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I am proud to present this very special double issue of the Journal of Synagogue Music, a “Festschrift” in honor of the 85th birthday of Hazzan Max Wohlberg, the greatest contemporary teacher of hazzanim. Max has served as an inspiration to several generations of hazzanim. His personal style, his warmth and caring and his tremendous patience for his students, his modesty and his strength of character have pointed the way for hundreds of students.

This issue was made possible in part through the efforts of members of the Cantors Institute Alumni Association, who conceived the idea and arranged for several of the articles which appear herein. I am particularly grateful to Erica Lippitz and Brian Mayer for their efforts.

We have chosen to honor Hazzan Wohlberg more through study than through a testimonial. Readers will no doubt enjoy Max’s own “Recollections and Reflections” and Rabbi Morton Leifman’s “Affectionate Reminiscences,” found in the opening pages of this edition. Yet the bulk of the issue focuses on broader subjects.

Charles Davidson’s contribution analyzes three unaccompanied recitatives by Hazzan Wohlberg, each representing a different stage in Wohlberg’s style and development. One of these recitatives is also included in the music section in the form of an arrangement with accompaniment by Joseph Ness.

“Some Reflections on Two Genres of Berakhah” by Saul Wachs is adapted from a lecture given at the memorable 85th birthday celebration for Hazzan Wohlberg at the Jewish Theological Seminary, an event which was also arranged by the Cantors Institute Alumni Association. This event included a concert of Hazzan Wohlberg’s compositions and the dedication of a beautiful portrait of Hazzan Wohlberg, the first portrait of a Hazzan to grace the walls of the Seminary.

“Aspects of Jewish Music in Contemporary Britain” by Alexander Knapp is reprinted from the Proceedings of the Second British-Swedish Conference on Musicology: Ethnomusicology. This 377-page volume includes almost 100 pages of articles specifically on Jewish subjects. It is available from Dr. Ann Buckley and Paul Nixon (Editors), Darwin College, Silver Street, Cambridge, CB39EU, UK. The price is £27.

Brian Mayer’s examination of the Nusah for Bar’chu in the evening service on Shalosh Regali is gives a close-up view of what sort of choices Hazzan Wohlberg has needed to make in order to unify and simplify ideas about nusah. After reading his account, you may be inspired to examine original sources more closely.
Joshua Jacobson’s examination of Ta’amey Hamikra has implications both for the rendering of tefilot and the proper cantillation of all biblical text. This article too should encourage further study.

Our Review Section includes an examination of various recent recordings, and the Music Section has three works: Joseph Ness’ arrangement of Max Wohlberg’s Mi Sheberach, Boaz Tarsi’s original setting of Hashkivenu, and Daniel Katz’s arrangement of Max Wohlberg’s Amar Rabi Yosei.

Below you will find a reproduction of the table of contents of the June 1977 edition of the Journal of Synagogue Music, an issue dedicated to the 70th birthday of Max Wohlberg. This makes us hope and wonder what the Journal will look like in the summer of 2007, which will mark the 100th anniversary of the birthday of the honoree!

-Jack Chomsky
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RECOLLECTIONS AND REFLECTIONS

MAX WOHLBERG

Recently The New York Times published an interview with an old Yiddish actor, Feivish Finkel, who recalled and, with nostalgic musings, described the vital and vibrant Jewish East Side of New York of a half century ago. My first encounter with the East Side took place on the very first day I arrived here. However, a brief prefatory story is essential.

Being the last member of my family left in Europe, while still a student in the Yeshiva in Szatmar, I received in due course a ticket for the Cunard Line to travel to the United States on one of their ships. These ships left from Cherbourg, France. I therefore packed all of my belongings into a modest-sized suitcase and leisurely wound my way to Paris.

On the day after my arrival there I stopped into a restaurant where at the very next table, I heard some people conversing in Hungarian. I could not resist and introduced myself to them. They consisted of a young man with his mother and two young ladies, who were sisters. What they had in common were reservations for the Acquitania (Cunard Line) which was scheduled to leave from Cherbourg on the following afternoon.

Although I had not as yet stopped at the Cunard office for a confirmed reservation, I decided to join this group and hope for the best. We traveled to Cherbourg and boarded the tender which took us to the ship. Throughout this trip, wherever it was necessary, the young man in our group and one of the sisters held up the tickets and passes and I humbly walked behind them, both hands occupied.

On the ship we were directed to the office of the chief steward, who was to assign cabins. Here I parted with my friends and found an innocuous comer where I tried to relax, and waited till the tender left the ship and headed for the shore. Then I headed for the office of the steward. The office was already closed. It took a few minutes to locate the steward, who looked at me with wonder, disbelief and annoyance. Too late to return me to shore,
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he reopened his office, looked through his records and found an unoccupied upper birth in the cabin of an understandably upset Rumanian gentleman.

After a _pleasant_ journey, our ship arrived in New York in the late afternoon of a Friday. Having failed to notify my family, who lived on the East Side, of my travel plans, I was puzzled as to how I would manage to locate their residence and, since it is already Shabos, how I would get there. Fortunately, Providence was gracious and helpful. Aboard ship, traveling with me, was a distinguished looking, bearded gentleman who was met here by his nephew. I showed him the address of my family and he informed me that he and his uncle would be walking to their home, which was two blocks beyond the residence of my family.

We checked our luggage and started walking. The ship docked on the west side of Manhattan and we had to cross the width of Manhattan to reach East 9th Street, near Avenue C. The walk, taking more than an hour, was most impressive. The cold, warehouse and factory-filled west side was followed by exciting, busy Broadway and elegant residential 5th Avenue. Crossing Madison Avenue, we glanced up to the noisy, rambling elevated lines and made our acquaintance with the East Side. Gradually we seemed to be seeing more and more of our own people, some of whom, we guessed, might be returning home from the Synagogue. In any event, we felt at home on our first Shabbat here.

Reaching the home of my family, my guide and I walked up one flight and knocked on the door of their apartment. As the door opened, I heard my mother call out “perhaps a telegram from Moshe.” “No,” I answered, “Moshe himself.”

I spent the following years getting to know America through the lens of the East Side. I managed to get acquainted with the intricacies of the English language while I attended the Herzliah Teacher’s Seminary. Tuesday evenings I spent at the Educational Alliance on East Broadway listening to a lecture sermon by the World-renowned Zwi Hirsh Maslianasky. On Tuesday mornings the Yiddish newspapers announced “Masliansk y Yedabeir.”

In those days there were a number of daily Yiddish newspapers appearing in New York: the _Forward, Morgen Journal, Tageblatt, Wahrheit, Freiheit and Der Tog_. The latter became my favorite and I read it until its last day. Its daily columnist B.Z. Goldberg who, incidentally, was a son-in-law of Sholom Aleichem, succeeded in tackling an endless
number of subjects with skill and competence. Of these newspapers, only the Forward survived. It now appears as a bi-lingual weekly.

Next to the Forward building was the music store of Joseph Katz. It was there that I learned of the various facets of Jewish Music; Folk, Theater, art, cantorial, Hassidic, choral, instrumental and Nusach. Here began my serious study of every aspect of Jewish music and the reading of the vast multi-lingual literature relating to it.

Shortly thereafter, the store of Katz closed and Henry Lefkowitz opened the Metro Music Co. on Second Avenue near 4th Street. Joining the regular, almost daily group of its visitors, customers and kibbitzers, I met such musicians as Rumshinsky, Secunda, Zilberts, his brother Mark Silver, Abe Ellstein (his brother was for a while my accompanist) and Kotylansky. Later Lefkowitz published two of my Yiddish songs, for which I also wrote the text.

As by that time I had decided to enter the cantorate, I visited a large number of Synagogues that flourished on the East Side. Congregation Eitz Chayim on Avenue C engaged me for Shevuoth and sold tickets for admission. And I finally wound my way to Second Avenue and Houston Street, the headquarters of the Chazanirn Ferband, the national organization of Cantors, where I applied for membership. Since I was an unknown young foreigner, Cantor Joshua Weisser was asked to interview me. After a short but interesting conversation, he enthusiastically sponsored my admission.

Besides Weisser, with whom I established a lasting friendship, I was privileged to get to know a number of most interesting personalities. Since I was rapidly appointed to the Board of Directors and for many years served as (Yiddish) recording secretary, hardly anyone escaped my notice. Among the older members were Meisels (predecessor of Rosenblatt), Zeidel Rovner, A.L. Rutman, Greenspan (Sholom Ananever) and Arele Blum, who practically in minutes (for modest remuneration) would supply you with a needed recitative. I should also include here A. Singer, whose Zochreinu L’chayim — actually the refrain of one of his popular Yiddish songs — is sung all over.

Among the musically or intellectually creative men I got to know were Ephros, Yassinowsky, Zaludkowsky, Beimel, Wasilkovsky, Semiatin and Rappaport. Representing the Conservative wing were A. Katchko, J. Schwartz and D. Putterman.

The so-called stars included such names as Rosenblatt, Kwartin, Roitman, Hershman, S.M. Steinberg, Kapov-Kagan, Pinchik, Glantz, the Kusevitzkys, followed by Vigoda and Ganchoff. There were, of course, many more who, while possessing beautiful voices, preferred to stay out of the limelight. A perfect example of the latter was Sauler (father of
Gayna and father-in-law of Cantor Robert Kieval), cantor for many years of Brooklyn Jewish Center.

While I maintained friendly relations with Kwartin, Glantz, Weisser, Ephros and others, it was Putterman who most influenced the future of my career. Our discussions regarding the Future of the American cantorate and the need for a school to train cantors resulted in our meeting with Dr. Cyrus Adler, then Chancellor of the Jewish Theological Seminary, and with his successor Dr. Louis Finkelstein. Some 41 years ago our efforts bore fruit and the Cantors Institute was born.

Since I became associated with the C.I. from its very beginning there was one unvarying principle that guided all my decisions concerning the training of Cantors and the results we sought to achieve. A professional cantor, I always maintained, must be a religious Jew who is a master of our liturgy; one who is a competent musician and possesses a pleasant voice; one who is at home in our traditional literature and knowledgeable in secular culture; one to whom congregants can turn with confidence with their questions and problems.

To assist in the achievement of this goal, I compiled a comprehensive list called Basic Library of A Hazzan and presented it to our students. The four-page list covers twelve areas: Prayer Books, Liturgy, Dinim Uminhagim, Synagogue Music-Nusach, Cantor and Choir, Recitatives, Congregational singing, Collections (Songsters), Zemirot, Israeli songs, For Younger Children and Literature and Musicology.

While this list may appear to be all-inclusive, I obviously omitted such items as Sephardi, Ladino, Yiddish folk and art songs and secular music. I simply relied on other members of our excellent faculty to cover other areas.

As I contemplate the nature of our profession and note the changes that affected it during the past six decades I persist in maintaining that we continue to hold high the criteria of competence and mastery and aim for perfection.
The warm friendship that I have enjoyed with Hazzan Max Wohlberg extends for about fifty years, going back to my adolescence in Minneapolis, Minnesota, where Hazzan Wohlberg served at Beth El Synagogue, a congregation that had developed, over the years, a fine musical tradition, and where a well-trained twenty voice mixed volunteer choir sang on Shabbat evenings and on the Yamim Nora'im. The previous hazzan had grown up in Ohio and had been a student of Paul Discount, a cantor and composer still familiar to many in the Jewish music world. The choir sang a great deal of Discount’s music. Being a still raw, not very sophisticated youngest member of the choir, I was sure that Discount was at least a peer of Mozart and of Bach. And then Wohlberg came to Beth El and introduced us to Lewandowski, and then to Naumbourg, and very soon to Sulzer. The service changed, and so did our musical liturgical tastes. I still have a soft spot for Discount, but learned early enough that there were other even more remarkable Jewish voices, and that the ruah hakodesh extended its gifts to non-Jewish composers as well, sometimes in great measure indeed.

But aside from liturgical music, Hazzan Wohlberg exposed our choir to a full range of Jewish music experiences. We were introduced to Yiddish and Hebrew art songs, to the cultural flowering of East European music. We learned songs that had Hebrew and Russian words intertwined in the same sentence. We were introduced to the newly reborn Hebrew language through dozens of Hebrew songs. Without knowing it, we were learning some aspects of modern Jewish history at the same time we were being exposed to a splendid repertoire of secular and liturgical music.

I have written in this periodical on previous occasions of the private hours that Hazzan Wohlberg spent with me when I was an ambitious fifteen-year old. For about four months, we would meet two hours a day for five days a week studying nusah for the Yamin Nora'im, and I was able to officiate as the hazzan at the overflow service. The following year Hazzan Wohlberg decided that I should have a choir helping me, and he
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prepared a dozen settings— two part music — for a group that he trained while I watched and learned how to conduct.

All of Hazzan Wohlberg’s students have benefited from his Weltanschaung as it is expressed in every aspect of his life. First of all, he is at home and in love with everything Jewish; the Hebrew language and its grammar, the Tanakh, the Talmud, Jewish history, general music, Jewish folk music, the MiSinai tunes, nusah, biblical cantillation and its grammar, the modern repertoire of liturgical and general Jewish music. He exudes enthusiasm, and is able to do that in a quiet, dignified loving way. He is critical in a quiet, often humorous dignified way. There are never conscious insults to fellow faculty members. There is compassion — sometimes almost to a fault. There is ahavat Yisrael and ahavat hagriot. He always has a number of legitimate questions about the music that he is teaching: Is it authentic? Is it in good taste? Is it singable? Where does it come from?”

He has an overwhelming sense of responsibility toward the tradition. If a piyut is no longer chanted in most congregations and has a traditional melody, then perhaps we can “redeem” the melody. Let’s see where else the melody can be used. If the piyut is temporarily “out of work,” learn it anyway; a hazzan should know it. Who knows, the poem may yet be resurrected. One should believe in t’hiat hametim for a good poem as well as for a good melody.

Wohlberg has a number of other loves. His family, of course. Seeing him in March at the Seminary convocation at which his son Jeffrey received an honorary doctorate brought tears to many eyes. Cantor Wohlberg presented his son to the chancellor saying, “B’ni bhori, yehidi, yakiri.” His love and concern for his grandchildren, for his daughter-in-law, for his siblings and for his nephews and nieces is beautiful, natural, sweet.

One must mention Cantor Wohlberg’s humor, of course. He is a master of many genres of humor as well as the psychology of humor. He is also a master raconteur whose stories delight and entertain.

Of course, his love for his students is an important priority in his life. His concern is always far their development as musicians, as scholars, as Jews, as people, as representatives of the cantorial tradition and as shfihey tsibbur -representatives of the congregations to the Almighty. He cares and it shows.

He has taught at the Cantors Institute every semester for over forty years. His devotion to teaching has been extraordinary. He now commutes to New York from Philadelphia for two full days a week, sleeping over on a hard dormitory bed and changing trains in Trenton in order to save the Seminary a few dollars in travel costs, this shortly after undergoing major
surgery. His approach to the training of the hazzan combines tradition with modernity. Perhaps the following story is pertinent.

A young Seminary professor of Talmud was visiting a Yeshivah in B’nai Brak. He happened on two youngsters studying a very complicated Talmudic inyan. It was obvious that the youngsters didn’t understand a great deal of what was going on in the text. The American professor sat down with them and carefully explained the problems that the chapter was dealing with and what the youngsters were misinterpreting. One of the young men ran to his rosh yeshiva and informed him that a man with a thick American accent was sitting in the bet midrash and had taught a very difficult section of Gemarah to him and to his study partner and had clarified a number of issues. The Israeli rabbi came to the Bet Midrash room and asked the professor who he was and where he was from. The young Talmudist explained that he was from The Jewish Theological Seminary in New York and taught Talmud there. The rabbi said that he had never heard of that institution and asked for a description of the students who studied there. He was answered that The Jewish Theological Seminary trains rabbis, teachers and cantors. “Cantors”, said the rabbi. “Where on earth does your institution find teachers who can train cantors?” “Oh,” said the young professor, “We search for and find men who know nusah and others who can teach students how to read musical notes and these people teach prospective hazzanim.” “When I said ‘finding teachers of cantors’ I was referring to searching for people who could teach students the proper kavano t — what to feel in their hearts and in their minds when they chant the sacred prayers, and you mean people who teach young men how to read little black dots on white papers. You are not producing cantors: Who needs musical notes? We need proper kuvunuh.”

Cantor Max Wohlberg has devoted his teaching career to making sure that his students are learning that praying is not just performing. Wohlberg knows about kuvunuh. He also knows that the hazzan must combine the emotional and the religious with a knowledge of those little black dots on that white paper. For in truth, Hazzan Wohlberg is the quintessential Conservative cantor, responding to the sacred ancient texts in all of its magnificence and to the modern methods of learning, preserving and adding to the wealth of the Jewish experience. Kavanah and culture, the
notes, the words, the heart and the mind — all are in his legitimate provenance, and all are what he has communicated to generations of superbly prepared hazzanim. The entire Jewish community has gained from his life and we are all in his debt. His life has been and continues to be, a great blessing.
AN ANALYSIS OF THREE UNACCOMPANIED RECITATIVES OF MAX WOHLBERG

Mi Shebeirach, 1950.
Mizmor L’David, 1950.

CHARLES DAVIDSON

In the area of the unaccompanied recitative, Max Wohlberg has made a real and lasting contribution to Jewish Music. In his other works he is faced with the requirements of harmonization, the construction of accompaniments or the writing of contrapuntal lines. However, in the unaccompanied recitative he is free to use his natural melodic talent, unencumbered by other concerns. In the unaccompanied recitative his informed imagination is restricted only by limitations of voice and text.

The three settings which have been chosen for study are representative of three stylistic periods: 1) an extension of the east European tradition (Mi Shebeiruch); 2) a modernization of that tradition (Mizmor L’David); 3) a contemporary neoclassicism (Amar Rabi Y’hoshua, Ethics of the Fathers 6:2). Each of the three recitatives will be analyzed separately.

Mi Shebeiruch (Example 1a) is a modernized version (1950) of the old-style, melismatic recitative. The excessive coloratura which marked representative selections of the period has here been reduced to a minimum, leaving just enough ornamentation to be vocally challenging. There is a grand and majestic character to the piece marked by graceful and extended phrases. The structure is clearly evident: G minor opening phrase (measures 1-6) followed by shifts in tonality from G minor to Dorian (measure 11) to Ukrainian-Dorian (measures 15-16) and back to G minor for section A. Section B begins with an Ukrainian-Dorian motive traditionally identified with the text at measures 20-26 and then moves again to the Dorian on G (measures 23-24). After a brief excursion through Ukrainian-Dorian (measures 25-26), Dorian on G (measures 27-28), and back to Ukrainian-Dorian (measure 39), the section closed in G minor (measure 30). Section C offers a congregational melody in G minor.
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(measures 32-39) and then continues in what is obviously a hazzanic section in the relative Major (measures 40-41). A return to Ukrainian-Dorian (measure 42) precedes a brief episode in the harmonic minor of G (measure 44). A long G minor phrase, concluding in B flat Major (measures 46-49), follows. An extensive pre-concluding phrase (measures 51-53) sets the stage for a typically bravura ending in G minor.

