

subjective interiority, experience, and love. The poet's 1917 cycle *Sestra moia zhizn'* is understood here as "an example of an exceptional poetic dwelling in, and experience of, place, in which practically any small landscape detail . . . turns into a powerful geographic appearance . . ." (143). Zamiatin's goal is to investigate by what strategies a concrete, identifiable place becomes a space of emotional experience, and to seek a systematic process for such transformation. He thus identifies Pasternak's initial transfer of particular biographic and topographic details onto the eternal "places" of love—such as the steppe, the garden, or the world at night. This is followed by the blending of this newly-emergent place with local affective histories, easing the intensity of the poet's own emotional experience. The final step, Zamiatin suggests, is "the indifference to place," a creation of a fluid, flexible space in which anything concrete and factual can be endlessly rearranged to suit the poet's subjective pursuits.

One of the book's repeated claims is that its examined works, while studied in regards to the historical and ideological contexts of their spatial particularities, have not been fully analyzed in terms of their spatiality *as such*. Zamiatin's goal, accordingly, is to isolate artistic strategies that perform spatial transformations within a text, which he does in great detail. Yet the disengagement from history and ideology in the discussion generates a blind spot within his argument, with the question persisting *why* certain places and themes, as well as certain modes of creative spatial molding, have been privileged not just in individual artists' works but in specific historical circumstances. The accumulation of interpretative elements, furthermore, occasionally tips the analysis out of balance. Zamiatin's larger goals are not always clear, just as his repeated insistence on a *system*, on the presence of a "strict meta-geographic order," is not always convincing. These shortcomings notwithstanding, *Gunny v Parizhe*, through its combination of broad historical purview and focused textual analysis, illuminates the expansive role played by space in the development of Russian culture, and points to rich directions for further study.

LIDA OUKADEROVA
Rice University

Rodina: Mark Shagal v Vitebske. By Viktor Martinovich. Moscow: Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie, 2017. 240 pp. Notes. Bibliography. ₴309, hard bound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2018.262

This book has an ambitious aim—to reconstruct and re-assess the complex relationship between Marc Chagall and his native Vitebsk. The study is supported by a wealth of documentation and archival research—often previously unknown documents, unearthed from various archives in Vitebsk. Despite its modest size, this book is clearly the result of intensive research in Russian archives; it uses a lot of previously unknown primary material and possesses a good scholarly apparatus. It is well documented.

The author clearly knows the subject well and is conversant with the current thought on the subject, showing a detailed knowledge of primary and secondary sources (although I felt that in some cases the author relies too heavily on Alexandra Shatskikh's volume on Vitebsk). Apart from shedding new light on Chagall's life and work in Vitebsk, Martinovich provides a very useful account of street decorations of Vitebsk on the first anniversary of the October Revolution and of Kazimir Malevich's arrival in Vitebsk.

The structure of the book is well balanced, although in the first chapters the author spends perhaps too much space discussing inaccuracies in the information

regarding Chagall's date and place of birth; although this information is important, such lengthy discussion is not very necessary.

Another inaccuracy occurs in the description of the reasons for the help given by David Shterenberg to Chagall (113). Somehow, the author fails to mention that both artists had studios in the famous La Ruche in Paris before the First World War, which explains their strong bond in post-revolutionary years.

Martinovich's book is nominally composed of three sections. The first deals with myths and mistakes which have often occurred in Chagall's biographies. It also offers an account of Chagall's return to Vitebsk from Paris. The second part describes Chagall's post-revolutionary work in Vitebsk, his conflicts with the artist Mstislav Dobuzhinsky and art-critic Aleksandr Romm, and his contradictory new rules and monopolistic control of his art school specializing in artistic production in Vitebsk. It also highlights the earlier dominant role of Chagall and the later hegemony of Malevich. The final chapter deals with the oblivion of people in Vitebsk toward Chagall and his oeuvre, as well as the broader contemporary attitude toward Chagall in Belorussia.

With the new wave of interest in Chagall's life and work in Vitebsk, which will likely only be accelerated by the upcoming exhibition at the Pompidou Centre in Paris called *Chagall, Lissitzky, Malévitch: L'avant-garde Russe à Vitebsk (1918–1922)*, this book makes a valuable contribution to the field of Russian art history. Martinovich brings out the hallucinatory vigor of Chagall's visionary life, and also the extreme solipsism of his personality. It is a well-written, compassionate portrait of a paragon of human talent and ambition confronted by misunderstanding and mediocrity.

NATALIA MURRAY

The Courtauld Institute of Art

Klezmer: Music, History, and Memory. By Walter Zev Feldman. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016. xxiv, 412 pp. Appendix. Notes. Bibliography. Glossary. Index. Illustrations. Photographs. Tables. Musical examples. \$74.00, hard bound. doi: 10.1017/slr.2018.263

Perhaps Zev Feldman, as he is known in the Jewish musical world, was not born to write this book, but his whole life has prepared him for that task. A scholar, teacher, and performer of Ottoman Turkish, Central Asian, and Jewish music, he was one of the pioneers of the so-called "klezmer revival," or what he prefers to call following Mark Slobin, the klezmer revitalization of the late 1970s. In eastern Europe, the Yiddish term *klezmer* (plural *klezmerim* or [di] *klezmer*) designated a professional Jewish musician who performed at traditional Jewish weddings as part of a (usually small) ensemble known as a *kapelye*. The purely instrumental repertoire of these *kapelyes* survived into emigration, so it was not a genre that had died and had to be revived. Feldman writes that by 1976 he had begun using the term "klezmer music" to refer to the Jewish instrumental music that he had been studying, although he acknowledges the coinage of parallel Yiddish terminology (*klezmerishe muzik*) by the Soviet Jewish ethnomusicologist Moisei Beregovskii in the late 1920s.

Feldman's magisterial work is in two parts. Part One, "The Klezmer Profession: Social and Artistic Function," consists of six chapters dealing with such topics as "The Word Klezmer and Jewish Professional Musicians," "The Jewish Wedding