INVENTING JEWISH MUSIC
Philip V. Bohlman

INTRODUCTION: ON THE THRESHOLD OF INVENTION

It was 1848, and the music of central Europe’s Jewish communities was in a state of chaos. In the cities, acculturation was moving ahead full throttle; in the villages and shtetlts, there was a growing sense of isolation and abandonment. The very nature of Jewish identity was being questioned from within Jewish society and challenged from without. Traditional music, once a symbol of Jewish identity and an embodiment of Jewish community through performance, seemed as if it was falling into decay while the musical life of continued to disintegrate. The year 1848 was, however, not a time of passive acquiescence, and the Jewish cantors of central Europe, troubled by the growing awareness that Jewish musical practices differed from community to community, from country to country, turned to the publication of a journal to enact a program of musical reform: Liturgische Zeitschrift zur Veredelung des Synagogengesangs mit Berücksichtigung des ganz Synagogewesens ["Liturgical journal for the edification of music in the synagogue, with consideration of the entire synagogue life"].

In articles published between 1848 and 1862, the lifetime of the Liturgische Zeitschrift, numerous opinions were expressed concerning the

- While conducting fieldwork for my dissertation in Israel during 1980–82 I received my first opportunity to grapple with the active invention of Jewish music when Israel Adler invited me to examine and then to catalogue the archives of the World Centre for Jewish Music in Palestine, which were housed in the Jewish Music Research Centre at the Jewish National and University Library in Jerusalem. Prof. Adler encouraged the inventiveness with which I approached the undertakings of the World Centre during the late 1930s and was also the first to urge me to transform my research into the book documenting this extraordinary organization (Bohlman 1992). I could not be more pleased that this article owes its origins to that early encouragement from Israel Adler and that contributes to the celebration of the wide-ranging inventiveness of his career. Special thanks are due to the Director of the Phonogrammarchiv of the Austrian Academy of Sciences, Dietrich Schüller, who generously made copies of A.Z. Idelsohn’s field recordings and field notes available to me. I should also like to express my gratitude to the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation for its support of research in Germany during 1990–91, which has proved fundamental to this article.
dire problems facing the musical life of the synagogues. There was no single musical style, no common consensus of synagogal life. The cantors were confused about the role of instruments and women in liturgical music, and of course about the role of the vernacular — German, Dutch, Polish, Hungarian — which further stripped synagogal music of its Jewish identity. There was particular concern about the absence of musical literacy resulting in the implementation of music education programs. There was, broadly speaking, an urgent concern about what to do to counteract the vertiginous changes through which the music of the Jewish community was apparently going, and about who should take this matter in hand. The articles, however, did not simply state the problems and fuss over them, but rather became forums for the cantors to take charge. The *Liturgische Zeitschrift* was a journal that advocated and took action.

The journal’s agenda assumed several forms and identified several specific programs of action, all of them motivated by the open call for “edification” in its title. First among its agendas was to establish the nature of music in biblical times. This would be the first step in filling in the historical gaps between the past and the present, and recognizable attempts to forge an historiography of music, particularly synagogue music, were made. The cantors proposed new ways to transcribe, notate, and teach Jewish music; each journal included extensive sections with transcriptions of standard liturgical settings, as well as a few settings that were thought to be improvements (see Example 1).

The *Liturgische Zeitschrift* sought creatively to build the future by responding to an ancient past in which Jewish music was bound to the life of the entire community, a golden age in which choruses of 4,000 and massive orchestras performed. In an oblique way, this past resembled bourgeois European society during the same period, a society to which Jewish communities were drawing increasingly closer. Would Jewish society retain its own identity? Would some sort of music be recognizable as belonging to that society? Jewish music? These were discussions and debates that raged in the pages of the *Liturgische Zeitschrift*, and it is for this reason that we witness in these pages one of the first aggressive and conscious attempts to invent Jewish music.