Because of a more than passing use of the Dorian mode in this recitative Wohlberg’s employment of the Dorian will be considered as idiosyncratic. Of interest is the composer’s occasional change of the highest tone in phrases which are repeated. This has been observed in other examples as well. In Mi Shebeiruch the composer moves to a higher note on the repetitions in measures 23-24, 27-28, 43-44. Because of the consistency of its use here, this movement is designated as “Higher Note in Repetition.” A tendency to move melodically from one tonality to another before the end of a phrase is also observed in this selection. In addition, a new tropal motive is recognized in the last measure: T'vir of M'gillat Esther. See Example Ib.

Example la.

[Music notation image]
Example lb.
Although Mizmor L'David was written in the same year as Mi Shebeiruch, the two pieces are quite dissimilar in style, even when taking the differences in text into consideration. The abundant melisma of Mi Shebeiruch gives way to the subdued, melodic statements, pristine in their simplicity and clarity of expression, in Mizmor L'David. Mi Shebeiruch is filled with the sort of vocal ornamentation that was the hallmark of a previous generation; Mizmor L'David in contrast, is spartan-like in its use of notes. When Wohlberg’s recitatives composed before the 1930’s are compared with those that follow, the general difference in styles is marked. Mizmor L’David is a pivotal composition, marking Wohlberg’s change of style in the composition of recitatives; from the typically florid hazzanic showpiece of the early Twentieth century to works that employ much less melismata and vocal acrobatics.

Regarding tessitura in this setting, most of the vocal lines are contained within the range of a triad. The writing is economical and strives to be text-interpretive. The music of this setting of the Twenty-Third Psalm is evocative of trust and hope rather than of darkness and morbidity.

The piece begins and ends with Wohlberg’s characteristic “Israeli-sounding motive,” incorporating lowered 7th scale degrees. The second half of the opening theme (I, last two beats: 3, F, G, F) finds its answer in IV (last four beats: C, B, A, C, B, B) and in X (last four beats: A, B, C, A, B) as well as in XI (the first three beats: B, C, A) thus neatly binding the whole structure together. Particular attention is paid to the four notes which make-up the second half of the opening theme in their slow descent to a cadence from the second scale step to the tonic (G' to F). This descent is mirrored at the end of III, at the end of V and at the end of XII, drawing even tighter the thematic draw-strings of the work. Mention must be made of the intricate and yet simple multiple-modulations in the piece. Beginning in F the melody progresses naturally to B flat minor at II: a return to F minor leads quickly to E Major (III) and back again to B flat minor (IV). A sudden excursion into the Ukrainian-Dorian Mode on F is evident at V with a return to F minor at VI. Ahuvah Rubbuh is forcefully announced at VII turning back to the Ukrainian-Dorian on F at VIII. A dramatic change to E Major takes place at X but without any sense of interruption in melodic continuity. It is followed by a leisurely return to F minor and a conclusion much in consonance with the calm and tranquil opening statement.

The introduction of a new tropal configuration is found in III: Pushtu of the Haftarah (see Example 2b).
Example 2a.

Ps. 23

Calming

(Mozart) Part: David: A-dare ray ro-i lo ehs-sor

bind de she yar-bit-ten a me minu-hat y'ha-ha-

le-ni naf-shi y'sha-vev yan-he-ni vin-ag-le

tze-dek lib ma'am shino. gam ki e-lekh b'

g'e zid-va-net lo ri-ra ra ki a-ta i-

(6) Slightly slower

Shiv'e kha umish-an-te-kha

he-ma y'na ha-mu-ni ta-a rokh ib-fa-

rav shul-han ne

Lightly

-ged tza-r-ray di-sha-ta va-

She-men ro-shi ko-si r va ya akh

tov va he-sey-dif-uni kol y'ne ha-yay
Example 2b.

Amar Rabi Y’hoshua (Pirkei Avot 6:2) is an amalgam of Wohlberg’s most recent neo-classical style with several brief passages of restrained coloratura; the resulting recitative combines one aspect of his earlier style with a vocal line in consonance with those of his most recent compositions.

He begins with a short upward-moving statement incorporating the lowered 7th scale step (I) at its conclusion. Extending to the fifth scale degree with two trumpet-like announcements, the sudden entries of B natural and D natural (III) add the colors of Ukrainian-Dorian to the F minor tonality. The complaint, “Woe to the people for their disregard of the Torah” is succinctly captured with a descending line reaching downward from Db (III) through the Ukrainian-Dorian. A delicately placed (and unexpected) lowered 2nd scale step falling from Gb to E natural to F at the end of the phrase, adds a sudden touch of exotic coloration. The slow, repeated triplets of descending 5th and 4th scale degrees with the rocking motion inherent in their triplet form (to the test: “shekel mi she-eino oseik batorah”) captures the motion of the student at Talmudic study (IV). An excursion from F minor to C minor is achieved through use of a “Kol Nidrei motive” (IV) which extends in a tasteful melisma. The barnyard homily of “nezem zahav b’af hazir, ishah yafah v’sarat ta’am (V) is stated through a short series of descending thirds (G diminished to F minor).
A vocal leap from the seventh scale-step to the third gives rise to a short hazzanic flourish on the relative Major (VII), with the announcement, *v'omer*. Two higher-ascending phrases, reaching toward heaven, strive to proclaim the Divine authorship of the *mikhtav elohim*. The admonition to interpret “engraved” (harut) as “freedom” (heirut) is declaimed in a gracefully extended line which wends its way from Ab Major back to F minor (IX-XII). The immediate association of the wisdom text *she'ein l'kha ben horin* (last phrase of X) with a graphic representation of prayers in free ascent is accomplished through the musical quotation of Neilah’s *Enkat M'saldekha*, (hereinafter, ENKAT). The interpretive use of this motive to provide a pictorial illumination is strikingly insightful. It is in such instances that one is aware of Wohlberg’s informed inspiration in his ability to interpret text and to promote liturgical association through the use of selected motives. This is also in evidence in the recapitulation of the *she-eino oseik ba-Torah* motive as the triplet figure appears again on the text *mi she-oseik*: (last phrase of IX). The *pentateuchal* zarka confirms the study admonition on the testb *Talmud Torah* (XIII). A simple high ending, far removed from the *bravura* ending of *Mi Shebeirach*, concludes the recitative.

Example 3a.
Example 3b.
As a composer of recitative, Wohlberg is most accurately characterized as a melodist, sensitive to the interpretive nuances inherent in liturgical texts; he is a musical extensor of the exegetic process. Wohlberg’s most distinctive musical contribution does lie in the area of the unaccompanied recitative, particularly the recitatives of his later period. These are noteworthy for their interpretive character, economy of means, bold and unexpected modulations, adherence to his concept of neimah, and melodic lines which are unforced and natural. In the solo recitative, Wohlberg has distilled the elaborate and much ornamented song-form into one which is linear and restrained.

Generally, Wohlberg’s compositions have a stamp of authenticity that is derived from the abundance of cantillation and synagogal motives incorporated within them. Certain melodicles (biblical and megillah cantillations, motives from hazzanic recitatives, synagogal kit-motifs, phrases of Yiddish song, characteristics of Israeli folk melodies and others) have become a part of Wohlberg’s musical vocabulary. He acquired these musical references through his long exposure to musical aspects of Jewish life, a state shared by many Jews of his generation. These musical components have been reinforced through his teaching and research. The musical quotations (or variations of the original motives) arrive so naturally in the course of his compositions that they seem to evolve full-blown, not having entering the conscious awareness of the composer until their appearance. On the other hand, there are many instances where premeditative selection seems operational. These instances are where his quotation of cantillation or synagogal motives connect the meaning of the text with the liturgical or historical implication of the musical source.

His general style derives from the romanticism of the late Nineteenth century. Of particular interest is his passionate pursuit of proper Hebrew accentuation and, particularly in the recitatives, his efforts to avoid tonal tedium.

Wohlberg’s particular fondness for triple meter is herewith noted. This predilection seems to be shared by other synagogue composers similarly immersed in Yiddish culture: Israel Alter (1901-1979) for example.* Viewed in this context, Wohlberg’s attraction to triple meter may be due to a learned linguistic trait.

Through his teachings, scholarship and compositions, Max Wohlberg has acquired a unique position in Jewish music. The contributions he has made in those areas are his living legacy. Regarding this study of his life and music, it is appropriate to conclude Tam V’ nishlam, the ancient formula customarily appended to a competed masekhet. Wohlberg’s life and works will serve as a foundation upon which others may build — Shevah l’El borei olam.

Editor’s Note  See the Music Section of this issue of the Journal for arrangements of Hazzan Wohlberg’s Mi Shebeirach (analyzed in this article) and Amar Rabi Yosei (similar to Amar Rabi Y hoshua analyzed in this article).
SOME REFLECTIONS ON TWO GENRES OF BERAKHAH

SAUL P. WACHS

INTRODUCTION

In an article entitled, “On the Yotzer and Related Texts”1 Morton Smith points out a number of similarities between Birkat Yotzer Or and Birkat Ma-ariv Arvim. These similarities extend to style and content. The similarities noted by Smith include the following:

a) With an occasional note of petition (judged by Smith to be, in all probability, a gloss), the texts are pure praise.

b) The texts are not connected to the Shema in any direct way, though they are part of Birkhot Keriat Shema.

c) The texts do not reflect the Deuteronomic message nor do they utilize the terminology that is distinctive to the fifth book of the Torah and related texts.2 That theology stresses God’s special love for Israel and God’s gifts of freedom, Torah and the land of Israel. Deuteronomic prayer texts often have strong precatory elements (Bukushot) and typically, address God in the second person. This tendency, to address God directly in prayer, is strengthened during the Rabbinic era. These are the dominant characteristics of the bulk of the public statutory liturgy. They are exemplified by Birkut Ahuvah Rubbah (Ahuvat Olam).

In contradistinction to the Deuteronomic model, Birkut Yotzer Or and Birkut Ma-ariv ‘Aruvim are concerned with creation, nature and, in particular, light and darkness.

Moreover, they are noticeably rich in language that is not to be found in Sefer Devarim. Words like Ad (Eternity) and such verbs as Sader, Yatzor, Gazor, Pa’er, Yuched, Herim, Romem, Halel, Shubeuch, to mention some of the examples, do not appear in the fifth book of the Torah, yet they are important in these liturgical texts.

D) These texts have a strong rhythmic structure, with divisions often indicated by rhymes.
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Smith’s thesis is strengthened by calling attention to other differences between the two texts and other liturgical texts in the *Matbea Shel Tefillah* that reflect the Rabbinic style of prayer, a style that can be traced back to the liturgies of Sefer *Devarim*.

a) The texts under analysis show a strong preference for addressing God in the third person. With the exception of the Berakhah formula itself (*Barukh Attuh Adonay*), the use of the third person predominates and Smith believes that then occasional insertion of the second person in the context of a petition is a gloss, not part of the earliest versions of the text.

b) God is the sole actor in these texts or, at least, in the earliest versions of the texts.

c) The message of these texts is universal. We pray them as human beings, awed by God’s majesty as manifested in divine control (*Malekhut*) over nature and the ongoing acts of creation and sustenance that make life possible. This idea is explicitly mentioned in *Birkat Chazan*, the first Berakhah of Birkat ha-mazon, a text that shares many characteristics with *Birkut Yotzer Or* and *Birkut Ma-ariv ‘Aruvim*.

d) These texts are totally or predominantly positive in tone. There is little or no awareness or recognition of the darker side of life or human nature or of the sufferings of the Jewish people.

e) These texts are used to begin a section of the service. Formally, they are characterized as Berakh of the Matbea ‘Arokh type.

f) There is a strong preference for the use of present tense or participle forms. This is particularly true for the older parts of the texts. The theological import of this would seem to be to emphasize the ongoing creative input of God in the world.

We can set texts such as *Birkut Yotzer Or*, *Birkut Mu-uriv ‘Aruvim*, and *Birkut chu-zun* in apposition to *Birkut Ahuvut Rabba* and *Birkut Ahuvut Olam* (which are more typical of the prayers in the liturgy) and discover two rather distinctive patterns.

I will refer to the kinds of prayers that we have been analyzing as Genre A and the more common rabbinic prayer as Genre B and contrast them:

Genre A usually occurs at the start of a section.

Genre B usually occurs in the middle or end of a section.

Genre A utilizes the *Matbea ‘Arokh* form.
**Genre B** utilizes the form known as *Berakhah ha-Semukhah le-chavertah (Chatimah but no Petihah)*.

**Genre A** is universal in content and tone.

Genre B is concerned with the national experience.

Genre A deals with **God's** Kingship in Creation and Nature.

Genre B deals with God’s role as teacher, lover, and redeemer in the context of history.

Genre A tends to favor the present tense or participle forms.

Genre B tends to utilize all tenses.

Genre A is essentially limited to positive topics.

Genre B contains positive and negative topics.

Genre A is totally or almost totally devoted to praise.

Genre B mixes praise and petition.

Genre A sometimes utilizes pleonasms.

Genre B does not have this characteristic.

Genre A has only one subject-God.

Genre B has more than one subject, e.g. God and Israel.

Genre A favors the third person pattern and speaks of God.

Genre B favors the second person pattern and speaks to God.

I have already noted the tendency of Genre A texts to be “starter” texts. It is interesting to note that the opening texts of *Birkhot ha-Shachar* and *Pesuke de-Zimrah* share some (but not all) of the characteristics of Genre A. Both *Birkat Asher Yatzar* and *Barukh She-amar* (first half) deal with creation. Both are primarily concerned with universal, as opposed to national, dimensions of divine activity. Both deal with praise. It would appear then that the Shacharit and Arvit services follow the model of the Torah, in which the universal precedes the national and in which creation is the primal activity of God and the initial source of human awareness of God’s presence in the world. Another interesting stylistic characteristic of *Birkat Yotzer Or* is the large number of times that the words, “El “, “Elo him “, ”Elohe “ are found. The words “El ” and “Elohim ” represent two different ideas in the Torah but the differences became less significant as the Rabbis gave unique importance to the **Shem Hameforash** and its more common expressed form, “Adonuy.” In general, the words “El” and "Elohim" are avoided in Tannaitic texts except when a Pasuk is cited. Yet, in these prayers they abound.

Another formal dimension of *Birkat Yotzer Or* should be noted. I refer to the unusual profusion of words containing the letter “mem.” It is true, of course, that any Hebrew text can be expected to contain words containing a “mem.” After all, that letter forms the masculine plural and is used in the present tense for all **Piel, Pual, Hifil, Hofal** and **Hitpoel**
verbs. Nevertheless, I would suggest that the sheer numbers of words containing the /m/ sound in this Berakhah, is significantly larger than in most prayers and, in some parts of the text, the levels of Mem-alliteration and rhyming are striking. The /m/ sound is interesting in and of itself. From the point of view of sound waves, it is the opposite of the /s/ or /sh/ sound. The latter has been described as “white noise.” White noise is sound that contains every possible wave length, and is usually heard as a hissing sound. On an oscilloscope, the sound would appear as a totally chaotic jumble with no structure whatsoever. The opposite of white noise is pure harmonic sound. This is a hum, like the sound of a tuning fork. On an oscilloscope, this would appear as a perfect wavy line, the epitome of order and regularity, denoted by the letter /mem/. It should be pointed out that in many meditative traditions, the /m/ sound is seen as one that leads to tranquility and inner peace. The sound itself seems to be conducive to the harmony that one seeks in the meditative state. For example, Sefer ha-yetzirah translates the “still small voice” in which Elijah heard God (I Kings 19:12) as a “fine humming sound.” Mem is also associated with Malkhut, kingship, which is basic to Genre A prayers.

Another common sound in Birkat Yotzer Or is the sound “Ah.” This is associated with breathing. It thus seems reasonable to project a meditative side to Birkat Yotzer Or, one in which the “Gibbuv,” or piling up of praises (with many repetitions of the Mem sound) may be for purposes other than precision in language or the presentation of ideas. In this case, the sound, the sense of ecstasy, the attempt to say what cannot be reduced to words, may be as important as the ideas. For that is the essence of Gibbuv. One endlessly repeats variations on the same idea out of the need to truly express one’s admiration. Yet the feeling persists that, with all of the repetition, one cannot adequately praise the object of that admiration—in this case, God. This thought is explicitly voiced in the Kaddish, (Le’ela Min Kol Birkhata Veshirata . ..) and in Nishmat (’Ilu Finu....Eyn Anachnu Maspikim...). While each mystical group has its own specific techniques and ideas, there is a common core to the mystical experience and common ways of expressing that experience in words. Birkat Yosser Or would appear to be reflective of that attempt to sense God’s presence through sound and meditation.

SUMMARY

To recapitulate the differences in genre, the theology of Deuteronomy consists of elements which came to dominate rabbinic prayer texts: the love of God for Israel, God’s choice of the people as an ‘Am Segullah, the redemption from Egypt, the gift of Torah, and the gift of
Eretz Yisra’el. None of these elements are to be found in Genre A texts. They are universal, concerned with God’s kingship and His creations. They praise far more than they request Divine aid. They adore and describe Divine power and wisdom. Moreover, if we single out the elements of third person discourse, universalism, a concern for God as King and Creator, the very positive outlook and the element of praise, we can link Genre A texts to the first paragraph of Barukh She’ amar, and (to some extent), the first half of ‘Alenu.

How do we explain the existence of these different styles of prayer within the corpus of official liturgy? Smith suggests that the Deuteronomic style which typifies prayer texts in the later books of the Tunukh, the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, most of the New Testament and Jewish liturgy is not the source of what I have called Genre A. He rejects the viewpoint, originally advanced by Elbogen, that these prayers come from the Merkavah Mystics, the earliest known group of Jewish mystics, whose importance has been made known to us, largely due to the work of Gershon Scholem. According to Smith, Birkut Yotzer Or derives from the Qumran literature. The language and style—Pleonastic, strings of short cola ending with words of the same grammatical form, thus producing rhyming—is to be found in the literature of the Dead Sea sect. Smith points to possible connections to Egyptian influences in these texts but also mentions the Psalms as possible sources for the universal type of prayer. (Genre A is similar in many ways to Psalm 104, which has been connected by many Bible scholars to Egyptian texts.) Smith thus concludes that by the first century C.E. if not before, the Deuteronomic tradition of national, petitionary prayer in rhetorical prose, appealing to the God of the fathers for benefits and referring to the national history was flanked by a poetic literature of praise addressed to an eternal cosmic God, who reigns in nature and who is to be praised and adored by His creatures.

