this book to be taken seriously as solid and theoretically informed historical scholarship.

Emmons, for example, owns the notion (of Louis Mink, Hayden White, et al.) "that we impose narrative structures — story lines — on historical "facts" or "events" from without, that history is not narratively configured "in nature"" (pp. xi-xii). Emmons also usefully tries to address the question: "what light can this local and seemingly insignificant story" — a rambunctious petite histoire, seemingly so remote and bizarre that the author calls this close narrative not "history from below" but the rather clever coinage, "history from the periphery" — "shed on broader historical perspectives and issues?" (pp. xii-xiii) Trying to negotiate "objectivist" social science and "subjectivist narrative theory" (p. xiv), Emmons answers that the affair caused "considerable reverberations in high places in St. Petersburg," that its protagonists "afford a glimpse into the mental world of individuals who represent significant social groups" ("a rank-and-file member of the revolutionary-populist intelligentsia" and a "Russian cleric"); and that the saga reveals much about "sexual and legal mores of the time in both Russia and California." (p. xiii) In passing, Emmons also assays a few (not particularly probing) observations about the theme of anti-semitism (both Vladimir and Russel alleged a conspiracy of Jewish plotters).