At the end of the twentieth century it may well be unsettling to realize that, in 1848, the concept of Jewish music was at best inchoate. There was no such thing, no bounded repertory to fit conveniently under the rubric, “Jewish music.” Treatises about music in Jewish life did not employ the term in any consistent way, and in fact would not until the twentieth
Inventing Jewish Music

We can find an abundance of other terms in European languages as well as in Hebrew: “synagogue song,” “Hebrew song,” “music of the Bible.” After the concept of folk music had been around a while, even “biblischer Volksgesang” had some currency; Johann Gottfried Herder threw the term “hebräische Poesie” into the etymological pot (1826). By no

means do words make the music, but their abundance and contradictions help us understand why the cantors writing in the Liturgische Zeitschrift were so upset with the musical cacophony they increasingly encountered. By the early decades of the twentieth century, the verbal babble had subsided a bit, and by the 1920s it had just about disappeared. The term “Jewish music” and its subsets, “Jewish folk song,” “Jewish song,” and “Jewish cantillation,” had supplanted all the other terms.1

The differences that so disturbed the cantors in 1848 had not really disappeared, but they had been ordered, measured, and cobbled together into a neat, yet powerful canon. How this Jewish music would have measured up to that called for so passionately in 1848 is hard to know, for it was the product of a long historical process that could scarcely have been imagined or predicted. They, too, never once suggested that something called “Jewish music” might exist.

What we now understand as “Jewish music,” therefore, is really the product of fairly recent historical and historicizing processes, which first emerged in the nineteenth century because of the growing encounter with forces that challenged Jewish identity and culture. This cultural and musical Other of the nineteenth century assumed new forms in the twentieth century, first with the realization of returning to erez yisra’el, then with the brutality of the Holocaust, and finally with the establishment of the State of Israel. Jewish music did not simply result from this historical encounter with the Other; it was, instead, a creative response to it, a conscious mustering of musical symbols and styles to articulate modern Jewish identity. This response contributed a fundamentally new impetus to Jewish music history, indeed linking music to Jewish history in profound new ways. Inventing Jewish music in the first half of the twentieth century became one of the most powerful metaphors for articulating the Jewish confrontation with modernity.

1 The first conscious and consistent of the adjective “Jewish” to refer to specific domains of social practice, hence to some larger notion of culture, appears in the mid-nineteenth century, particularly in the writings of scholars associated with the Wissenschaft des Judenthums, that concept itself identifying a notion of culture. The writings of Leopold Zunz (1875–76), for example, employ thematic titles such as “Namen der Juden,” “Grundlinien zu einer künftigen Statistik der Juden,” and “Die jüdische Literatur.” It is hardly surprising, therefore, that one of the most important philosophical tenets of the Wissenschaft des Judenthums was the creation of a Jewish historiography that accounted for variation, change, and modernization (Meyer 1988: 75–77).
INVENTING HISTORY, CULTURE AND MUSIC

It is not the least bit shocking in a postmodern age to hear that history is not necessarily what appears in the history books, that culture is not necessarily what anthropologists publish in their ethnographies, or that some long-held truth was in fact fabricated, the real intent or good will of scholars notwithstanding. History, culture, authenticity in music, the composer's intention: such notions fail to trouble us because we recognize they are not just metaphysical objects "out there," waiting to be discovered, documented, and put in their places within texts that tell future generations the truth. As Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (1983) write about tradition, it may result from an act of invention, a construction motivated by ideology and politics (cf. Clifford and Marcus 1986). As essays in The Invention of Ethnicity (Sollors 1988) demonstrate, basic forms of identity and community-building may have less to do with reality than with the construction of reality. The charting of global culture, if not the mapping out of conflicts between regions and continents, also follows upon acts of invention, for example the inscription of new forms of nation and empire during the Enlightenment and its aftermath (cf. Mudimbe 1988 and Wolff 1994).