Already in 1893, Kohler pointed to a possible connection between the prayers of the Anshe Ma’amad, and those of the Essenes and between these and the mystics who studied Ma’aseh Vereshit and Ma’ aseh Merkava h. In recent years, Talmon has demonstrated the importance of the Dead Sea group in helping to shape the future course of liturgical prayer in Judaism. More recently, Bar Ilan has analyzed the relationship of the Yorde Merkuvuh and sections of Birkut Yotzer Or. All of these groups were attuned to mysticism and this is reflected in their approach to liturgy as well. At this time there is no consensus as to the age of the beginnings of the Yorde Merkuvuh.

Given the role of God as sole subject or actor in Berakhot of Genre A, it is striking that one of the unique contributions of the theology in the scrolls of Qumran to world religion was the idea of (Monotheistic)
predestination. In this view God is in complete control of everything that happens. One of the most direct indications of the strong belief in predestination by Qumran is found in The Manual of Discipline, pages three and four.

“From the God of knowledge is all that is and that is to be; And He established all their designs before they came into being, in a manner preconceived, according to His glorious design, their work will be accomplished not to be changed; in His hand are the ordinances of all and He provides for them all their needs...”17

The same view (with regard to nature) is reflected in the structure of Genre A Berakhot. In Birkhot M a’ariv ‘Aravim and cha-Zan et haKd, God is the sole actor in every sense of the word. The selection cited above from the Manual of Discipline shares common thought and language with Biirkat Hazan and Birkat Asher Yatzar. In Birkat Yotzer Or (as it was expanded), there is a section in which the angels act, but they have only one function in the liturgy and that is to praise God. In fact the constantly repeated word “Kullam” in this section negates the idea of individual initiative among the angels. They are “programmed” to praise God, that is their sole function. (In this connection, given the role of the Deuteronomic model in affecting rabbinic liturgy, it should be noted that one of the characteristics of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic school is the removal of any role for angels. In general, the prophets and their disciples, tended to denigrate if not obliterate the role of angels as active beings.) 18

How can we bridge the connections between the liturgy of the Dead Sea sect and our own (Rabbinic) liturgy? It is possible that despite the separatism of this group that its ideas were somehow absorbed into the official liturgy. It seems more likely, however, that the ideas of the group were shared by others including people who remained within the organized community of the Pharisees and the rabbis who followed them after 70 CE. We do not really know if the ideas (or the books that were found in the remarkable library of Qumran) were restricted to that sect or even created at Qumran.19 It seems more logical to suggest that, in fact, at least some of the ideas of the group (e.g. its universalistic emphasis), were shared by others and that the emergent liturgy, after 70 CE, reflected both emphases found in the two genres discussed above.

Weinfeld, in a completely different context, points out that Universalism and Particularism are both represented in the period of the Exile and Restoration. The universalistic trend is found, for example in Deutero-Isaiah, while the particularistic trend is expressed in Ezra. Weinfeld feels that the particularistic trend derives essentially from the
Torah which stresses the separation of Israel from the nations. Certainly both universalism and particularism have deep roots in the Bible, and though political, economic or social trends may have pushed one of these emphases to a dominant position over a period of time, it seems highly unlikely that the other was completely overwhelmed. 20

Genre A and Genre B: A Worshipper’s Viewpoint

To all of this, I would add a personal reaction to the two genres. In Genre A, God alone acts, all is positive and the human being is present, only as observer. In reciting these texts, I find myself deeply humbled. The message seems to be that without human activity all of the problems in the world, misery, poverty, crime, hunger, evil and suffering do not exist; where God alone is in full command, all is good. The message of Chapter One of Bereshit is reviewed each day through these texts. Like that chapter of the Torah, we see in Birkat Yotzer Or, Birkat Ma’ariv ‘Aravim and Birkat cha-Zan, an implied message that without human activity, all that is distressing about the world is removed. The world is ordered and harmonious. This idea of humility as a reaction to the contemplation of God’s creative acts is reflected strongly in the Mishneh Torah:

“‘When a person contemplates His great and wondrous works and creatures and from them obtains a glimpse of His wisdom which is incomparable and infinite, he will straightway love Him, praise Him, glorify Him...and when he ponders these matters, he will recoil affrighted and realize that he is a small creature, lowly and obscure, endowed with slight and slender intelligence, standing in the presence of Him who is perfect in knowledge’ and so David said, ‘When I consider Your heavens, the work of Your fingers-what is man that You are mindful of him?’ ” (Psalm 8:4-5) 21

Elohim (El) (the name for God that predominates in Birkat Yotzer Or) is manifest in the impersonal forces of nature. Human encounter with God in nature is impersonal. The skies are distant. Nature is silent. God had a quality of “He-anonymity.” 22 Human cosmic insignificance is exposed through contemplation of the silent natural order, the experience of the presence of Elohim. But if Genre A relegates the human being to the sidelines and reinforces a sense of our limitations and our insignificance on the cosmic level, Genre B reminds us of our dignity. We can address God; directly (Thou). We can act and react, we are the beneficiaries of divine attention, love and teaching. We are God’s beloved and can
reciprocate that love through study and the practice of Mitzvot. Our dignity emerges from the fact that God teaches us, and we can respond to the message that is embodied in the Berit, the covenant? That message is normative; it is a message of Torah and Mitzvot. It gives us a sense of “We consciousness,” heightening our awareness of being members of a covenantal community. From a worshipper’s view, the two texts, whatever their origins, induce very different views of the relationship between God and the Jewish human being. Each complements the other, each contributes something special to the act of prayer?

Judaism, Abraham Joshua Heschel used to say, stands or falls on the word. Jewish prayer requires us to take words seriously. Attention to ideas, placement of prayers, sounds and genres can increase our ability to empathize with the authors of the prayer texts and thus achieve Kavanah in prayer. Jewish prayer is, in Eric Werner’s term, “Logogenic.” The word is central to the act of prayer. A great Hazzan, as Dr. Heschel used to point out, is one who can help the worshipper to see a new nuance, a different shade of meaning in the familiar words of the Siddur. This is the crucial difference between the Hazzan and a singer. There can be no recovery of the art of prayer, said Heschel, without a sense of the dignity of words. To restore that sense of dignity is a worthy task for the person who would act as Sheliach Tzibbur for the Holy Congregation of Israel.

Notes


2. The term “Deuteronomist writing” refers to the book of Deuteronomy, the editorial framework of Joshua-Rings, and the prose sermons of Jeremiah. For a detailed analysis of the role and content of liturgy in Deuteronomy, see Moshe Weinfeld, Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972, pp.32ff. The typical Deuteronomic liturgical formulation stresses such topics as the Exodus, covenant and election of Israel, inheritance of the land, and observance of the laws and loyalty to the covenant. Weinfeld points out that the universalistic dimension is characteristic of the later texts associated with the Deuteronomic school, cf pp.36,42.

3. The use of the word “Attah” in the Berakhah formula, standard since the third century c.e., may be seen as an exception to this generalization. Some scholars claim that the word “Attah” is, itself, a later addition to a previously used formula “Barukh Adonay”. The latter is very common in the Bible, the former is found only twice (Psalms 119:12 and First Chronicles, 29:10), clearly pointing to a Second Temple origin and a gradual process of acceptance as the normative Berakhah formula. For an extended discussion see Joseph
Heinematm, *Prayer in the Talmud*, Berlin: Walter De Gruyten, 1977, chapter three. According to Spanier, originally, the Berakhah formula did not contain the word “Attah”. Arthur Spanier, “Zur Formengeschichte des Altjudischen Gebetes” in MGWJ LXXVIII (1934) pp.438-447. “Barukh Attah Adonay was the preferred formula among the D.D.S. sects.” TP Ber IX 12d (Rav-Shemu’el) shows that in the 3rd C. there were still disputes as to whether or not”Attah”is required in the Berakhah formula. (See also Midrash on Psalms XVI:8). As noted above, there are two Biblical examples of the formula Barukh Attah Adonay (Psalms 119:12 and I Chr. 29:10). In neither case is it followed by an active participle (Po el Beinoni). Both are late texts. Hurwitz sees the presence of the formula itself as evidence of late (second) Temple Hebrew. Avi Hurwitz, *Beyn Lashon Lelashon*, Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1972 p.144-5. The use of the third person reflects and accentuates the sense of awe and reverence the author felt in the presence of the magnificence of God’s creations. (See comments of the Rambam. above, p.6). The insistence by the Rabbis (normative since the third century c.e.) that every Berakhah contains the word “Attah” thus guarantees that, even within *Birkat Yotzer Or*, there is an assurance that man can address God directly expressive of the intimate relationship that exists between God and Man. The difference in this regard between *Birkat Yotzer Or* and *Birkat Ahavah Rabbah* is relative rather than absolute.

4. In *Birkat Yotzer Or*, the sections describing angelic praise are deemed to be later additions to the text. Their secondary status is reflected in Siddur Rav Saadiah Ga’on, where their recitation is limited to public prayer, see p.13. There are a number of Genizah texts in which the version prescribed by Saadiah for the individual’s recitation of *Birkat Yotzer Or* is the only version of the Berakhah offered. (See Elbogen, ha-Tefillah be-Yisra’el, Tel Aviv: Devir Co., 1972, p.13) Saadiah’s textreads: Barukh....ha-Olam, Yotzer Or...ha-Kol. Hame’ir la’Aretz Wela-darim Aleha Be-rahumim Rabbim, Ve-tuvo Mehadesh Be-khol Yom Tamid Maaseh Ve-reshit, Barukh...Yotzer ha-Me’orot (See Siddur Rav Saadiah, I.Davidson, S. Assaf and B.I. Joel, eds., Jerusalem: Me-kise Nirda-mim, 1985, p.13). See, also Ezra Fleisher, ha-Yoserot Behitha-vutam ve-Hitpat-hu-tam, Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1984, pp.6-7.

5. In addition to explicitly positive words like “Rahamim,” “be-two,” “be-hokhmah,” the texts imply a very positive attitude towards creation through the words ”Yotzer” and “Bore” which are “echo” words calling to mind the creation story in Bereshit, chapter one, with its refrain “Ki Tov.” Those words play a similar role in *Birkat Asher Yatzar et Ha-adam be-Hokhmah (Birkhot Hashachar)* and in five of the Sheva Berakhot recited at a wedding. See Saul P. Wachs, ‘The Siddur: Words, Intertextuality and Hidden Meanings’, New York: The Rabbinical Assembly, Proceedings of the 1989 Convention of the Rabbinical Assembly, p.200f. In *Birkat Maariv ’Aravim*, the penultimate sentence(...Tamid Yimelokh Alenu ...) may be interpreted as introducing both a Bakkashah and a negative note. It has long been recognized that all of the penultimate sentences in *Birkhot Ker’i’ut Shema Shel ‘Arvit* are additions to the
text. (They are missing, for example in Siddur Rav Sa’adiah Ga’on who also negates the validity of reciting the Bakkashah “Or Hadash Al Tziyon Ta’ir” in Birkat Yotzer Or.) That Bakkashah is also missing from Amram (See, Seder Rav Amram, Ga’on, Daniel Goldschmidt, ed., Jerusalem: Mossad ha-Rav Kuk, 1971, p. 13). Another way of understanding these supposed Bakkushot is to see them as equal to statements of faith. Thus, in Birkat Hazan, “We’al Yehsar Lanu” may be understood as being equivalent to “Lo Yehsar Lanu” (See Psalm 121:3 and the comments of “Iyyun Tefillah” on the text “We’Al Yehsar Lanu” in Siddur ‘Osar Hatefillot, vol. 1, p. 486.). The same would be true for the words “Tamid Yimlokh Alenu...” in Bir’kat Ma ariv ‘Aravim, where these words would be understood as statements of faith and confidence.

Another approach would see the Bakkashot as “spontaneous” insertions in the midst of a praise text. Thus, for example, the text of Nishmat praises God for past gifts, The section concludes: “Ad Henah Azarunu Rahamekha, Ve-lo’ Azavnu Chasadekha” and then this is followed by the words, “We’al Titteshenu ‘Adonay Elohenu La-netzach” which is then immediately, followed by the words “Al Ken”, introducing a section of praise which is an appropriate response to Divine love. The request “We’al Titteshenu...” is missing from Sefer Rav Amram Ga-on (p. 70), Siddur Rav Saadiah Ga’on (p. 119). Sefer ‘Abudraham ha-Shalem (p. 165). (Mahzor Vitry does contain the Bakkashah as follows,”Na ‘Al Titteshenu Adonay Elohenu We’al Takhlimenu Lanetzah.” (vol. 1, p. 153f)). In this view, then, a praise or thanksgiving text awakens feelings of gratitude which in turn trigger an intense desire that the flow of providence not be broken. Thus, the momentary change in mood through a brief petition embedded in a text that is essentially devoted to praise and thanksgiving. Yet, the transition from a petition to the praise i.e. “Al Ken” is awkward and the text flows more smoothly without it, or if we assume that “We’al” is to be understood as meaning “We-lo’.”

6. In Hebrew, “Gibbuv”, the term refers to a piling up of synonymous or related words to the point of redundancy. Other examples of pleonasms are found, among in the Kaddish, and in Nishmat among other places in the liturgy. Some rabbis had a dim view of such Gibbuv. See, for example, TB. Megillah, 25a

7. The use of prayers that describe creation to begin a liturgical section seems to be a conscious liturgical imitation of the first chapters of the Bible. Moreover, judging from some of its characteristics (e.g. One subject God, totally positive text, stress on kingship and control of nature), the first chapter of Bereshit may well have been the archetype for Genre A. In this connection it should be pointed out that the first part of Barukh She’amir, which is missing in many Genizah texts and is found in Siddur Rav Sa’adiah Ga’on only for Shabbat (Davidson-As&, p. 118) shares many of these characteristics. The second part of that prayer refers clearly to the praises (Tishbahot) which make up the bulk of Pestuke de-Zimrah. The first part seems out of place. There are no Genizah texts containing the first part of the prayer. The differences between the two halves and the fact that the second part begins with the Matbeya ‘Arokh form of the Berakah, point clearly to the idea that, originally only the second part was recited at this point of the service. The text was related by Elbogen to the
section preceding **Pesuke de-Zimrah**, and particularly to the prayer, “Atah Hu Elohehu (Elbogen, p.65). It is first mentioned by R. Mosheh Gaon (circa 825 CE). Zunz ascribes it to the Saboraic period. This text, which utilizes third person in referring to God may have been attached to the Matbeya **Arokha** section which follows in order to conform to the pattern whereby God is praised and described before being addressed directly. See Heinemann’s comments on **Barukh She’ amar** below, note 9.


9. In the weekday version: ‘**Elohe (‘Olam), ‘El (Barukh), (Kevod)**’El,’ Elohehu. In the Shabbat version: **Ha’el (Hapoteah), ‘Elohe (‘Olam), ‘El (Adon), La’ el (‘Asher Shavat), (Shuvut)**’El, (Viyevurekhu) La’el, (Yitenu) Le’el, * Elohehu (Yitkadashe). In both versions: ‘**Elohim (Hayyim),(Et Shem ) Ha’el, Le’el (Barukh), ‘El (Chui Wekuyyum). Here, we note the use of the word “**El**” or *‘El* inBerakhot recited by the Essenes of the Dead Sea Scroll sect (Thanksgiving Scroll XI, 16, 27-28, 30; Manual of Discipline XI, 1). On the frequency of the use of the word “**El**” in the Dead Sea Scrolls, including liturgical portions, in contradistinction to Rabbinic liturgy, see Moshe Weinfeld, “**Ikvot Shel Kedushat Yoser u-Fesuke de-Zmrah, bi-Megillot Qumran uve-sefer Ben Sira, ”Tarbi z vol. 45, (1975-6), p.19. The article points to numerous parallels between the morning prayers of the Qumran sect and **Birkat Yotzer ‘Or**. See also, **Index of Hebrew words in Menahem Mansoor, The Thanksgiving Hymns**, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1961, p.224. (The use of ‘El as the predominant term for God in Qumran literature is documented in S. A. H. Haberman, **Megiloth Midbar Yehudah**, Tel Aviv: Machbaroth Lesifrut publishing House, 1959, pp. 4, 12-14, as compared to the use of the word “‘Adonuy’”). Saul Lieberman has pointed to three practices which the Tosefta labels as “**Derekh ‘Aheret**” (Heterodoxy). Two of them have to do with reciting a Berakhah over the sun and the third has to do with the use of “**El**” or *‘El* in place of *‘Adonay* when reciting Berakhot. He points out that the author(s) of the Manual of Discipline, a key Qumran text, consistently avoids the use of the Tetra-Grammaton or the word ‘**Adonay even in Berakhot. Lieberman concludes that the **Tosefta** is criticizing the behavior of the Essenes whose acts of ultra-piety, reflected a rejection of the practices of the **Pharisees.** This is not offered as conclusive evidence that the Qumran group recited the exact text we know as **Birkat Yotzer ‘Or.** It does, however, suggest another possible connection between the Essenes and some form of **Birkat Yotzer ‘Or.** See Lieberman, “Light on the Cave Scrolls, pp. 190ff. Heinemann points out that aside from the **Thanksgiving Scroll**, where the word “‘Adonuy” is commonly used in **Berakhot**, (as is the word “‘El”), other Qumran texts appeared after Lieberman’s article in which “‘Adonay” was used for prayer.
Heinemann, op.cit., p.121. It is nevertheless correct that, as far as the scrolls currently available, the word “‘El” is used far more frequently than ”‘Adonay” in prayer. While Heinemann tends to minimize the differences, (Prayer in the Talmud, p.121, the most recent concordance supports the view that “‘El” was used far more often than “‘Adonay” in the texts of the Qumran group. (See, James H. Charlesworth, Graphic Concordance to the Dead Sea Scrolls, Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991).