Most musical scholars, moreover, may have reached the point of wondering if there really is such a thing as "authentic music," not to mention worrying about what modern musicians should do about it once it has been revived. Surely, I should not have given this article the title, "Inventing Jewish Music," without referring directly to the growing awareness of the debates about the invention of tradition, culture, and ethnicity, or about the slipperiness of authenticity in music. Clearly, I am intentionally calling into question the nature of what we assume Jewish music might have been in the historical past; clearly, I wish to challenge assumptions about the history that produced such a concept, hence the relation of Jewish music to that history. "Jewish music" is, after all, "out there." In no way does this essay claim that there is no such thing as Jewish music or that it is an artificial construction. This would gain nothing, and it, too, would be no less a construction. To say that Jewish music probably bears no resemblance to the music of the Second Temple, though perhaps more controversial at first hearing, is not really so different from saying that the operas of the Florentine Camerata were not really the same as Greek drama. I am not so interested, here, in what is out there, but rather with how it got out there. I am interested with the processes that led to modern Jewish music history.
Accordingly, I shall be taking the concept of “invention” a bit farther, taking Hobsbawm, Ranger, and others as a point of departure, but in fact reformulating the concept. To signify my reformulation I have preferred to use the concept as a gerund, “inventing,” which then also signifies the more active, ongoing process that I understand when I speak of “inventing music.” Arguably, my reformulation also stands to be understood as a somewhat conservative gesture, for I intentionally invoke an etymological history of the concept that has its roots in Aristotelian poetics and the reformulation of these, say, in Renaissance rhetoric and the appearance of the concept to identify a genre in Western music history.

If one looks closely at the intellectual history of “inventio,” the concept incorporates two fundamental tenets. First, “inventio” takes something old and makes something new from it. The old does not disappear, but rather assumes a new identity within a different form. For Aristotle, the inevitability of some sort of transformation was immanent even in the poetic notion of “imitation,” which he used in a radically different way from the aesthetics of late modernity, what Walter Benjamin called “the age of mechanical reproduction,” that is imitation and invention that hulls one into seeing no transformation (Benjamin 1969). Consider for a moment this basic statement from Part IV of Aristotle’s Poetics:

The poet, being an imitator, like the painter or any other artist of that kind, must necessarily, when he imitates, have in view one of these three objects: he must represent things such as they were or are; or such as they are said to be and believed to be; or such as they should be.2

Aristotle did, however, argue for a distinction between poetry and history, a distinction that Renaissance poetics problematized by conjoining aspects from both in the concept of invention. The poet can take history as a point of departure, or in Jacopo Mazzoni’s words of 1587, “the poet has before him a wide field in which he can enlarge and particularize the history by introducing his own inventions without fear of transgressing the credible.” Invention exists, therefore, at the interface between history and literature, and becomes then not just a trope of rhetorics, but one of history, or more specifically historiography (see Arbusow 1963: 91–95). As an historiographic trope, invention empowers the historian to go beyond the facts that are “out there” and turns the historian’s gaze away from the

---

mirror of the past toward the window of the present and the lens of the future, in Aristotelian terms, toward objects “as they are said to be and believed to be, or such as they should be.” The historian’s gaze can therefore be fixed in different ways; it can afford different perspectives; it does not necessarily content itself with rightness and wrongness.\(^3\)

Also important to my thinking about the concept of invention is that it embraces the creative activities of the artist. The historian and the poet are no longer separable; they occupy the same discursive space and work toward the same ends. When I apply this notion of inventing to the history of Jewish music in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, I do so having observed that those theorizing about music’s position in Jewish society and those composing and performing Jewish music were in many cases the same. The cantors writing in the Liturgische Zeitschrift were the same as those contributing transcriptions and compositions to its musical section. The collectors and anthologizers of Jewish folk song in the early twentieth century were usually poets, often literary theorists, and additionally composers, arrangers, and performers. In my thinking about the emergence of Jewish music, I have come to realize that all these acted as historians; all contributed their voices in different ways. It is significant, in this sense, that they turned to representing large musical systems, in fact large musical subsystems subordinate to the superorganic system of Jewish music. “Writing music history” is not a practice separate from other modes of musical representation; as in the Renaissance concept of invention, there was no longer any clear boundary between poetics and historiography.