Given the tendency to avoid the use of the words “‘El” and “‘Elohim” during the Tannaitic period in official rabbinic circles, one can understand Smith’s view, that these texts reflect the ideas and style of another group, one for which the universal experience of human beings was as worthy of representation in prayer as the particular experience of the Jew. Certainly, the use of the word” “‘El” provides a more common language among people of different groups and even religions with which to talk about God. During the period following 70 C.E. leaders such as Rabban Gamli’el were more interested in limiting intergroup religious dialogue between Jews and others than in promoting it. The formulation Barukh Attah Adonay is found principally in the Thanksgiving Scroll, cf.Heinemann, p.92. Heinemann, suggests that the Dead Sea group maintained a tradition derived from “Hasidim Rishonim” (early generations of pious men) in which “‘El” and ”‘Adonai” were used interchangeably. Pharisaic Judaism departed from this tradition showing an ever-increasing preference for the use of the word ”‘Adonay” as the substitute for the Tetragrammaton in Berakhot. From at least the third century C.E. Tannaitic period, this preference became normative for Rabbinic Judaism. (See Heinemann, p. 121). The presence of the word “‘El” three times in the Chatimah of Yishtabach is also interesting, given Smith’s inclusion of that text among those that are ”related” to Birkat Yotzer Or. It is noteworthy that the Kaddish also shares some of the characteristics noted above. God is the only subject, there are pleonasms, third person is used when referring to God, and praise is predominant in the first half, (judged to be the oldest part and common to all versions of the Kaddish). Heinemann has identified the Kaddish, the first half of Barukh She’amar and the first half of the ‘Alenu as belonging to what he calls the “Bet Midrash” liturgica Genre. There may be a connection between this genre and what I, in this essay, have called “Genre A.” See, Heinemann, Prayer in the Talmud, Chapter ten.

10. Birkat Yotzer ‘Or (Minhag ‘Ashkenaz) on weekdays, has 259 words and 138 Mem sounds or more than one for every two words. (The Petichah is marked by its own assonance or partial rhyme scheme in that every word after the Beralchah formula has a Cholam). On Shabbat, there are 213 Mem sounds out of 460 words. In Birkhat Ahavah Rabbah, the number of Mem sounds is 29 out of 104 words. Although one cannot easily speak of a “typical prayer”, for comparison’s sake, I took the first 259 of the Amidah Shel Chol and came up with 61 examples of the letter Mem. Thus, the ratio of Mem sounds in Birkat Yazer Or to that found in the Amidah Shel Chol in this limited sample was significantly larger. Moreover, the presence of “Mem” sounds is somewhat concentrated. For example in the sections ha-Me’ir La’aretz;...Ba adeinu;
Titbarakh Tzurenu...be-Yir’ah, we know that Chasidei Ashkenaz had a major role in fixing the prayer texts and that they did so with an intense interest in mystical elements in the texts including Gematri’ot. In the system of “Atbash” in which the “Alef” substitutes for the “Taf” etc., the “Mem” lines up with the letter “Yod.” It is possible that, in addition to its labial quality which allows the “Mem” to be hummed continuously, the letter took on additional meaning as the substitute for “Yod,” the fiit letter of the Shem ha-Meforash or Tetragrammaton. (Avraham Ben Azriel in Arugat ha-Bosem followed the lead of his teachers R. Yehudah he-Hasid and ‘Elazar ha-Rokeah in this.) (“Atbash” is already found in the Bible in Jeremiah 25:26 and 51:41 Sheshekh-Bevel. Seder Rav Amram Ga’on (pp 12-13) has the sections with the high concentration of “Men” sounds. Sa adiah has much less of this material (p.36). Nusah Paras has an expanded set of alphabetical Acrostics based on the model of “Kullam Ahuvim” see Shelmo Tal (ed) Nusah ha-Tefillah Shel Yehude Paras, Jerusalem: Makhon Ben Tzvi, 1981, pp.57.

11. Aryeh Kaplan, Jewish Meditation: A Practical Guide, New York: Schocken Books, 1985, pp.129-130. In Seferha-Yesirah, or example, “Mem” represents water (Shin= fire), “Shin” represents a hot chaotic state of consciousness, while “Mem” denotes a cool harmonic state (Kaplan, p. 129). I am indebted to John Hamilton, sound engineer, Hi Fi House, of Broomall, Pennsylvania, who explained that when the Oscilloscope measures the waves of sound, “S” or “Sh” are recorded as chaotic waves. “M” is a passive or reflective sound, suitable for meditation. It is not static or caustic. Of all consonants the “M” or “N” sounds are most passive and reflective. Only the vowel “O” sound would be more restful. (Note the “O” rhyme in the Petichah of Birkat Yotzer ‘Or. Birkat Yotzer ‘Or is also rich in the number of “Nun” sounds. (Weekdays 33; Shabbat 63). Thus, the total of “Mem” and “Nun” sounds for Chol is 171 out of 259 words and on Shabbat 276 out of 460 words.


13. Blumenthal sees a definite connection between the Merkavah tradition and Jewish liturgy. The most important trace of Merkabah Mysticism, however, is to be found in the liturgy of Rabbinic Judaism. “Ha-‘Aderet ve-Ha’emunah” - Pirke Heykhalot 28: 1 is actually part of the liturgy. Some of the Piyyutim are of the Heikhalot form and tone and even the daily liturgy makes use of the multiplicative, hypnotic style of the Heikhalot literature. Also, the occurrence of certain phrases such as “Yotzer Vereshit”, Nehedur Bekhavod Al Hamerkavah. More subtly, the angelology of the morning liturgy and the Gedushah are evidences of an attempt by the liturgists to somehow allude to the mystical experiences of the Merkavah tradition. Similarly the theme of parallel doxology (that the earthly doxology parallels the celestial one) and perhaps even the entire theme of God’s kingship—which constitutes one of the central insights of Rabbinic Judaism, are indicative of the efforts of liturgists to come to terms with the insights and experiences of this mystical realm. The Rabbinic liturgists acted on the material in three ways:
a) They eliminated the ascent and name-seal themes and greatly attenuated the splendor of the celestial personnel and hymns, thereby creating a truly modest and more subtle rendition of the mystical element in worship. They also intertwined the mystical themes with other rabbinic themes, Torah, study, purity of heart, redemption, history etc. In so doing the rabbis added a subtle mystical element to Rabbinic Judaism and they “saved” Merkabah Mysticism from becoming a historical curiosity. By “taming” merkabah mysticism, the rabbis made it part of the living religious tradition of the people. ibid., p. 97. Heinemann also sees definite connections between the Essenes and the Merkabah mystics, see Joseph Heinemann, Prayer in the Talmud, Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1977, p.274.

14. Heinemann, ibid. The presence in the Kedushah of the angels in Birkat Yotzer ‘Or is also indicative of its remoteness from the tradition of Deuteronomy. According to Weinfeld, the Deuteronomic ideology is reflected in the omission of the role of angels in the redemption of the people of Israel whereas angels have such a role in texts associated with the “E” source. Angelology was an important part of the Qumran’s religious life. The Mishnah makes no mention of them whatsoever. Caster has suggested that there is a clear connection between the “Litany of the Angels” and Birkat Yotzer ‘Or. He has also suggested that we push “back to a remoter antiquity that lore of the Heavenly Chariot (Merkabah) which formed a staple of later Jewish mysticism and which some scholars have attributed to the Essenes,” Theodore H. Caster, The Dead Sea Scrolls, (3rd ed.) New York Doubleday Anchor Book, 1976, 284-295.

15. Shemaryahu Talmon, “The Emergence of Institutionalized Prayer in Israel in the light of the Qumran Literature,”* in Qumran, Sa Piete, Theologie Et Son Milieu, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologica Lovaniensium, vol. 46, ed. M. Delcor, pp. 265-284, Louvain: 1978. Talmon points out that the renunciation by the sect of sacrifice while the Temple yet stood forced them to deal with the situation faced by the Rabbis after 70 C.E. The prayers they instituted to replace the sacrifices may well have provided models that found their way into the Matbea Shel Tefillah.

16. Meir Bar Ilan has analyzed the relationship between Nishmat and Heikhalot Rabbati and between ‘El Adon and Merkavah mystical texts. Meir Bar Ilan, SitreTefillah we-Hekhalot, Ramat Gan:Bar Ilan University, 1987, especially chapters 3 and 4.


18. See on this, Alexander Rofe The Belief in Angels in the Bible and in Early Israel, Jerusalem: Makor Publishing Ltd. 1979.

19. See Norman Golb, “Who Hid the Dead Sea Scrolls?” Biblical Archaeologist, June, 1985, pp.68-82. Golb has argued that the contents of the scrolls reflect the ideas of Palestinian Jewry of the first century, in general, rather than that
of sectarian Jews and that some, if not all of the scrolls found at Qumran, were
brought there for safekeeping after Jerusalem was placed under siege. This
view is decidedly in the minority among scholars at this time.

bi-Tekufat Shivat Siyon” Tarbiz, vol.33, March 1964. See Note 12 above.
Weinfeld offers numerous examples of similarities in topic, language and text
between the liturgy of Qumran and that of the Babylonian rite-based Siddur.
The idea of Havdalah, featured in Birkat Ma’ariv ‘Aravim is also very
important in Qumran liturgy, cf. Weinfeld, pp. 20ff. He also points out that the
connection between Birkut Yotzer ‘Or and the recitation of Psalms (Pesuke de-
zimrah) is common to both, the Qumran liturgy is immediately preceded by
Psalms 150 showing that this connection is quite old, cf. T. B. Shabbat 118b.
Qumran liturgy stresses Psalm 145 and also includes lectionaries (Liktei
Pesukim) as does ours. Segal has shown that Ben Sira’s hymn of praise also
has a connection between praises (Tishbahot) and the idea of God as creator of
all (Ben Sira 51:12-14) cf. M. Z. Segal, Sefer Ben Sira Hashalem, Jerusalem:
Bialik Institute, 1953, pp.355f. Louis Finkelstein suggests that Birkut Yotzer
‘Or and others of a similar universalistic nature were ordained by the Anshei
Keneset Hagedolah (thus being pre-Tannaitic). See Max Kadushin, Worship
In chapter 4, Kadushin offers a full discussion of the relationship of each
Berakhah to Keriat Shema in the complex known as Keriat Shema
uVirkhotecha. George Foot Moore (Judaism In the First Centuries of the
Christian Era) and Solomon Schechter (Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology)
discuss both universal and nationalistic emphases during the relevant era.

21. Mishneh Torah, Sefer Mada, 2:2. It is noteworthy that one of the salient
characteristics of the Hoduyot, the liturgy of the Qumran community,
particularly in its petitions, is the contrast between the weakness and
insignificance of the prayer and the infinite power of God. See, on this, Ben
Zion Wacholder, The Dawn of Qumran, Cincinnati, Hebrew Union College

22. See the i&as of Joseph B. Soloveitchik as interpreted by David Hartman in

23. I am indebted to Professor Reuven Kimelman for pointing out that in the Torah,
Moses is presented as the teacher and that the i&a of God as teacher is almost
lacking. Though the liturgy abounds in Biblical language, it often uses that
language to introduce rabbinic ideas. For other examples of this, see Saul P.
Wachs, “ Alenu:Rabbinic Theology in Biblical Language’, Conservative
Judaism, vol. XLII number 1, Fall 1989, pp.46-49.


25. It is striking that the musical mode which dominates most of Birkhot Keriat
Shema and the Amidot of Shabbat in the Ashkenazic synagogue is known as the
“ ‘Ahavah Rabbah” mode. Idelsohn explains the name by saying that it is
derived from a prayer in the morning ritual with which, on the Sabbath, the
precentor usually introduces this mode into the service.*’ (A. Z. Idelsohn.
have here a musical reflection of the sense by Ba’ alei Tefillah, that with the
advent of the *Ahavah Rabbah* prayer, they were confronting a text that was significantly different from the text (Birkat Yotzer ‘Or) that preceded it.

I should like to express my appreciation to my colleagues at Gratz College, Professor Nahum M. Waldman and Dr. Hayim Y. Sheynin who read this paper and made helpful suggestions.
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The article on the following pages is an abbreviated version of a paper comprising the following sections: Preface, Introduction, chapters on Jewish Settlement in Britain, Jewish Music in Britain, Dissemination, The Present and the future, a Summary, Appendix A (a partial listing of dissertations on aspects of Jewish Music submitted to British Universities and other institutions), Footnotes, and references to 33 recorded musical examples interspersed throughout the text. In its present form, this paper will be confined to Jewish Music in Britain, The Present and the Future, Footnotes and a new Bibliography (incorporating selected entries from Appendix A).

This paper appears by kind permission of the Editors of the Proceedings of the Second British-Swedish Conference on Musicology: Ethnomusicology, Cambridge, 1989. The Proceedings, comprising over two dozen articles in all, contain a further five which cover various additional aspects of Jewish music: Babylonian, Anglo-Indian, Klezmer, Italian, Israeli, Yemenite, Karaite, etc. The publication can be purchased (£27.00 inclusive of postage and packaging, payable in sterling only) from Dr. Ann Buckley and Mr. Paul Nixon (Editors of the Proceedings), Darwin College, Silver Street, Cambridge, CB3 9EU, U.K.

ALEXANDER KNAPP is a musicologist and author in Cambridge, England.
Aspects of Jewish Music in Contemporary Britain

Since most Jewish music has been imported into Britain from different parts of the world at different times, it may be useful to identify six main categories, before attempting to assess the extent to which a set of blended British-Jewish styles may have evolved. The main genres (starting with the least acculturated) are: liturgical, semi-religious, folk, art, popular/commercial, pop; and these function as ‘umbrellas’ for a host of sub-genres.

Liturgical music comprises: psalms and cantillations of Biblical texts; prayer-modes (nusah, akin to Arabic maqamut or Indian ragas) used mainly for non-Biblical prayer text and hymn-poetry (piyyutim); fixed chants; choral music. Semi-religious styles include: the music of the Hasidic Jews; graces and table songs (rmilot). Folk idioms encompass the Klermer music (see below) of the Ashkenazim and the Romunceros of the Sephardim, and so many more besides. Jewish art music may be defined as a Western (or, arguably, Eastern) ‘Classical’ framework for composition into which distinctive Jewish elements (especially traditional texts and/or melodies) have been introduced. Popular/commercial music denotes the folk-art synthesis found, for example, in Broadway musicals (and typified by Fiddler on the Roof). The most common form of the final category is ‘Hassidic Pop’ which usually consists of ancient or modern Jewish texts, sacred or secular, set in the contemporary Jazz or ‘pop’ idiom. (Traditional Hassidic dance and traditional American Jazz share syncopation as an essential feature).

Jewish languages used in this country are: Hebrew and Aramaic, and Ladino (among Sephardim only) for sacred texts; Yiddish (among Ashkenazim), Judco-Spanish (among Sephardim), and various forms of Judeo-Arabic, etc. (among the Oriental Jews) for secular texts. The use of English in Jewish song is generally more limited in Britain than in North America where it appears frequently, both in liturgical and secular contexts.

In the synagogue, music is usually provided by a soloist and/or choir, with or without instrumental accompaniment (according to denomination); and musical participation by the congregation may occur to a greater or lesser extent. Although some Sephardi, Oriental, and Ashkenazi tfussidic, ‘Conservative’, ‘Reform’ and ‘Liberal’ congregations may have a solo cantor (Heb: Hazzan originally Shliah tsibbur: ‘messenger of the congregation’), most will rely vocally upon the services of a lay reader.
(Heb: *Ba’al tphilla*), or upon a choir, or upon congregational participation. It is mainly in the Ashkenazi ‘Orthodox’ community that the cantorial vocation has been preserved (although, even here, in recent years, there has been a policy of phasing out full-time cantors in favour of part-time professionals and lay-readers). Although there are sizeable numbers of ‘Orthodox’ Jews of West European origin in Britain, it happens that the vast majority of ‘Orthodox’ cantors are of East European stock.

What are the characteristics of this kind of traditional Jewish music? East meets west in a unique and delicate synthesis, as exemplified in Fig.1: the Russian-American cantor Z’vulun Kwartin’s setting of a traditional Eve of Passover text, Leil Shimurim. Oriental qualities include: modality, microtoncs, melismatic ornamentation, improvisation, recitative (i.e. a predominantly non-rhythmic style), elements of West Asian (i.e. nasal and occasionally glottal) voice production, emotional intensity, oral transmission.

Although most cantors in this country, whether British-born or visitors from abroad (mainly Israel and North America), are proficient in Western notation and well able to learn the necessary repertoire from sheet music (with or without the help of an experienced colleague), many will have learned famous liturgical ‘set pieces’ by celebrated predecessors direct from records. Deliberate modifications may be made in order to ensure a more comfortable tessitura or to create an individuality of interpretation distinct from that of the original ‘composer-performer’.

Most published sheet music in this genre is printed in North America, especially New York. There are no surviving publishers of cantorial music in Britain. Much of the repertoire, however, is preserved in manuscript (especially where transpositions and new arrangements have been made). Multiple photocopies are circulated among the cantorial fraternity; these are sometimes so faint and dogeared through repeated copying that superimposed inking is the only way to render them legible. Errors frequently occur in the process, and valuable archival information (name of cantor-composer, date and place of composition, etc.) may be lost. This is particularly unfortunate in the case of composite works which may comprise juxtaposed text settings by various individuals. In any event, the sheet music may often be regarded as no more than an *aide-memoire*, since unpremeditated abbreviations and interpolations in performance are quite normal practice.

The oriental features referred to above are most in evidence during a Sabbath or Festival Service in the synagogue, when the use of musical instruments is forbidden; the voice is consequently unfettered by Western equal temperament. If there is a male choir it will usually provide slowly
changing **sustained** chords in Western harmony (**brumming**⁴) and will not interfere with the solo line. Furthermore the congregation may offer heterophonic support in a variety of undertones.

But a transformation takes place when cantors give recitals (never on Sabbaths or Festivals), or perform at a Meiave Malka (- a Sabbath night communal entertainment, involving a sequence of music, informal lecture, and light refreshment). On such occasions a piano or organ must be provided for accompaniment, even though little regard may be paid either to the quality or tuning of the instrument, or to the expertise of the accompanist! Acculturation to western norms is reflected in the presence of an 18th, 19th, or occasionally 20th century harmonic backcloth which, to some extent, neutralizes the microtonality occurring naturally in East European cantorial performance practice (quite a separate issue from ‘singing out of tune’, which is also not unknown...). The cantor may sing liturgical items and folksongs; and sometimes even operatic arias from the popular repertoire (to the delight of some and the consternation of others).

Very few cantors have enjoyed successful careers in opera. (The Americans Jan Peerce and Richard Tucker are rare examples). Nevertheless, the operatic art and that of the cantor (Heb: **hazzanut**) share a number of features in common. For example, both utilize coloratura (of different kinds), and both encourage the ‘cult of the individual*.

Cantors who are well known throughout the international Ashkenazi community (invariably billed ‘world famous’, ‘world renowned’, etc. in the Jewish press) will attract large audiences and command handsome fees, whether the event takes place in a modestly sized synagogue hall or on London’s South Bank. Fulfilling the established convention of beginning their set-pieces slowly and quietly in low-middle tessitura, they will thrill the **cognoscenti** by inexorably raising tempo, amplitude and pitch levels, and climaxing at the end of the piece **prestissimo, fortissimo, in altissimo** (not always in keeping with the meaning of the text). Many cantorial compositions incorporate a metrical folksong; if it is familiar, the audience will join in spontaneously (singing and/or rhythmically handclapping) and the soloist may take a few bars rest. (The accompanist, however, cannot). Programmes are made available to the audience; but apart from the advertising revenue, they are largely redundant, since the cantor usually decides at the last minute what he will sing, and in what order (often completely at variance with what is printed), and will announce each item to the audience together with some background comment (humorous or poignant, as appropriate). The accompanist must be comfortable with all aspects of the cantor’s style and repertoire, so that he or she may enter into
the spirit of ‘composing-performing’ at the keyboard, especially in the case of pieces that have not been rehearsed.

Most such concerts double as fund-raising activities, and they may last anything from 2 to 3 hours, having usually commenced between 15 and 30 minutes after the advertised starting-time in order to accommodate late-comers. A long interval is scheduled, about half way through, to allow for a raffle, numerous announcements/speeches, and an opportunity for those present to indulge in animated adulation or denigration of the celebrity, according to values that seem, at best, ill-defined... (In rare cases, such conversations may occur during the concert itself). Another well established pattern is the cantorialcum-choral concert, in which the choir (men and/or boys) will normally open each half of the programme. The cantor will then present a few pieces with instrumental accompaniment and each half will conclude with items for cantor and choir.

When listening to a ‘live’ concert performance or a recording, the professional reviewer, Jewish or non-Jewish, is faced with a dilemma: Is he or she to listen with wholly occidental ears, and apply to a rendering of traditional Jewish music the same criteria of assessment as would be applied, for example, to a Lieder recital? Or must there be a complete change of gear, as it were, in attuning to an oriental ambience? In the context of instrumental accompaniment in the European idiom, we may ask whether the western emphasis on precision and a degree of predictability is in keeping with the oriental preference for spontaneity and improvisation.

The ‘cult of the individual’, referred to earlier, is present also in the field of male-voice choral music; and this results in the very antithesis of the western ‘ideal’ of a perfectly blended sound? Just as the cantor might wish to emulate the opera-star, so the chorister may wish to be compared with the star-cantor. This phenomenon is especially apparent when choral pieces with solo parts are sung by soloists from within the choir. To the uninitiated listener, the vocal pyrotechnics inspired by internal rivalries can be bewildering; for example, extended fermatas on high notes, or the superimposition of unwritten harmony notes on top of a concluding chord (usually triadic). Undisciplined, rather than oriental, is the common habit of anticipating a choral entry - as if to check the layout and harmony of the next chord - well before the end of an unaccompanied solo passage. But, reservations aside, a really fine Jewish male-voice choir can be as nuanceful and compelling in performance as any equivalent body of men from Wales or the U.S.S.R.

Sephardi synagogue choirs are also all-male. But the style in Britain is generally more acculturated. Although generalizations can be misleading, and every rule has its exceptions, it may be fair to assert that the ethos of
East Ashkenazi choral music tends to be more toward nostalgia, and that the Anglo-Sephardi manner reveals a lightness of touch redolent of Victorian music of the last century.

‘Non-Orthodox’ choral music will be discussed shortly. Meanwhile, a few words about congregational participation in the *Orthodox* synagogue. The solo chanting of the Bible (cantillation) - as distinct from that of the liturgy - is normally undertaken by knowledgeable lay members of the community. It is a demanding skill: much must be learned by heart, since the scrolls used in religious services contain only Hebrew consonants specially calligraphed; no vowels, or musical ‘accents’ (Heb: *ta‘amei hammiqra*) are shown. Members of the congregation can develop a substantial following, especially if their vocal qualities parallel their textual expertise.

But the desire for musical self-expression among congregants more often than not extends to active corporate participation. Gone are the days when congregations were satisfied to respond to a religious service as they would to a secular concert:

Music should in the main be conducive to the congregation ‘joining in’. Once it has largely departed from this aim, the congregation by leaving it to the Cantor and the choir and becoming listeners, has become an audience. If, as an audience, it finds itself becoming musically appreciative, then it is leaning... on the ‘crutch of culture’, a substitute excluding the religious objective.10

These challenging words, written by Henry Goldstein, a British Rabbi in the ‘Reform Tradition’, sum up the rabbinical attitude toward music across most of the ethnic and religious spectra, with only one notable exception: the Hassidim. They regard the limitlessness of song to be superior to the finiteness of prayer as a medium for communicating with God, and will often replace liturgical texts with a variety of syllables long ones (e.g. ‘yai, yai, yai’) for slow, reflective melodies; short ones (e.g. ‘biri-biri-bim-bom’) for fast, joyous tunes.

*Hassidic* Jews would doubtless concur with another Reform Rabbi, Jeffrey Gale, when he observes that “the purpose of synagogue worship is not simply to charm our senses and stimulate our imagination, but to put us in the proper frame of mind to study and perform God’s Will”.12 But how would they respond to his assertion that “while Jewish music and prayer should appeal to the emotions, we must never overlook the intellectual aspect of *Judaism*”?13 Rabbis, whatever their theoretical
objections, do accept that music is an integral part of Jewish prayer in particular and Jewish life in general, Rabbi Goldstein again:

A modern Israeli melody must rub crotchets with European classical and chasidic-type tunes. This may be, to some, a musical hotchpotch, not perhaps aesthetically pleasing - to a music lover possibly rather confusing - but so what? This is what we are. These styles reflect the way we think. We are the children of many traditions.”

This is especially the case with regard to ‘non-Orthodox’ establishments in Britain and abroad, viz. ‘Conservative’, ‘Reform’ and ‘Liberal’, whose liturgical musics are decidedly heterogeneous. Of the three, ‘Reform’ is the longest established; and a few words about its history will set the scene for a discussion of music originating and developing essentially outside the ‘Orthodox’ sphere.

The ‘Reform Movement’ began in about 1800 in Germany, as a consequence of the emancipation of the Jews which, in turn, was one of the direct results of the French Revolution. Equal rights found European Jews eager to be accepted legally, professionally, socially and culturally - as full citizens of the countries in which they lived. Some converted to Christianity, and became ‘assimilated’ into the host society. (But even they were not immune from residual antisemitism.15) Others - not prepared to take quite such a radical step, but nevertheless in pursuit of substantial ‘integration’ - rejected the ethnicity of their religious and cultural heritage and attempted, consciously or subconsciously, to become ‘more French than the French’, ‘more German than the Germans’. Traditional dietary laws, prohibitions relating to the Sabbath and Festivals (work, travel etc.), and many other hallmarks of Jewish life were abandoned. The countless generations that had been subjected to enforced ‘nationhood’ behind Ghetto walls were now seen, by this section of the Jewish population, as a tragic legacy of the past. The waves of nationalism that swept Europe in the middle of the 19th century, by and large, had little influence on Jewish self-perception at this time. Political Zionism was not to develop dramatically within European Jewry as a whole until the last two decades of the 19th century.

The early ‘Extreme Reformers’ were anxious to place as much distance as possible between themselves and their ‘Orthodox’ co-religionists. So they dispensed with the Hebrew language, the cantor and the cantorial style, the ancient cantillations, prayer modes and recitatives. In their place, they introduced the language of the country in which they lived, four-part chorales in the Lutheran idiom accompanied by organ, major and minor
keys, strict metres and regular phrase lengths. This musical ethos has been
preserved with the least alteration by the ‘Liberal’ movement in Britain.

Later ‘Reformers’ had doubts about this wholesale disposal of Jewish
musical tradition. ‘Moderate Reform’ reacted against these excesses and
reintroduced traditional tunes, arranged and harmonized in accordance with
the conventions of European art-music. Two of the most important
synagogue composers whose music exemplifies this style were Louis
Lewandowski of Berlin and Salomon Sulzer of Vienna.

Though some interest in aspects of the ‘Reform Movement’ was shown
in Eastern Europe, it was essentially in Western Europe and America that
it found the widest response. And both ‘extreme’ and ‘moderate’ elements
have been preserved in the music of British ‘Reform Jewry’, though there
is some bias toward the ‘moderate’ approach.

Many changes over the past two centuries have, in a musical sense,
brought ‘Orthodox’ and ‘non-Orthodox’ closer together. The position of
‘choirmaster’ and the use of four-part harmony in the 18th and 19th
‘classical’ tradition - ‘Reform inventions’ as it were - are now wholly
acceptable in the ‘Orthodox’ synagogue, as is the use of the organ or
harmonium for weekday services, memorial and weddings. Cantillation
and cantorial recitative (even if not usually the cantor himself) have been
reinstated in many ‘Reform’ synagogues, and the substantial use of Hebrew
in all; and in some congregations there has been a recent move away from
the use of the organ (and even the choir) on the grounds that it inhibits
congregational singing in unison. Nevertheless, two of the largest
metropolitan congregations - the West London Synagogue (‘Reform’) and
the Liberal Jewish Synagogue - are each justly proud of their magnificent
four-manual organs.

What, then, are the clear differences in musical practice? ‘Orthodox’ and
‘Conservative’ choristers are male, and usually non-professional; all (with
very few, rarely acknowledged, exceptions) are Jewish and may
instinctively retain a Jewish vocal style absorbed during childhood; most
have some knowledge of Hebrew. ‘Reform’ and ‘Liberal’ choirs are
usually ‘mixed’, though some are all male or all female; some synagogue
choirs are partly or wholly non-Jewish, whereas other synagogues insist on
an all-Jewish complement; some choirs may be professional, others non-
professional, yet others a combination of both; voice production and
performance practice may bear the stamp of childhood memories or
training in western art-music or a mixture of both elements; familiarity
with the Hebrew language may vary widely from one individual to another.

A full account of rabbinical pronouncements giving support to one or
other of these divergent standpoints would involve extended and
painstaking analysis of the *Talmud*, the numerous codifications of law, and responsa of subsequent centuries. In principle, ‘Orthodoxy’ espouses tradition and centralised authority (the Chief Rabbi is ‘Orthodox’), whereas ‘non-Orthodoxy’ inclines toward autonomy and self-determination.

In some congregations, music is high on the list of priorities; in others, this is not the case. Consequently, musical standards differ enormously. But the question remains: according to what criteria are standards per se assessed? Is it axiomatic that professionals are more suitable than non-professionals? There are comparatively few Jewish singers (especially men) with a formal western vocal training; fewer still seem enthusiastic about participating as choristers (as distinct from choirmasters/mistresses) in synagogue choirs. Paradoxically, a higher level of commitment may be found, not only among Jewish amateurs, but also among non-Jewish professionals! (It would be interesting and instructive to look into the psychological reasons for this...)

Most British composers of choral music for the synagogue are Jewish. Among the best known of the older generation are Israel Mombach (‘West Ashkenazi/Orthodox’), Samuel Alman (‘East Ashkenazi/Orthodox’), David de Sola (‘Sephardi/Orthodox’), and Charles Salaman (‘Ashkenazi/Reform’). Their respective styles may seem, to non-Jews, indistinguishable from British non-Jewish choral music of the period; but British Jews of all denominations will recognise their music as ‘Jewish’. Some regularly used compositions are by non-Jews. Handel figures once, and Beethoven three times, in *Kol Rinnu v’Toda (The Voice of Prayer and Praise)*, the Ashkenazi ‘Orthodox’ British chorister’s ‘bible’. And the first choirmaster at the West London Synagogue was Dr. C.G. Verrinder, some of whose compositions and arrangements show a deep sympathy for traditional Jewish melos.

During the latter part of the 20th century, the sources of Jewish choral music in Britain have proliferated, through increased research and improved processes of dissemination. Traditional tunes mingle with Jewish music from the 17th century Italian Renaissance, the 18th century Baroque and Classical, the 19th century German Romantic, and in this century the music of countless Israeli and American composers.

Non-Jewish music, also, finds ready acceptance once it has been transformed in any or all of the following ways: secular or profane words are replaced by suitable religious or other texts in Hebrew, Yiddish-Judeo-Spanish, Judeo-Arabic, etc.; major tonalities are often (but not always) converted into major or minor modalities or minor tonalities; a Jewish voice production and performance practice is applied; and if the music is repeated frequently enough, within one or two generations it will be
revered with as much affection as any ‘traditional’ melody of much older provenance. The rationale behind this is summed up in the Hassidic principle of ‘saving secular tunes from the Devil’. But the process was taking effect long before the rise of Hassidism in the late 18th century, and continues in the present day. One ‘Liberal’ congregation in the suburbs of London, for example, sings a joyous Hebrew song (Ehad mi yodea, from the end of the Seder service on the first night of Passover), in English translation, to the melody of the English folksong “Green Grow the Rushes, O!"

Just as some ‘Orthodox’ Jews feel as if they were in ‘church’ when attending a service in a ‘Reform’ or ‘Liberal’ synagogue, so some ‘non-Orthodox’ Jews tend to judge music in the ‘Orthodox* synagogue as a fossil of the ancient orient, a product of centuries of insularity. The extent of acculturation, as indicated in the foregoing pages of this paper, demonstrates that Jewish music in even the most close-knit communities has undergone a gradual metamorphosis. But, more to the point, can the ‘nonorthodox’ sections of the community claim to have been untouched by that attitude of mind that creates the very insularity they scorn? Conditioning is a fact of life, no matter what may be one’s religious persuasion. So, in practice, ‘Conservative’, ‘Reform’ and ‘Liberal’ Jews have their established traditions too; the only difference is that theirs are of more recent origin.

And with what vehemence are these traditions upheld! I have witnessed respected members of a ‘Reform’ synagogue castigate an individual to the point of tears for daring to teach one traditional tune as a setting for a text usually sung to another. Such incidents can lead to lasting personal or factional antagonisms. Curious it is, that, in place of worship, music can be reduced to a weapon... And, by all accounts, this is a problem not at all unique to Judaism.

Our survey has, so far, centred upon liturgical music, though other genres have been introduced in passing. Unconventional treatment of cantorial song introduces a new dimension. Avant-garde techniques such as serialism have not been adopted in Britain, though they have been experimented with by American cantors. But the admixture of contemporary Jazz techniques, not only in keyboard accompaniments, but also in voice production, has gained ground in Britain, so creating a ‘popular/commercial ethos somewhat removed from the devotional atmosphere usually associated with the synagogue. (Admittedly, such performances would not be integrated into a religious service in the synagogue itself, but would rather form part of an entertainment in the
adjoining synagogue hall or in some other secular context). Some listeners enthuse; others recoil; few are indifferent.

Hassidic-Pop music is much in demand among modern Jewish youth, especially in the larger conurbations. Yet it is fast being equalled in popularity by Klezmer (a Yiddish contraction of Hcb. kle-zemer, lit. ‘musical instruments’), a form of music-making that traces its origins to the distant past and which, after a period of eclipse, is enjoying a remarkable revival in many parts of the Jewish world. Though Klezmer in the present century has absorbed some of the salient traits of Traditional Jazz, it is founded on the highly acculturated Jewish folksong and dance styles of the European continent. Centres for its study and performance are springing up in various parts of Britain (e.g. London and Sheffield), and a number of Jewish and non-Jewish folk-musicians are showing keen interested in this genre.20 Klezmorim (exponents of Klezmer) were traditionally called upon to play at Jewish weddings and other family and communal celebrations. And it is especially in this milieu that Jewish folksong and dance are preserved in Britain at the present time.

The Israeli **Hora** is known throughout British Jewry, though it tends to be danced more among the less acculturated groups. **Hava Nagila** is probably the best known example within and outside the Jewish sphere. This idiom is a direct descendent of the much earlier, but still popular, **Hassidic** circle-dance from East Europe. Another **Hassidic** form is the ‘crocodile’, where all dancers face in the same direction, with one hand stretched out and placed on the shoulder of the person in front, and the other hand waving a white handkerchief. 21

Ashkenazi folksongs in Yiddish, Sephardi folksongs in Judco-Spanish, Oriental folksongs in Judco-Arabic: all have been carefully preserved in transit, and are sung in Britain much as they would have been in the country of origin. Whereas Ashkenazi folksongs may be sung interchangeably by men or women, the Sephardic folk heritage tends to be transmitted through the female line (though there are also some fine male exponents of the idiom, especially in Israel and America). A distinct line of demarcation between men’s song (domestic and social topics) and women’s song (epics, love lyrics and lullabies) has been preserved in the Oriental folk tradition.

‘Artistic’ arrangements of folk materials have been made over recent decades, both in Britain and abroad, according to the pioneering principles adopted by several Russian-Jewish composers and folksong collectors who, in 1908 in Leningrad (then St. Petersburg), combined together to create The Society for Jewish Folk Music. But whereas one can identify a Russian-Jewish folk tune - or indeed an American-Jewish folksong using
English words - and distinguish them from their non-Jewish counterparts - there is no such Anglo-Jewish equivalent. So East Ashkenazi’ in Britain means unequivocally ‘East European’, and ‘Sephardi’ means unambiguously ‘Mediterranean’. Jewish folk singers who are British-born - whose families may have been settled in Britain for generations - instinctively retain an inherited style that distinguishes them from indigenous folk singers.

A consideration of consciously Jewish art music in Britain, however, reveals a rather different situation. But first, what do we mean by the term ‘Jewish Art Music’? Does it encompass all the music of a composer born Jewish, even if there is no Jewish intention or traditional content in his or her work? Furthermore, does it exclude all the music of a non-Jewish composer, even where there is a clear Jewish purpose or substance? To what extent do context and proportion play a role? A definition that will suffice for most other categories of Jewish music (e.g. ‘that music which traces its origins directly or indirectly to the Levantine music of Temple times, but which has, for two millenia, been subjected to the innumerable influences of the Diaspora’), will not be adequate in the field of art music. For, in the western world, Jewish composers have had rather less than 200 years in which to adapt to a non-Jewish musical culture that is at least 1,000 years old. And that - rather than the Temple - is the starting point.

There are a number of British Jews who have gained prominence, in varying degrees, in the mainstream of 20th century composition. Most are of Ashkenazi stock. All media of expression have been utilized: solo instrumental, solo vocal: chamber instrumental, choral; orchestral, operatic. Brief references to the works of a sampling of these composers will illustrate the extent to which ‘Jewishness’ is a significant ingredient in their music.

Samuel Alman, one of the few ‘Orthodox’ synagogue choirmasters to receive a formal western musical training, composed a large quantity of art music in addition to his liturgical settings. His opera, King Ahaz, was commissioned to open the Feinman Yiddish People’s Theatre in London’s ‘East End’ in 1912. Joseph Horovitz (b. 1926), best known for his music in a lighter vein, has also used traditional material in a few of his compositions, such as Ghetto Song for guitar. Wilfred Josephs (b. 1927) has composed a Requiem, based upon the Kaddish, a Jewish prayer of praise most often associated with memorials for the departed. Malcolm Lipkin (b. 1932) wrote his chamber work Clifford’s Tower after having read an account of the massacre of the Jews of York in 1190. It was premiered at the Cheltenham Festival in 1980. Kaddish for Terezin, for two solo voices, two narrators, two choirs and orchestra, by Ronald Senator (b.
(1926) was first performed at Canterbury Cathedral in 1986. Malcolm Williamson (b. 1931), Master of the Queen’s Musick, has identified closely with the Jewish community in general and with Jewish music in particular. \textit{Hashkivenu Adonai}\textsuperscript{23} is a setting of a traditional liturgical text. Most of the above works have been inspired by the more melancholy aspects of Jewish life and history.