Inventing, therefore, took its place in both aesthetic and historical domains. In doing so, it generated a new form of music history, one that

\(^3\) Several Israeli composers deliberately employed a compositional device they likened to “invention,” particularly as it consciously took an existing Jewish melody and then subjected it to a type of invention, which in turn proffered an Israeli identity to their work. Josef Tal, for example, described this process of compositional invention when writing of the origins of his First Symphony:

When I had been asked to write my first symphony here, it was for the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra. I took an old Jewish-Persian tune, which I found in the big Thesaurus by Idelsohn, which I thought was quite a sophisticated tune. In the tune were quite a lot of cells, each one of which was interesting from the point of view of the intervals [it] used, from the point of view of rhythm. In fact, before I quoted the tune in full, which comes quite late in the symphony, I started to use the single cells of this piece and to work it out. I was free of harmonizing it in any style, be it modal harmony or tonal harmony or chromatic tonality. I could even do that dodecaphonically, if I wanted to.... I was absolutely free, so I chose whatever I chose to do. (Interview with Josef Tal, 20 November 1980.)
confounded both past and present. The processes of inventing Jewish music depended on the conscious connection of music in nineteenth-century Europe to that in *erez yisra'el* prior to the destruction of the temples, and if at all possible to the music of the First Temple. Abraham Zvi Idelsohn, for example, managed to locate this music in the chants of eastern Jewish communities returning to Jerusalem in the early twentieth century. European cantors sought out the connections in their own repertories, whereas Jewish folk-song collectors imagined a music bound to a Jewish “folk” whose oral tradition since the biblical period had remained unbroken. All these musics were placed in an historical context, just as they appeared in the published liturgies, the transcribed *hazzanut* of an individual community, and the folk-song anthologies. The historical context, moreover, was less and less distinguishable from the contemporary context, and with the Jewish settlement, the Yishuv, it became the context which Jews returning to Israel were carving out for the future. Jewish music was not just a form of expression that was or is, to take Aristotle again, it was something that was “believed to be” and indeed “should be” (Arbusow 1963: 91–95).

**JEWISH MUSIC AND MODERNITY IN HISTORICAL DIALECTIC**

The specific case of inventing music I interpellate here is not just the result of history in general, but rather the specific conditions and transformations of modern Jewish history, or “the Modern Era.” The Modern Era signaled an abrupt schism with the past, a tendency to break away from the centripetalizing forces of the Jewish community, and a growing need to negotiate with the world outside the community (cf. Herzig 1990). Rather than the previous processes of defining the community from within, whether in the power symbolized by sacred texts and reified by a religious polity, the modern community found itself increasingly defined from without. The role of language in the community is one example of this transformation. The German language did not just enter central European Jewish life because of increased contact with the non-Jewish world, but in fact first entered the legal records of the community in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century when officials in the German cities required that Jewish community records be kept in German and, somewhat later in the eighteenth century, that German take the place of Hebrew in some schools. New historical processes were therefore rapidly unleashed as the Jewish community entered into a struggle for control over the signs of power and identity. Modern
Jewish history, understood from this perspective, became a way of “fixing indeterminate meanings” or resolving situations of “cultural contestation” (Comaroff and Comaroff 1991: 18). That music should enter into these forms of cultural resistance was inevitable, not just because it offers such a panoply of ways to “fix indeterminate meanings,” 4 but because it provides such a powerful language to negotiate with the Other. Jewish music in modern Jewish history, then, assumed a growing importance as a means of establishing identity vis-à-vis the Other, that is in the face of non-Jewish society. If we recognize the importance of responding to the growing encounter and exchange between Jewish and non-Jewish society as fundamental — as central — to modern Jewish history, then we also begin to see just why it was that music was invested with so much power to establish and maintain Jewish identity.

Jewish music history examined in this essay, therefore, began at the first moment of negotiating with non-Jewish society that stemmed from Jewish society itself, the Haskalah, or Jewish Enlightenment. In Table 1, I have attempted to calibrate this Jewish music history, following it through specific stages and responses, specific attempts to establish Jewish identity and represent it musically.

Table 1 provides an overview to make it easier to gain a better sense of the whole. Although I have employed what appear to be distinct steps, I do not wish to imply that one step necessarily depends on its predecessors. Instead, the constituent parts of the table intersect and overlap, not just within a particular historical moment, but to the larger historical sweep that stretches from the Haskalah to the full articulation of Jewish music as a response to twentieth-century historical moments, notably the Holocaust and the establishment of the State of Israel.