Mention should be made of other British Jewish composers of the present and recent past whose contribution to Jewish art music is significant. They include: Brian Elias, David Fligg, Erika Fox, Benjamin Frankel, Alexander Goehr, Franz Reizenstein, Robert Saxton, Malcolm Singer, and David Stoll.

An unusual and effective means of introducing modern Israeli art music into Britain is the series of beautifully illustrated recordings entitled \textit{The Living Bible}.\textsuperscript{24} This twelve-record set comprises readings from the Old Testament by Sir Laurence Olivier, accompanied by performances of works by Mchnahem Avidom, Josef Kaminski, Oedoen Partos, Shosana Shapira, Karel Salomon, and others. The music of Paul Ben-Haim is used as a backdrop against which the words of God are spoken.

Jewish works by non-British Jewish composers are often performed and recorded by Jewish musicians in Britain. For example, the Zemel Choir have in their repertoire not only much Israeli choral music, but also \textit{Avodurh Hakodesh} (‘Sacred Service’) by the Swiss-American composer Ernest Bloch. And settings of Psalms 137, 114, and 22, form part of a recording (not yet released) consisting of Bloch’s complete songs made by soprano Andrea Baron and pianist Roy Howat.

It seems, at present, that most Sephardi, Oriental, and Hassidic Jews in Britain do not pursue a line that integrates their respective musics into the mainstream of British art music. Where involved as executants, they tend to keep professional activities separate from any involvement in ‘traditional’ music-making.

The Present and The Future

A ‘renaissance’ of Jewish music in this country could be initiated in a number of ways:

(1) By seeking funds available for commissioning works for the synagogue and the concert hall, from composers who feel ‘Jewish’ according to temperament and/or persuasion.

(2) By transcribing, harmonizing (where possible), orchestrating (where appropriate) and recording the tradition chants and songs of Hazananim resident in this country. There is a risk that their individual musics may
eventually disappear unless something constructive is done to preserve them.

(3) By reaching a wider public, both Jewish and non-Jewish, through the media of recitals, concerts, broadcasts, symposia, lectures, publications, etc.

(4) By gathering together colleagues in music and related fields who are in sympathy with these aims, but who at present feel despondent at the apathy that surrounds them, and isolates them from kindred spirits...

(5) At a future date the climate may be favourable for setting up a Jewish department of ethnomusicology at university level in this country. General issues (e.g. acculturation; cultural prejudice through ignorance; positive and negative powers of music in religious and political conflicts; etc.) in relation to [Jewish] music and its practice both here and abroad could then be disseminated as serious and ‘respectable’ studies in depth.

This peroration first appeared in an article published in the Jewish Quarterly fifteen years ago. How much have things changed since that time? Let us begin by taking each point in turn, and see where it leads:

(1) Money has always been plentiful for some ventures within British Jewry, and limited for others. Music is not regarded as one of life’s necessities. Most musicians are expected to feel ‘privileged’ or ‘thankful for free publicity’ or ‘charitable’, and are made to feel guilty if they behave in the business-like manner that is the norm in all other professions. Even concert organizers are predisposed to give automatic funding priority to expenditure on publicity, postage, piano-tuning, administrative and staging costs; and, too often, the performers - especially ‘innocent’ young professionals - will be offered remuneration only if there is something left over at the end. But a Jewish musician successful in the wider community will also be successful within the Jewish community. And such is the appetite for kudos that non-Jews suspected of even the most tenuous Jewish association will be brought into the Jewish fold! Bruch, Ravel, and Bizet are but three among many non-Jews who occasionally appear in compilations of Jewish composers, either because of the sound of their name, or because of their affinity with traditional Jewish melos, or by reason of family connections. Conversions to Christianity, as, for example, in the cases of Mendelssohn, Mahler, and Schoenberg, are disregarded in considerations of ethnic identity. But what if any of these composers had wanted to marry a Jew? How assured might they have been of a wholehearted welcome? Is there an emotional ‘double standard’ at work here? - a gulf between ‘image’ and ‘reality’?

(2) Standards of musical literacy have certainly risen. But the collection of traditional tunes is not keeping pace with the disappearance of what might be termed the ‘holocaust’ generation who brought countless melodies
into this country. Some folksongs have been preserved through transformation into art-songs. However this process is not without its problems. At a recent conference, I was made acutely aware of the strength of feeling that many folk musicians have in regard to ‘authenticity’. Some arrangements (including one of my own) that I had demonstrated, of a Judeo-Spanish *romancero* from Turkey, were likened to an exercise in ‘western imperialism’, because they were written for voice and piano, thereby constraining the voice into equal temperament and other non-oriental practices. I took the point - although at no time had there been any suggestion that these arrangements were intended to supplant the original version of the song, but rather that they offered a variety of interpretations of a melody full of expressive and harmonic implications. Cantorial song is equally vulnerable. Sensitive or insensitive treatment at the hands of accompanist and choirmaster can respectively enhance or destroy. The extent to which there is familiarity with nusah and the skills of improvisation determines the degree to which there can be ‘harmony’ with the cantor, without neutralizing modality or interfering with spontaneity.

Of course there is acculturation; this can be a creative - not competitive - encounter between east and west. But as soon as western performance criteria can be applied, so can western criticism. Hugo Weisgall, the American composer and scholar, has complained of the “pervading atmosphere of the second-rate which makes it difficult for the uncompromising musician to remain active in Jewish music.” He continues:

> Even among professional groups where normal professional competition might be expected to force proceedings to a high level, one is frequently subjected to ‘concerts’ of the worst possible music executed in the worst possible taste. The difficult task of training a popular audience... 

If this has been the situation in America, with its Jewish population running into several millions, what may one fairly expect from the British community of merely one-third of a million - and steadily decreasing? Is it any wonder that Jewish musicians in the ‘mainstream’ are embarrassed about the state of Jewish music? What are the sources of this prejudice?
Reactions such as these may be the result of ignorance and misconception: Jewish music is ‘compared’ with western music and found wanting. Those Jews who think it too ‘foreign’ or ‘oriental’ find it difficult to appreciate that some non-Jews are deeply attracted by its exotic qualities (though others are not). Education, in the widest sense, would help to minimise the adverse effects of ‘judgment’. At any rate, concerts of Jewish music are drawing ever more eager audiences; large halls in London are often ‘sold out’; and the response to such events in the large centres of the north are, if anything, even more vigorous.

(3) Dissemination of Jewish music has increased considerably over recent years, mainly as a consequence of the enthusiasm and commitment shown by many individuals and institutions. But there is always the danger of parochialism. It has often been noted that Jewish music is a potent force in the preservation of the Jews as a distinct ‘people’. While this is doubtless true, its expressiveness is no more confined to a single ethnic group than the communicative qualities of Christian-inspired music are restricted to Christians. In its quintessential forms it can transcend the limitations of the written word and penetrate cultural barriers. An open perception brings awareness of the unity of music at deeper levels: and the implications for real ecumenism are enormous.

(4) Some of the despondency mentioned in paragraph (4) of the quotation stems not from apathy but from the imposition of standards by those whose ‘qualifications’ to do so are minimal or absent. In the synagogal context, it is usually the wardens (Heb: Gabba‘im) who have the greatest administrative powers over the conduct of the ritual. Since much lay-authority is vested in them, the temptation to inspire fear is not always resisted; nor is dissent always tolerated. ‘Political’ pressures can lead to wrong decisions being made in the interest of expediency. The choice of music and musicians may be determined by those whose perception of music is, at best, limited. Where there are arguments concerning participation versus contemplation, tradition versus modernity, intuition is rarely allowed to play a part...

Isolation is felt especially by Sephardi and Oriental Jewish musicians who may feel insecure within the more confident Ashkenazi society that surrounds and overwhelms them. There is evidence of anxiety, in anticipation of doubt being cast upon their knowledge of, and expertise in, their own traditional musics. The process of bridge-building is slow and painstaking. If understanding between Jew and non-Jew is to be encouraged, is not the same equally desirable between Jew and Jew?

(5) The teaching of Jewish music at Tertiary level in this country still lags far behind that available in the U.S.A. In New York there are three
institutions that offer extensive and intensive, full-time courses in Jewish music: Yeshiva University (‘Orthodox’), Jewish Theological Seminary (‘Conservative’), Hebrew Union College (‘Reform’). Each contains cantors’ institutes; each has facilities for research to higher degree levels. In Israel there are universities and academics where Jewish music is taught. In Britain, however, there are no musical, musicological or ethnomusicological full-time courses in this subject at undergraduate or postgraduate levels at this time. The younger generation of British-born cantors officiating in British synagogues have either trained abroad, or privately with an experienced mentor in this country.

But despite the lack of ready-made facilities, research is being done here and there (see Bibliography). The vast majority of academics and students in the field of Jewish music, both in Britain and elsewhere, are Jewish. Why is this the case, when, for example, the Indian or Chinese ethnomusicological fields are full of non-Indian or non-Chinese scholars (some of them Jewish). When the overwhelming majority of researchers into the culture of an ethnic group are, at the same time, members of that group, the problem of encroachments upon intellectual freedom and impartiality arises. This is especially the case when the culture is ‘on the doorstep’. Is it inevitable that the ‘insider’ will react either positively with pride, or negatively with shame, to the subject of research; or is it possible to be objective, unemotional, and psychologically ‘unattached’? Does the ‘inside information’ of the ‘insider’ - that ‘essence of being’, unknowable to the ‘outsider’ - help or hinder observation? Can the ‘insider’ be allowed to disassociate him- or herself from the expectations of other ‘insiders’ (e.g. conformity to the traditional mores and religious beliefs of the group, commitment to the continuing and separate identity of the group)? These are just a few of the many questions awaiting serious attention.

Notes
1. Transliteration of Hebrew and Yiddish words is according to one of the ‘popular’ systems in current use. The letter H is pronounced in a lightly guttural manner.
2. ‘Ultra-Orthodox’ sects who wear traditional 18th century Polish dress.
3. Jews who originally settled in Eastern, Central, Northern, and Western Europe.
4. Jews who originally settled in the Iberian Peninsula and thence around the shores of the Mediterranean.
5. Not *Reformed* (a designation used for some Christian Churches).

7. Hampstead United Synagogue in London is the only 'Orthodox' congregation with a mixed choir; the continuing controversy centres around the traditional role of women in Jewish society, and the putative effect of women’s voices upon male congregants.

8. An onomatopoeic term for choral humming with the mouth closed. Pauses or consonantal accents will, respectively, anticipate or punctuate changes of harmony. This form of accompaniment may have its origin in the boy-soprano (*singerl*) and bass who, in previous centuries, would stand on either side of the cantor and support him harmonically in thirds and sixths, as appropriate.

9. The seeds are sown in boys’ choirs in 'Orthodox' synagogues and Jewish schools, where the training encourages a ‘grittiness’ of sound entirely different from the ‘purity’ and restraint so characteristic of Church and Chapel choirs.


11. This ambivalence has many social and historical sources. Two will suffice here: (i) there is a traditional rivalry between rabbi and cantor in matters of status and authority in the synagogue and (ii) ‘music’ especially secular or instrumental, is regarded as something of a frivolity. However, throughout the ages, and in the present day, certain rabbis have felt and expressed a deep musical affinity, and have contributed substantially as musicologists and/or executants. Dr. Norman Solomon, presently Director of the Centre for the Study of Judaism and Jewish Christian Relations in Birmingham, is an ‘Orthodox’ Rabbi who holds, apart from other degrees, a B.Mus. from the University of London.


13. ibid.

14. Rabbi Henry Goldstein, op.cit, p.5


16. Rabbinical interpretations of the Old Testament of the Bible, originating in the two great centres of Jewish learning - Jerusalem and Babylon - and compiled in the 3rd, 4th and 5th centuries A.D.

17. Mombach (1813-80) was born in Pfungstadt. He came to London, where he taught cantorial song at Jews’ College, and directed the choir of the Great Synagogue for 52 years. Alman (1877-1947) studied at the Royal
College of Music, and became choirmaster at several London synagogues successively. De Sola was the cantor of the Bevis Marks Synagogue from 1815 until 1860. Salaman, whose middle name - Kensington - refers to the district of London in which he was born, wrote over 100 settings for the West London Synagogue. His 84th Psalm (Ma Yedidot) was included in the service for the re-opening of Worcester Cathedral.


(N.B. The Jewish date - in this case 5693 - is calculated from the traditional date of the creation of the world, according to Biblical chronology, and is sometimes followed by the initials ‘A.M.’ - Anno Mundi).

19. Similarly, the Christian ‘Salvation Army’ poses the rhetorical question: “Why should the Devil have all the best tunes?”

20. I know of a Jewish fiddler in Exeter (Jewish population c.80) who hitherto specialized in English folk dance music, and who has now added Klermer to his repertoire.

21. Among the Hassidim, men will dance only in groups with other men, and women similarly only with other women.

22. It is sometimes argued that, since western art music is founded on Gregorian Chant, and since Gregorian Chant derives substantially from Temple Chant, therefore Jewish music can be claimed as the basis of western music! This view of twenty centuries of musical history and development is, for reasons too many to enumerate, simplistic to the point of distortion. Suffice it to observe that, by the time European polyphony was beginning, Church and Synagogue had long since diverged, and were travelling - musically and otherwise - entirely separate paths.

23. There are seven names of God that ‘Orthodox* Ashkenazi Jews will pronounce only in prayer. When these names occur in items sung in concert or in recordings, a recognized substitute will be used. For example, Adonai will be replaced by Adoshem or Hashem; Elohenu by Elokenu. Sephardi, Oriental, and ‘non-Orthodox* Ashkenazi Jews, however are not bound by this custom, but sometimes adhere to it in order to avoid causing offence to ‘Orthodox’ Ashkenazim.
26. Schoenberg reconverted to Judaism towards the end of his life.
28. ibid.
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EVENING *BAR’CHU* FOR SHALOSH REGALIM:
WILL THE REAL NUSAH PLEASE STAND UP?

HAZZAN BRIAN MAYER

At the Cantors Institute of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, nusah for *Shalosh Regalim* is taught from a corpus of tunes compiled and determined by Professor Max Wohlberg. These “Mi-Sinai tunes” are currently presented in the CI’s written curriculum (hereinafter CIWC). The CIWC is seemingly comprehensive. Professor Wohlberg has taken great care to present the American cantorial student with a thorough and authentic model of Ashkenazic nusah. In doing so, Professor Wohlberg homogenized the variations of many European communities into one bona fide rendition.

Such a compilation is based on a selective process. Inevitably, some versions of a particular chant or tune are excluded in favor of others and it is fascinating to examine that which has been eliminated. Under the guidance of Professor Wohlberg, I am writing my doctoral dissertation pursuing these very elements of nusah which are often overlooked. My approach is to compare the CIWC with all of the available western, central and eastern European sources. In effect, I am retracing Wohlberg’s steps, examining anew the sources from which he culled the CIWC. For each tune I examine the modal content, identify significant motifs and distinguish any metrical melodies. In some instances I have discovered whole passages of nusah which were apparently fundamental to the liturgical music of Ashkenazic communities but are no longer employed. These tunes have not only fallen from the practice of contemporary Jewry, but they have also remained beyond the study of today’s cantors.

The nusah for the Evening Service of *Shalosh Regalim* is somewhat enigmatic. When looking at the CIWC, one encounters mixed signals in the very first item. *Bar’chu* is presented in two entirely different versions. Line 1 is written in the major mode while Line 3 is minor.

---

1. The term “Mi-Sinai tunes” is used here in a very broad context, encompassing many portions of chant which would not qualify under a more narrow definition Mi-Sinai tunes.

HAZZAN BRIAN MAYER is Cantor of Temple Emenu-El, Providence, Rhode Island, and Instructor in Cantillation at the Cantors Institute of The Jewish Theological Seminary.
(Example 1). It is clear that Wohlberg intended to preserve two separate traditions despite his usual desire to present his student with a homogenization. In the space of this article I will focus only on the material pertaining to CIWC Line 1.

Example 1.

A close look at CIWC Line 1 reveals a near duplication of No.157 in Joseph Sulzer’s 1905 edition of his father’s Schir Zion (Example2). The respective opening motifs (hereinafter Opening Motif A) are the same, the metrical settings of the words “et Adonai” are identical and they both return to the tonic in similar fashion. The fascinating characteristic about both settings is what they do not portray.

Example 2.
Opening Motif A

As was often the case, Josef Sulzer took some substantial liberties with his father’s work. For this study it is imperative to return to Salomon’s original works to search for his rendition of the nusah. Salomon’s quest for authenticity is stated in the preface of Schir Zion I (1839): “I see it as my duty . . . to consider as far as possible the traditional tunes bequeathed to us, to cleanse their ancient and decorous character from the later accretions or tasteless embellishments, to restore their original purity . . . ”

Salomon’s Bar’chu, No. 42 (Example 3), which he labels alte Weise, opens with the identical motifs in the tenor line as appear in the previously cited examples (Opening Motif A and Metrical Tune-part A). In the fifth measure, however, the tenor line rests and the sopranos sing a metrical tune (Metrical Tune - part B) different from the tenors’ third measure, but apply it to the same words.

Example 3.


3. I view this metrical tune as having two related parts, since although part A sometimes appears alone, part B almost never does; it follows directly on the heels of part A. The same is true of the better known metrical tune for the evening service of the High Holy Days. It, too, does not always appear in its entirety, but its fragments often do appear in order as one complete tune.
Metrical Tune - Part A

```
\[ \text{Metrical Tune - Part B} \]
```

This additional tune rears its pretty head in other composers’ settings of Bur’chu. Not surprisingly, Moritz Deutsch, a devoted student of Salomon Sulzer and his assistant cantor from 1842-1844, employs it albeit without the repetition of words. Curiously, though, Deutsch does not open with his teacher’s choice for the opening motif; he delays its appearance by placing another motif (Opening Motif B) before it. He also embellishes Metrical Tune - part A (Example 4).

Example 4.

II. Theil.
Abendgebet für die Festtage.

```
\[ \text{Opening Motif B} \]
```

Finding in Deutsch the tune omitted by Josef Sulzer does not provide enough evidence to prove that Josef overlooked an important element of the nusah; one might conclude that Deutsch simply repeated a nigun of his mentor’s creating. However, a look at Samuel Naumbourg’s Evening Service will show that this tune was known beyond Sulzer’s circle.