4 In other words, music is a very slippery signifier. That music signifies different meanings to different individuals and cultures is a central precept of any semiotics of music (see, e.g., Tomlinson 1992). National anthems provide one case-in-point as a socio-musical genre that have enormous range of conflicting meanings. Most national anthems are malleable enough as signifiers to take on any meaning that a given historical moment makes possible (see Kurzke 1990 for a history of meanings signified by “Deutschland, Deutschland über alles” and other German “national anthems;” cf. Bohlman 1994). The “national anthem of liberation” employed by black South Africans, “Nkosi Sikelel’ iAfrika,” began its life as a Christian missionary hymn, composed at the mission Lovedale College in 1890 and then circulated in devotional songbooks. During the past century, “Nkosi Sikelel’ iAfrika” has passed through many transformations, including a stint as anthem for the Transkei, the first “ethnic homeland,” before assuming its current highly symbolic and powerful role. A song that began its life as a product of the colonizer now serves as a means of resisting the apartheid created by the colonizer (see Comaroff and Comaroff 1991: 3 and 315).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HISTORICAL MOMENT</th>
<th>CRITICAL PROBLEMS IN JEWISH COMMUNITY</th>
<th>HISTORICAL RESPONSES</th>
<th>MUSICAL RESPONSES</th>
<th>NEW ASPECTS OF JEWISH MUSIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haskalah (Jewish Enlightenment)</td>
<td>Engagement with non-Jewish society, the</td>
<td>Jewish Enlightenment</td>
<td>Local repertories increasingly canonized through written</td>
<td>Multiplication of minhagim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late eighteenth century</td>
<td>“Other”</td>
<td>in Central Europe</td>
<td>tradition</td>
<td>(books encoding local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Moses Mendelssohn)</td>
<td></td>
<td>traditions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hasidism in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eastern Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First half of</td>
<td>Cultural negotiation with non-Jewish</td>
<td>Vernacular languages</td>
<td>Canonization of Ḥazzanut</td>
<td>Composed liturgies Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nineteenth century</td>
<td>society</td>
<td>increasingly present</td>
<td>Vernacular in synagogal</td>
<td>and instruments allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in Jewish life,</td>
<td>music</td>
<td>Choruses and instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>including Jewish</td>
<td>Professionalization of cantor</td>
<td>groups Treatises on Ḥazzanut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>musical life</td>
<td>“Music of the Ancient</td>
<td>(synagogue traditions appear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emergence of the</td>
<td>Hebrews” assumes</td>
<td>in scholarly discourse and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>modern, urban</td>
<td>ethnographic character</td>
<td>venues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qehillah (community)</td>
<td>in music historiography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jewish “sciences”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(e.g., Wissenschaft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>des Judentums)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second half of</td>
<td>Reestablishment of Jewish identity</td>
<td>Broadened identity:</td>
<td>Jewish folklore and folk</td>
<td>Collections of Jewish folk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nineteenth century</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Westjüden” and “Ostjüden”</td>
<td>Gesellschaft für</td>
<td>music songbooks with Jewish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>together Zionism,</td>
<td>jüdische Volkskunde</td>
<td>folk music Zionist songbooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as modern Jewish</td>
<td>St. Petersburg Society for</td>
<td>“Ha-tiqva” as musical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>polity (Modern)</td>
<td>Jewish Music</td>
<td>embodiment of Jewish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hebrew, as modern</td>
<td></td>
<td>identity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jewish language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early twentieth century</td>
<td>Reincorporation of biblical past/ Sephardic and Oriental Judaism</td>
<td>Establishment of the Yishuv in Palestine Jüdische Kulturbewegung (&quot;Jewish Cultural Movement&quot;) Buber-Rosenzweig translation of the Bible</td>
<td>A.Z. Idelsohn's field collection in the Yishuv Jewish folk music mass produced Jewish choruses and ensembles proliferate First Jewish folk music in Hebrew</td>
<td>A.Z. Idelsohn publishes the Thesaurus (1914-32) Yiddish becomes standard language of Jewish folk music Popular Jewish music (e.g., cabaret) thrives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collapse and Destruction of European Jewry: the Holocaust</td>
<td>Jewish identity shifted to the Yishuv (Palestine)</td>
<td>Immigration to Palestine intensifies Jüdischer Kulturbund (&quot;Jewish Cultural Organization&quot;) in Europe Jewish culture institutionalized in Palestine</td>
<td>Final attempts to preserve Jewish religious traditions in Europe (e.g., Worms hazzanut) Eastern Mediterraneanism in Yishuv Music academies, Palestine Orchestra, Palestine Radio, etc.</td>
<td>New Jewish &quot;art musics&quot; based on Hebrew-Israeli texts (e.g., Keren kayemet in Berlin) Monuments of Jewish music returned to Palestine Jewish music research in Palestine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Holocaust Era and Israeli Statehood</td>
<td>Emergence of international Jewish culture grounded in nation of Israel Rapid proliferation of symbols of Israeli national identity In-gathering of Jewish ethnic communities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proliferation of Israeli musical styles and repertoires Musics of ethnic communities collected and ordered American-Israeli musical axis</td>
<td>Modern Hebrew becomes necessary for new art music Melodies from Idelsohn Thesaurus become basis for Israeli music Canonization of cantorates in Israel and USA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was with the Haskalah that the first attempts to establish a modern Jewish identity began to spread throughout Europe. Scholars of Jewish history correctly note that there was not just one Jewish Enlightenment — the one acted out in North German humanistic circles by Moses Mendelssohn — but many, each formulating responses to modernity in different ways. Among eastern European Jews, the Haskalah (although overtly opposed to Hasidism) did absorb some Hasidic ideas and was willing to regard mysticism as a true expression of folklore. Eastern and central European responses to the Haskalah seem therefore to move in opposite directions, rationalism vs. irrationalism perhaps. However, let me stress my deliberate use of the word “responses,” whereby I intend to call attention to the creative nature of modern Jewish history. These responses were surely different, but they were also similar at a certain level, which is precisely why they often ended up spurring on invention at a later time. For example, one response found in all parts of Europe was that the vernacular, German, Yiddish, or other languages, became increasingly widespread as means of connecting everyday life of the Jewish community to sacred practices. In eastern Europe this led quickly to the canonization of Yiddish and Hasidic folk songs, one genre even known as “Haskalah songs.” It is only because of this response that the Yiddish language was elevated to a literary language in the nineteenth century and to the preferred language of secular Jewish folk song in the twentieth century.

Yiddish had been, of course, a language occupying a secular domain in Jewish life. German, also secular, had a different quality of Otherness in Central Europe, and its growing presence in Jewish life during the early nineteenth century necessitated responses of quite a different sort. Table 1, at this point, shifts to the first half of the nineteenth century, a period of growing negotiation and exchange with the Other. In many ways, this negotiation concerned language, but it was also made reflexively possible only because of language. The compromises in this period of negotiation often took place in musical arenas, such as in the liturgy of the synagogue. The challenge faced by the community was how creatively to respond to the inability of many to worship, pray, and chant in Hebrew. German had a growing presence in the central and east central European synagogue; at precisely the same time, music from without entered the synagogue on the coattails of the German language (Elbogen 1993: 297–333). Again, the musical response from within the community was creative, for it was during this second phase that the great cantor-composers, Salomon Sulzer, Louis Lewandowski, and Samuel Naumbourg, working in Vienna, Berlin, and
Paris, respectively, invented new liturgies for the synagogue. The newly-composed liturgies filled all possible gaps opened by the growing presence of German and the liberalization of the synagogue, with Lewandowski taking a more radical direction by composing even for large instrumental ensembles and for mixed choruses with women’s voices, and Sulzer following more conservative paths by not admitting women and instituting a simpler polyphony, only occasionally employing the organ. These musical responses were not, however, only a matter for the musical specialists, for we find them debated at extraordinary length in the synagogue records from the nineteenth century.5

The cantor-composers of the mid-nineteenth century chose religious musical solutions to essentially secular problems. By the end of the century the repertory of responses to the challenges to Jewish identity had begun to extend far into the secular realm (cf. Botstein 1991). The “reestablishment of identity” to which I refer in Table 1 resulted primarily from the employment of secular symbols and it was acted out largely in secular contexts. This will be immediately evident under the category of “historical responses,” where the creation of the modern Hebrew language and Zionism both owe their initial phases to this period. Jewish music could even assert identity as an historical response to European nationalism, with Hebrew versions of patriotic songs, for example, circulated on postcards (see Bohlman 1994: 42 and Ex. 2 + 3 here). The emergence of institutions that served as the conduits for the collection of Jewish musical repertories and then the canonization thereof took place during this period. In central Europe Max Grunwald established the Society for Jewish Folklore, which published song collections in its journals (see, e.g., Grunwald 1924/1925). The turn of the century witnessed the formation of other institutions and processes of canonization, for example the Society for Jewish Folk Music in St. Petersburg, together with the first “monuments” of Jewish music, the