Samuel Naumbourg, the chief cantor in Paris from 1845-1880, clearly was not a Sulzerprotege. Naumbourg was thoroughly imbued with the nusah of South Germany. His forebears were cantors extending back three centuries and his formal training came in Munich at the hands of the venerable Low Sanger and in the choir of Maier Kohn.5 Throughout his introduction to Z’ mirot Yisrael, published in 1847 (just eight years after Schir Zion I and several decades before Josef Sulzer’s or Deutsch’s publications), Naumbourg relates his understanding of the age-old nature of this music. Thus, he often labels his settings “ancienne maniere” or “ancienne melodie,” reflecting his attempt to transmit a tradition, much of which he attributes to the Maharil.6

Naumbourg’s Bar’chu is set for male trio (Example 5), an indication that this rendition echoes the style which was so favored by the eighteenth century and early nineteenth century cantors like Sanger. It opens, after a declamatory calling of the first word, with the familiar metrical tunecommonalloftheaforementionedsettings. Thesametune gracefully repeats itself, extending what has been a two-measure phrase into four measures.’

Example 5a


7. This repetition of the melody appears to be Naumbourg’s innovation, for no other source repeats it, including Sanger and Kuhn; see Idelsohn, Thesaurus of Oriental Hebrew Melodies, Vol. VII, (Ktav: 1973), pp.28 and 136.
Example 5b

Example 5c

This tune reappears at the end of Naumbourg’s Pesah Achlu (Example 5b); the words “v’ ga’ al. bimei hag pesah” areset with his four-measure version of the metrical tune from Bar’chu. The very next measure proves that the tune in Salomon Sulzer’s Ear’ chu was not a creation of the Viennese synagogue tunesmith, but rather it was an integral part of the tradition. Naumbourg’s setting of the text, Pesah Romim, which he labels anciennemelodie, is unmistakably the same as S. Sulzer’s Bar’ chu in his soprano line. Naumbourg’s version of the tune goes on further, up a major third, with a complete sequence.

Looking back to the beginning of Naumbourg’s Pesah Achlu, the piece is set, like Ear’ chu, in the male trio style. Interestingly, the three voices sing the word “pesah” in unison and employ the same motif (Opening Motif B) that Deutsch used to open his Bar’ chu setting. The top voice in Naumbourg’s piece continues, just as Deutsch’s, with an extended version of Opening Motif A. Furthermore, Deutsch applies this same
extended version to the corresponding Sukkot text, to' ani nit' eitz' mahot (Example 5c).8

Naumbourg’s source for Metrical Tune - part B is not clear. Neither of his Munich pedagogues, Maier Kohn nor Low Sanger employ it in their settings of Bar’chu or Pesah Achlu.9 Sources from other areas, however, employ various combinations of the opening motifs and parts of the metrical tune. From Berlin, Louis Lewandowski and Aron Friedmann provide similar renditions (Example 6).10 For Bar’chu, both employ identical opening motifs which begin with only part of Opening Motif B, and then continue with all of Opening Motif A. Friedmann, in his Shir Lishfomoh, proceeds with Metrical Tune - part A and finishes with a motif that includes a descending minor seventh.” The remainder of Lewandowski’s Kol Rinnah Utefillah and Todah Wsimrah settings neglect the motifs in question, each blazing unique paths.

Example 6

8. Although this discussion deals primarily with the service of Pesuh it should be understood that, with some specific exceptions, the nusah for Pesuh also applies to Sukkot and Shavuot. Naumbourg, in an asterisk attached to his Bar’chu (No. 108), comments that “an intelligent officiant can easily adapt these melodies to the words of the other piyutim which are nearly always the same form.”


10. Lewandowski, known primarily as the choral director and composer for the somewhat liberal Oranienburgerstrasse Temple, spent the first twenty-five years of his career in the old orthodox Heidereuterstrasse synagogue. His understanding of nusah was cultivated by Abraham Jacob Lichtenstein, cantor of the old synagogue. Friedmann served the same community. Although his tenure began in 1882, seventeen years after Lewandowski moved to the new temple, Friedmann’s nusah often corresponds to that of Lewandowski, probably reflecting the lasting influence of Lichtenstein.

11. This concluding motif will be dealt with further on in this paper.
Lewandowski’s Pesah Achlu in Kol Rinnah Uttefillah No. 70, opens with the entire Opening Motif B, skips Opening Motif A, and uses Metrical Tune - part A. Opening Motif B returns in his Pesah Tukkan, but is appears in the upper octave. Friedmann’s Pesah Achlu and Pesah Tukkan No. 241, begin with Opening Motif A and B, respectively, and employ Metrical Tune - parts A and B in both texts (Example 7).

Example 7
Other such combinations of these motifs appear in the Frankfurt am Main sources, Fabian Ogutsch’s *Der Frankfurter Kantor*, and Selig Scheuermann’s *Die gottesdienstlichen Gesange der Israeliten* (Example 8). Ogutsch’s Pesah *Tukkan* employs all of Metrical Tune - part B, albeit with an awkward modulation. Scheuermann’s *Bar’chu* is much like Josef Sulzer’s, using Opening Motif A and Metrical Tune - part A.

Example 8

II. Teil.

**Scholosch** *regolim*.

**A**, Pesach arvis.
Still another source, from Hungary, is M. Wodak’s *Ham’natzeach*. It is invaluable, for it is among the very few publications which account for Hungarian -Eastern European nusah for the Three Festivals. Wodak’s *Bar’chu* is full of typically Eastern European embellishments, but it follows the same parameters of the nusah: it employs Opening Motif B and both parts of the metrical tune (Example 9).

Abraham Baer’s *Baal T’fillah*, published in Leipzig in 1877, is the only nineteenth century source which frequently includes more than one version for chanting a text. It attempts to encompass more than just renditions of local custom, though it falls short of being comprehensive. Baer’s No. 719, *Weise 1* is the clearest example of applying a full range of motifs to *Bar’chu* (Example 10). His first two measures employ both opening motifs for the word “*Bur’chu*”. The words “*_et Adonai*” are reapplied to Metrical Tune - part A; Metrical Tune - part B with the sequence is set without text; the closing motif arrives at the tonic in the same fashion as do the Sulzers’ versions.
Although Baer’s work provides the broadest picture of the contemporary practice, there is one motif for which Baer does not account. It is the closing motif found in Deutsch’s Bar’chru. This motif, applied to the word "Ham’ vorach," begins on scalestep eight and drops a minor seventh before making its way to scale-step one. This figure, with its somewhat unusual interval, appears in several sources.

When looking at Deutsch, one must always consult his teacher’s work. Although Sulzer’s Bar’chu does not employ this motif, his setting of Pesah Achlu does (Example 11 - Schir Zion II, No. 94). The same phenomenon occurs in Baer’s Pesah Achlu (Example 12 - pp. 731, Weise 2) and Pesah Tukkan (No. 732, Weisel & 2). Given these close ties between Bar’chu and Pesah Achlu, demonstrated above in Naumbourg, Friedmann and Ogutsch, it is no surprise to find this closing motif with the descending seventh in either Bar’chu, Pesah Achlu or Pesah Tukkan in nearly all of the sources.
The one curious exception to much of what has been discussed above is Wohlberg’s CIWC. The CIWC never employs Metrical Tune - part B, with the possible exception of two veiled references, nor does it demonstrate the unique closing motif with the descending minor seventh.

Example 13

12. The fourth and third to last measures of Wohlberg’s Pesah Tukkan (line 22) and Haporeis (lines 35-36) seem to allude to the beginning of Metrical Tune part B. CIWC lines 21 and 34 begin with a metrical tune which is somewhat similar to Baer’s Pesah Achlu, no. 731 Wehe2. This tune, as Wohlberg’s presents it, does not appear in any of the sources (Example 13).
The reasons behind Wohlberg’s omissions are consistent with his overall philosophy about teaching and rendering nusah in the latter half of twentieth century Amcrica. In 1977 he wrote about “two trends present throughout our history. The first, more dominant one, is reverence for tradition. The second is accommodation to the present.”

All of his decisions about nusah are influenced by the tension between tradition and accommodation. In the case at hand, Wohlberg knows that Josef Sulzer and others omitted Metrical Tune - part B, thus giving him a historical precedent for the CIWC. He also disapproves of long melismas, particularly ones like Metrical Tune - part B which are not set to the liturgical text and are often sung with nonsense syllables. Wohlberg’s avoiding of the descending minor seventh cadential motif again reflects a historical precedent while also affording the cantorial student an easier motif to negotiate.

Like Professor Wohlberg, my mentor and teacher, I have found that the sources from the past two centuries have a great deal to teach us in the field of nusah. The evidence is convincing that in less than one hundred years, significant change has occurred; the expectant ears of the informed congregant no longer demand to hear the fundamental motifs and the full metrical tune of the Festival Evening Bar’chu. Although it is impossible to turn back the clock and undo the development of a dynamic tradition, I do propose the reintroduction of melodies like Bar’chu which are not only readily accessible, but are also part of a once vibrant whole. Today’s cantors should be mindful of Salomon Sulzer’s charge, “to consider as far as possible the traditional tunes bequeathed to us.”
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TA'AMEY HAMIKRA: A CLOSER LOOK

JOSHUA R. JACOBSON

What's wrong with these tunes?

Example 1

\[ \text{ta\-mid lo cha\-sar la\-nu, ve\-al yech\-sar la\-nu} \]

Example 2

\[ \text{ka\-ka\-tuv ve\-a\-chal\-ta ve\-sa\-va\-ta u\-ve\-rach\-ta} \]

Example 3

\[ \text{ Sho\-chen ad ma\-rom ve\-ka\-dosh, she\-mo.} \]

In the first example the word \textit{la-nu} was changed by the composer\textsuperscript{1} to \textit{la-nu}. \textit{La-nu} means "to us;" \textit{la-nu} means "they stayed overnight."

In the second example the same composer changed the words \textit{ve-a-chal-ta} and \textit{u-vey-rach-ta} to \textit{ve-a-chal-ta} and \textit{u-vey-rach-ta}. \textit{Ve-a-chal-ta} and \textit{u-vey-rach-ta} mean "you shall eat" and "you shall bless;" \textit{ve-a-chal-ta} and \textit{u-vey-rach-ta} mean "you ate" and "you blessed."

In the third example we see how the careless application of nusach to this text changes its meaning from "He who abides for eternity, exalted and holy is His name!" to "He who abides for eternity is exalted, and holy is His name!"

Well, who cares about such linguistic nit-picking? and what does all this have to do with ta'amey hamikra, anyway?

Ta'amey hamikra refers to the Jewish traditions of scriptural cantillation: the system of motifs that are assigned to the text and the

\textsuperscript{1} Moshe Nathanson

JOSHUA JACOBSON is chair of the Department of Music at Northeastern University and Founder and Director of Boston's Zamir Chorale.
graphic symbols that represent those motifs. The three functions of ta’amey hamikra are (1) to enhance the aesthetic quality of public reading by providing the texts with melodies, (2) to indicate the syllabic stress of each word, and (3) to clarify the syntactical sense by parsing each verse.

As Jewish music professionals, we are most often concerned with the first two functions: how to chant the Torah, the haftarot and the megillot with appropriate allocation of the motifs.

According to traditional Jewish practice, one is obliged to be scrupulous about pronunciation when reading scripture in public. If a ba’al k’riyah makes an error in cantillation that results in a change of meaning, he is to be interrupted, the correct reading is to be pointed out and he is to repeat the phrase with the correction.

The Shulchan Aruch, a sixteenth-century code of Jewish law compiled by Joseph Caro in Venice, stipulates:

In the first place, the reader is obligated to read with absolutely correct te’amonim and pronunciation, so that he does not confuse voiced schwa with unvoiced schwa and so that he knows which letters take daggesh.... If he makes an error in the reading, even in the pronunciation of a single letter, he is obliged to repeat it and pronounce it correctly.3

The Mishnah Berurah, a nineteenth century commentary on the Shulchan Aruch by the Chafetz Chayyim, elaborates on this passage.

If the reader makes an error in the melody of the te’amonim, and that error results in a change in the sense of the text (for example, if he chanted a word with a conjunctive ta’am in place of a disjunctive ta’am), he is obliged to repeat [the phrase].4

Unfortunately, many of those who are scrupulous about observing the correct word stress in cantillation are not always as careful when chanting the liturgy and singing hymns. As we saw in the first two examples cited above, a change in a word’s stress can change a word’s

---

2 Most te’amim (except the prepositive, postpositive and interlogic signs) indicate where in the word we should sing the “body of the trope” (to borrow Prof. Binder’s term). Those who are confused about where to place the Proper stress on words which have prepositive and postpositive tropes should consult the Koren editions of the Bible. The editors have consistently adhered to the policy of placing a secondary tropal sign on the stressed syllable of any word in which the trope falls on an unstressed syllable.

3 Shulchan Aruch, Orach Chayyim, §142 (the present author’s translation).

4 Mishnah Berurah. Orach Chayyim, §142 (the present author’s translation).
meaning. Example four shows Louis Lewandowski’s well-known setting of the verses included in the zichronot portion of the Rosh HaShanah service:

\[\text{Jer. 2:2} \]

\[\text{Ezek. 16:60} \]

Note the difference in accentuation of the word זכרתי. In the verse from Jeremiah, the word is זָכָרַתי, “I remembered.” But in the verse from Ezekiel the word appears with “vav consecutive” (וָוֶה יָדְחָה) as וֶזָכַרְתַּי, “I shall remember;” the accent has shifted and the tense is changed. Was Lewandowski aware of this distinction when he composed his setting?5

Example 4: Two excerpts from *Zacharti Lach* by Lewandowski.

---

5 I realize that it is tremendously difficult to impose new rhythm on a hymn that the congregation has been singing in its own way for years (although I confess I
Ta'amey hamikra also function as an elaborate system of punctuation, indicating the placement of major and minor pauses in the reading, as well as groupings of words which are to be syntactically connected. Every word in scripture is marked with a masoretic accent, or "ta'am." Te'amim are either conjunctive or disjunctive. A conjunctive ta'am indicates that the word is joined in meaning to the word which immediately follows. A disjunctive ta'am indicates a syntactic separation following the word. The masoretes instituted the te'amim as a means of clarifying the meaning of the sacred texts at a time when the Jewish people were no longer fluent in the use of the Hebrew language.

Without punctuation, a verse could be open to more than one interpretation. For example, this short verse from Gen. 24:34, א委组织 עבד could be read in any of three ways:

1. with a conjunctive accent on דני:
   נִיאָ מַר עֵבָר אֶבָר הַתָּא המַנְכָּא עַבְרָהָם

2. with a conjunctive accent on 아ַבְרָהָם:
   נִיאָ מַר עֵבָר אֶבָר הַתָּא מַנְכָּא עַבְרָהָם

3. with a disjunctive accent on מַיִּר:
   נִיאָ מַר עֵבָר אֶבָר הַתָּא מַנְכָּא עַבְרָהָם

The third version is the masoretic punctuation.

Another verse from the same chapter serves to further illustrate the point. Observe this phrase from Gen. 24:65.

The servant said, "he is my master.

One who is careless about the te'amim, making the "insignificant" error of confusing a mer'cha (a conjunctive ta'am) with a tipcha (a disjunctive ta'am), might easily pervert the sense of this verse, rendering it:

He said, "the servant is my master." Another interesting example is this enigmatic verse from 1Sam. 3:3.
At first glance we might translate this verse as "The lamp of the Lord had not yet gone out, and Samuel was sleeping in the Temple of the Lord where the ark of God was." However, the masoretic interpretation is quite different, and takes into account the fact that the young Samuel would never have been allowed to sleep in the sanctuary. The ta'am etnachta on the word גֵּרָה indicates the main dividing point in the verse. The phrase ending with the etnachta must therefore be treated as a parenthetical phrase. The adverbial phrase "in the Temple..." modifies "gone out," not "sleeping."

"The lamp of the Lord had not yet gone out (while Samuel was sleeping) in the Temple of the Lord where the ark of God was."

At times an improper inflection in the reading can lead to a heretical interpretation. In Isaiah 6:2 we encounter the following four words: מִמְּסָרִים מְרִימָה מְמוּלך מְכַשָּׁר. Connecting the last two words מְמַלְכִּים מְרִימָה מְכַשָּׁר would result in the unacceptable translation, "Seraphim are standing above Him." Isaiah’s vision surely would not have allowed any creatures to appear superior to the Deity. The masoretic interpretation places the disjunctive ta’am pashua on the word מְמַלְכִּים, separating it syntactically from the word מְרִימָה; "Seraphim are standing on high for [to serve] Him."

In the liturgy for the High Holidays we frequently encounter the phrase: יְהֹוָה אֲנִי נָכְרָה. In chanting this phrase, should we pause after the first word or after the second word? According to the masoretic interpretation, the latter would be more correct. The source of this phrase is Exodus 34:6: יְהֹוָה אֶל מֶשֶׁכֶךְ נִיהְיוּ נְכוֹנִים נָכוֹן נָכוֹנִים נָכוֹן. "The LORD came down in a cloud; He stood with him [Moses] there, and proclaimed the name LORD." According to Ibn Ezra, מ is the subject of the verb נָכוֹנִים; God uttered His own name to teach Moses how to invoke Him.

---

6 Note that this is how the verse is translated in the new JPS Tanakh (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1985).

7 Tanakh.

8 Note that in this case Rashi disregards the masoretas and follows instead the Targum, interpreting the subject of נָכוֹנִים as Moses.
Contrast this verse with Genesis 12:8.

Here the conjunctive ta'am mer'cha on the word אָדָם indicates that the word is in construct form (s'inchut), implying that Abram is calling "in the name of the Lord." The disjunctive ta'am tipcha on the word אָדָם causes a daggersh to appear in the first letter of אָדָם.

Another commonly misread verse is the quote from Jeremiah 31:11 which we chant in the ma'ariv service: "For the Lord will ransom Jacob and redeem him from one too strong for him." The ta'am tipcha indicates a slight pause after the word מַרְאוּד, while the mer'cha on קָדָם indicates that it is connected syntactically to the word קָדָם. The common practice of pausing between קָדָם and מַרְאוּד contradicts the sense of the text.

In the Torah service, we often hear the fourth verse from Psalm 34 chanted as:

Example 4

The presence of a disjunctive ta'am on the word הָרָא might suggest the following alteration:

Example 5

Note that Sulzer's original setting of the text shows that he was quite sensitive to the correct accentuation and phrasing.

Note that the te'amim for the book of Psalms are different from those of the twenty-one prose books.
Example 6. Salomon Sulzer, Gad’lu

We would also do well to follow more closely Sulzer’s original setting of the “Yehalelu” from the Shabbat Torah service. From an examination of the te’amim we observe that there should be a slight pause after (not before) the word ים.

"Let them praise the name of the Lord, for His name is sublime—His alone."

Example 7: Salomon Sulzer, Yehalelu

Up until this point the emphasis has been on demonstrating how the te’amim can serve as a guide to the correct pronunciation of individual words and the proper inflection of verses. But we can also reverse the process. By applying the principle of “continuous dichotomy” to a verse of scripture we can analyze the sentence structure and thereby predict the ta’am for each word.

Let us examine a simple verse: וגו נטט ה ווי ווי מלחה

“His wife looked back and she became a pillar of salt.” (Gen. 19:26)

The main syntactic division of the verse separates the two predicates וגו ווי ווי מלחה.

---

9 Note that the te’amim for the book of Psalms are different from those of the twenty-one prose books.

10 Continuous dichotomy refers to the process of dividing a scriptural verse into two parts according to the syntactical structure, then further subdividing each part into two smaller parts, and continuing until the smallest indivisible syntactic unit is reached. While this process was probably originally derived from the parallel structure of Biblical poetry, it was later applied to the prose books as well.
חבט אתשה מאתרי

Each of the two halves of the verse can then be further subdivided. According to one of the basic rules of syntactic subdivision, a phrase that begins with a verb is subdivided before its final complement.¹¹

In the second half of the verse we apply the principle that two words in construct state must remain together as a syntactic unit. Since הבּ and
מַלְטָה must remain together, the division must come before the word הבּ.

Now that we have successfully parsed the verse down to its smallest possible units, we next insert the te'amim appropriate to each syntactic position. The disjunctive ta'am marking the last word in a verse is siluk.

The disjunctive ta'am marking the last word in the first half of a verse is etnachta.

The disjunctive ta'am marking the next subdivision is tipcha.

The conjunctive ta'am “serving” tipcha is mer'cha.

¹¹ A complement (מַלְטָה) can be subject, object or modifier.
The conjunctive ta'am serving siluk is also mer'cha.

Let us examine a slightly more complex verse.

"We have brought in our hands other monies with which to buy food; we do not know who put the money in our bags.” (Gen. 43:22)

The primary dichotomy separates the two predicates הوزارة and ידענו.

In the first half, we mark the primary subdivision before the final complement.

We can now sub-divide the inner phrase; the dichotomy is before the predicate.

The second half of the verse subdivides before the compound complement.
The object itself is a phrase which further subdivides before its final complement.

We now apply the te'amim according to the hierarchical structure of the parsed verse. The final word of the verse is marked with the disjunctive siluk, and the final word of the first half of the verse is marked with the disjunctive etnachta.

In the first half-verse we mark the last word of the first sub-division with the disjunctive tipcha.

The last word in a phrase which is subordinate to tipcha is marked with the subordinate disjunctive, t'vir.

We can now mark the conjunctives which "serve" the disjunctives. Before tipcha—mer'cha.

Before t'vir, since there are two intervening unstressed syllables—darga.

The second half-verse is accented in a similar fashion. The final phrase before siluk must end with the disjunctive, tipcha.
The first subdivision, since it is on a higher level than tipcha, must be the disjunctive, zakef.

The conjunctive which serves tipcha is mer'cha.

The conjunctive which serves zakef is munach.

The verse is now fully accented.

With knowledge of the rules of parsing scripture and of the hierarchy of the te'amim, one can apply this method to any verse in the Bible. Although this procedure may seem complex when revealed in such a cursory fashion, a practiced reader studying the subject with a step-by-step approach can become rather proficient.

Regrettably, this method of analysis is not well known outside of Israel, where it is taught to young children in many schools. The benefits of this knowledge to a ba'al k'riyah should be obvious. The ability to predict patterns of te'amim can greatly facilitate the process of what often seems to be rote memorization. The introduction of this method of analysis into the curriculum of our day schools and Hebrew high schools could potentially improve the students' ability to understand the Hebrew Bible and could even increase the number of skilled ba'aley k'riyah in the next generation. Ta'amey hamikra does not have to be taught as a purely musical pre-confirmation exercise. It can and should be integrated into the curriculum of Bible study.

Unfortunately, there are no textbooks in English that adequately treat this subject. Binder’s text is an excellent resource but is limited to
musical interpretation of the motifs. 12 Cantor Samuel Rosenbaum’s books on Torah and Haftarah chanting reflect an earnest attempt to present the techniques of cantillation in a logical manner, but contain a number of errors.13 Maurice Gellis and Dennis Gribetz’s book presents many grammatical rules which are extremely helpful to the ba’al k’riyah.14 Yet none of these authors explains the relationship of the te’ amim to the grammatical structure.

Solomon Rosowsky’s revered tome 15 is many things. It is an extremely thorough treatise on every possible permutation of the ta’amey hamikra as they would appear in Western notation. It even presents a method for cantillating the Bible in Swedish translation. While Rosowsky does deal with grammatical aspects of the te’ amim, he does so primarily from the antiquated concept of the “chain of command” (emperors, kings, dukes, and so forth). There is no attempt to correlate the te’ amim to grammatical parsing of the text.

The best (and only) book on the subject in the English language remains William Wickes’ *Treatise on the Accentuation of the Prose Books of the Old Testament*, available now in a reprint edition.16 Wickes gives a thorough explanation of the relationship of te’ amim to the syntax, including the rules for parsing scriptural verse. But his book is better suited to scholars than to young students.

In Israel, many scholars have delved into the complex functions of the te’ amim. Rabbi Mordecai Broyer has written a thorough explication of the subject in his *Tu’amey HaMikra*. 17 There is one author, however, who stands alone in his single-minded dedication and his ability to present the complexity of ta’amey hamikra in a clear and understandable way. Michael Perlman, now living at K’vutsat Yavneh, has already written more than twenty books and continues to add to the list each year. His

seven-volume *Dapim LeLimud Ta'amey HaMikra* \(^8\) presents the subject in a series of fully-explained graduated lessons, with exercises for the student at the end of each lesson. His six-volume *Chug LeTa'amey Hahlikra* \(^9\) is a collection of lectures on various topics related to cantillation, including fascinating parshanut based on the te'amim. He has also initiated a series displaying the text of the Bible grammatically parsed with his own system of analytical symbols. Always concerned with the practical application of his work, Mr. Perlman has issued pamphlets for the shaliach tsibhur which display liturgical texts with the parsing symbols, a tremendous boon to those who are concerned with the correct rendering of the prayers.\(^{20}\)

* * *

This article represents an attempt to stimulate interest in an area of study which is largely unknown in this country and to raise the banner for correct pronunciation and inflection of the sacred texts. Many performers are extremely careful about consulting an authoritative ur-text score in order to discover a composer’s original intentions regarding the notation, phrasing and articulation of a particular passage; yet these same musicians are ignorant of the phrasing and articulation of the text of a Biblical passage.

If we believe that Hebrew is a language meant to be understood, not merely a gobbledygook of meaningless sounds to be spun out, then we must make every effort to speak and chant the language correctly. Would we respect a professional actor who constantly mispronounces words, destroys syntax and evidences only a minimal understanding of a script? Certainly we, as Jewish music professionals, should hold to the same standards in both performance and teaching.

The fact that most congregants can’t tell the difference should not be a determining factor. Acknowledgment of the Divine Presence demands that our public prayers and reading of scripture


\(^{19}\) Michael Perlman. *Chug LeTa’amey HaMikra.* 6 vols. (Tel Aviv: Zimrat, 1971).

\(^{20}\) To my knowledge, there has been only one attempt to translate Mr. Perlman’s work into English. Alan Smith, a student of Perlman’s, has put together a booklet entitled, *Removing the Mystery from Ta’amey HaMikra.* A lucid and entertaining introduction to the subject. Copies may be obtained directly from Mr. Smith at 27 Bet Zayit, Harey Yehudah. 90815, Israel.
be formulated in the ancient sacred language. We now have the opportunity and the sacred obligation to lead our communities with this knowledge.
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Jack Gottlieb is an accomplished talent whose music encom-\par passes many sacred and secular idioms. Indeed, the publicity for Gottlieb’s newest recording, Evening, Morn, & Noon, suggests that the very purpose of this project was to present sacred music which “embraces jazzy intricacy, folk-like simplicity, art songs and Broadway tunes, (while seeking to) remain true to its sacred intent and still reach a mainstream American audience.” It is a sampling of Gottlieb’s music from several full-length sacred services, as well as individual prayers and meditations.

The cd (Premier Recordings PRCD 1018) is organized around the rhythm of the Sabbath Day. After opening with three Psalm settings, music for Evening includes Candle Blessing No. 1, Ma Tovu, Hashkivenu, and V’ shamru. The Morning section opens with Shachar Avakeshcha and Anim Znirot, before moving on to traditional texts such as K’ dusha and Etz Chayim. Noon includes Tsur Yisrael, Retsei Vimnuchateinu, May the Words, and the recording concludes with a pastoral Benediction.

The listener should not anticipate traditional nusach, nor sounds of the last century on this recording. These compositions celebrate the contemporary idiom in their approach to melody, harmonics, and even the use of electronic instruments.

If one did not already know of Gottlieb’s long association with Leonard Bernstein, it would be apparent in the first selection, Psalm 95, where jazz rhythms and an energy of dancing remind us very much of his mentor. Through most of the recording, adjectives like “lyric”, ‘pastoral”, and “calm” describe the mood. But since the colors vary from one piece to the next, the collection does not seem repetitious. Ma Tovu, for tenor and brass, is a charming piece, in which the voice and instruments compliment each other. “Come My Beloved,” for soprano, flute, and piano is a thoughtful art song utilizing the text from the Song of Songs.

Throughout this recording, voices and instruments are integrated sensitively, as we hear thoughtful renderings of text and artistry of performance. Cantors appearing on the recording include Robert Abelson,
Richard Botton, David Lefkowitz, Helene Reps, Howard Stahl, and Meredith Stone. Actress Phyllis Newman appears as reader. Harry Huff, organist, the Metropolitan Brass Quintet, the New York Motet Choir, and Conductor Steven Sturk, round out the distinguished cast of performers.

The recording is a very useful archive of Gottlieb’s synagogue music, and will stand well as an example of creative sacred music of the late twentieth century. Singers will appreciate the quality of performance and splendid vocal writing. Historians of synagogue music will recognize that while this may not be a recording of the most popular music of our day, it does represent an aspect of the contemporary idiom.

RECENT RECORDINGS

Reviewed by CANTOR SHIMON GEWIRTZ

SHAAREI SHABBAT, a new cassette recording issued by Transcontinental Publications, contains 28 songs, blessings and prayers that can be sung in the home as well as the synagogue.

Arranged and produced by Doug Cotler, a talented performer and cantor from the west coast, the cassette features a number of cantors (mostly female) from in and around Los Angeles, singing the traditional melodies associated with the enclosed selections.

While the musical background is tastefully done, there are some jarring notes to be found in various prayers. For example:

1. The pronunciation of the third and fifth word of each verse of Shalom Aleichem is incorrect, being pronounced “malchey” instead of “malachey”. .. the meaning being entirely different.

2. The introduction to the Morzi should have been done with — at least — two people, rather than one person responding (incorrectly) to him/herself. (The introductory “Shir Hamaalot” is also inconsistent in pronunciation, while using the traditional melody).

3. Why is there no introduction to the Havdalah blessings? Even a simple chanting of the words would have sufficed.

SHIMONGEWIRTZ is Hazzanat Congregation Torat Yisrael, Cranston, Rhode Island.
Despite these quibbles, the recording is a welcome addition to the field of Shabbat music that can be used at home as well as the synagogue.

Incidentally, all of the material may be found in the new manual for Shabbat, called: SHAAREY SHABBAT – Gates of Shabbat – A Guide For Observing Shabbat, published by The Central Conference of American Rabbis.

Cantor Paul Zim has recently issued a number of recordings that reflect well on both his talents as a singer, cantor and composer of Jewish liturgy and songs.

His recording of Jewish wedding music, called A MUSICAL MAZEL TOV TO THE BRIDE AND GROOM is an enjoyable and helpful compendium of songs, blessings, prayers and instrumentals that can make any wedding a joyful experience. It includes selections from the ceremony all the way through the freilach atmosphere that should be sustained throughout the entire affair.

While many of the numbers are simply tasteful settings of traditional material, there are a number of original pieces (or little-known ones) scattered throughout the recording that can be used or adapted by other cantors.

One of the appealing aspects of cantor Zim’s singing on this recording is that although he possesses a beautiful tenor voice he chooses a lyric baritone range for most of the “sing-along” selections, which make it easier to join in on the fun.

In addition to the cassette, one may also obtain a music book with all the selections, including lead sheets and chords. Both the recording and book are published by SIMCHA Productions.

Another recent recording of Cantor Zim, which is certain to appeal to all lovers of liturgical music, is called “IN THE CANTORIAL TRADITION.” The selections afford Cantor Zim ample opportunity to display both his hazzanic gifts and fine tenor voice.

Most of the nine pieces included on the recording are recreations of well-known classics recorded by some of the great cantorial masters, such as Koussevitzky (with whom Zim studied and who he later replaced at Temple Beth El in Boro Park), Waldman, Ganchoff and others.

The orchestral arrangements enhance what had originally been piano or organ accompaniments, adding depth and excitement to Cantor Zim’s singing. The one small reservation I have concerns the male chorus that is heard on some of the selections. The vocal arrangements did not always serve the singer or the prayer, and seemed somewhat “heavy” in presentation. Still, the chance to hear another masterful rendition of Vimaalei, Mi Sheoso Nisim, Shuvi Nafshi and others done with taste and devotion are well worth any small quibbles one may have.

This recording is also published by SIMCHA Productions.
NISHMAT ADAM, THE SOUL OF MAN,
For Baritone, Soprano and Orchestra—Robert Starer

Reviewed by JUDITH K. EISENSTEIN

The title given above, provided by the composer, doesn’t quite define this exciting new work by Robert Starer. We should probably call it a cantata. It requires a speaker as well as the two singers, and it speaks both more and less about the “soul of man.” It is a sort of confession, of faith and lack of it, of the struggle between loyalty to one’s people and past, and the search for a spiritual core to one’s own being. Thus it becomes a paradigm for the struggle of large numbers of American Jews in our time.

Starer looks for answers in a wide selection of quotations, garnered from his reading over many years, and ranging from the Bible to Shakespeare to Stephen Wise, from Yiddish folk song to Yehuda Leib Peretz to the Mishnah. They are bound together by his own comments, and of course, by the music. This might sound a bit forbidding, lending itself to pompous platitudes. Nothing could be less true. Starer has demonstrated, in the past, that he has a unique, and totally fresh approach to text, as though he reads it for the first time, without the interference of time-worn clichés. This produces an immediacy of expression in music of a variety of moods—tenderness, anger, humor, and more.

The music itself, direct as it may be, is, nevertheless, highly sophisticated. It requires the services of two singers who can cope easily with the difficult intervals and irregular rhythms that are intrinsic to contemporary sound.

The instrumentation is rich, demanding a full stint of woodwinds, brasses, percussion (not timpani), strings and harp. This work could be performed with piano accompaniment. The piano score I have seen was provided by the composer, who happens to be an accomplished pianist. It would take a similarly skilled person to negotiate the score, and compensate for the loss of instrumental color.

The composition is divided into seven parts. The opening theme becomes a unifying factor throughout. It appears in many guises, diminished, expanded, inverted, in various movements, and returns in full force at the end. Part one is a statement of the struggle and the questions. The baritone sings Starer’s words, which break off at one point with a poignant chanting of the blessing Sheheheyanu, and continues with the questions,
concluding with the resolve to look to books for answers, because “we are, after all, the *am ha-sefer, the* people of the Book.”

However, his first quotation is not a literary one. Part II represents the composer’s link with his ancestry, tying his family past to his musical life in the present, by way of a set of variations on the familiar *Oif’n Pripichik*. After the statement of the theme, sung by the baritone, the piece is purely instrumental, a little gem of variation writing which could stand by itself as a performance piece.

Part III is a setting of Shylock’s famous speech from *The Merchant of Venice,* in which Starer uses Shakespeare’s words to express his own anguish, and that of all of us — Are we really different?” Here too, we have a solo which could be effective independent of the cantata, and indeed could be sung with a piano reduction of the score. In Part IV we find a complete shift of mood. Here is the first mystical source, a quotation from Peretz: “The instrument is the body, the melody is the soul.” And now we find tender melody, introduced by the English horn, which seems to me to be a metamorphosis of the opening theme, and developed by voice and flute. The strings provide the mystical atmosphere.

In Part V the soprano utters the awesome oath of allegiance to Jerusalem from Psalm 137, while the baritone continues with the spiritual search, in words from Psalm 139: “Search me, 0 Lord, and know my heart,” etc. At this point I must call attention to the fact that the Hebrew texts are always sung in Hebrew, but they are sung as well in English translation. By and large this works well, though I have some small quarrel with some of the translation, too niggling to identify here.

“One Jew sins and all Jews suffer” says the speaker, introducing Part VI, and the singer intones the Hebrew “*Yisrael — echad chata vekhulam ne’enashim*” in a chant resembling cantillation. This leads to one of the choice moments in the cantata, a ballad-like passage telling a delightful Talmudic tale with charm and humor (another Starer hallmark). It leads directly to the large seventh part, which sums up the whole, both in its words and music. Two themes play against each other. One voice, quoting both Hillel and Stephen Wise, sings the pride of self-reliance and activism, and the melody reminds one of the old songs of Zion, in the days of the Chalutzim, in march rhythms, and work rhythms. The second voice joins, singing: “The light of God is the soul of man.” (Proverbs 20:27) That, of course, is the passage which gives the title to the whole piece. Both voices end with that passage, in what can only be the triumph of a reconciliation. The orchestra reiterates the opening question in a written *out allargando.*

The premiere performance of *Nishmat Adam* was recorded, and
should soon be available, presumably with its score as well, through the Milken Family Archive of 20th Century American Jewish Music. It will appear, together with a number of other compositions described as “The Jewish Music of Robert Starer.” We shall be grateful, indeed, to the “Archive” and to its creator and architect, Dr. Michael Isaacson, to be given access to this, along with the larger repertory of music produced in America. The prospectus seems to restore the balance, in Jewish musical affairs, between art and popular music. It should be spur to serious young composers to devote some of their energies to Jewish expression, and an incentive to the powers-that-be in the Jewish community to provide occasions and means for the performance of these treasures of our growing heritage.
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Wohlberg/Kats
The original *recitative* is published in Max Wohlberg's *Pirkei Zemer: Selections from the Psalms and Pirkei Avot* (Elkins Park, PA: Ashbourne Music Publications, 1992). The piano part was composed in March for Yael Fischman. The *fermatas*, the barring, and the heading "parlando" are the composer's; all other marks are the arranger's.