5 Until 1990 the synagogue records for many European synagogues have been difficult to find and employ for musicological research because they were either destroyed by the Nazis during their Kristallnacht plunderings or stored by the former East German government in the Zentralarchiv in Potsdam, where access was rarely granted to them. As part of the new Potsdam branch of the Bundesarchiv, whose main seat is in Koblenz, these records afford the opportunity to reinterpret the relationship of aesthetic debates to political and religious life in the synagogue. It should be noted, furthermore, that some communities published their own synagogue records, at least, in summary form, allowing the music historian to unravel musical and aesthetic debates histories over the course of several centuries (see, for example, Wachstein 1926 for the records in Hebrew and German for the Eisenstadt Jewish community).
songbooks of Zionist congresses, Ginsburg and Marek’s collection of Yiddish folk songs, Evreiske narodnye pesni y Rossii (1901), and the Zionist, later Israeli, anthem, “Ha- tiqvah.” Effectively, these acts of musical invention brought eastern and central Europe together, reinvoking the unity of a common European Jewish culture — a modern Ashkenaz — and situating it in modern Jewish history at the beginning of the twentieth century (see Aschheim 1982).

With the nature of European Jewish music established and the mass production of its repertories underway, a bolder historical gesture necessarily followed in the early twentieth century: the reincorporation of the ancient musical past of eretz yisra’el. Politically and geographically, this historical move entailed the reestablishment of contact with Palestine and the discovery there that a music had survived, if even in traces, which could putatively be like the music preceding the destruction of the Temple and the subsequent Diaspora of almost two millennia. Abraham Zvi Idelsohn, for example, did precisely this. He argued musicologically for a link between so-called “Oriental” Jewish musics and those described in the Bible and other documents. He then made these available to Europeans, confirming through his “monuments” (i.e., the ten-volume Thesaurus of Hebrew-Oriental Melodies [Idelsohn 1914–32]), compositions, music-history texts, and musicological argumentation that there was — and had been all along — a larger, all-encompassing Jewish music.

Example 2. “Ruhmeslied” (“Mizmor Šir”), ca. 1908, postcard in Hebrew, with photograph of Franz Josef I.
Example 3. Folk-song postcard: “Nadneda” by Ch. N. Bialik and M. Rabinowitz, Jewish National Fund, 1930s.

Again, we witness a sort of alternation between religious and secular responses. Idelsohn’s response was unquestionably religious, as were those of his contemporaries, the philosophers, Martin Buber and Franz Rosenzweig, who were laying the groundwork for an intellectual sea they dubbed a jüdische Kulturbewegung, a “Jewish cultural movement,” the primary inspiration for which was their new translation of the Bible. In the subsequent phase, the fifth in Table 1, secular responses came to the fore again. Moreover, the definitions of what was “Jewish in music” now perforce associated it with Israel, now revealed it to be modern rather than
ancient. Just as Jewish evening academies in Frankfurt and Munich expanded their language courses in Hebrew,⁶ the Jewish choruses in those cities perform the works by Bach, Handel, and Mozart from the Hebrew Bible, in fact in translations often prepared in the British Mandate of Palestine. The “Mediterranean” school of composers centered about Paul Ben-Haim composed songs using modern Hebrew, juxtaposing this with musical vocabularies based on Arabic maqamat, or modes. Hans Nathan, commissioned by the Jewish National Fund (Qeren qayyemet le-yisra’el) to invent an Israeli national art song, did so in Berlin by using Hebrew “folk poems,” some collected, most newly penned, which took their explicit topics from a modern Jewish presence in Palestine, and which were then set by Jewish composers on several continents (Nathan 1994). These new musical activities, focused on creating a Jewish music, effected a total conflation of past and present, and of the Jewish histories that represented these. Indeed, the historical conflation was made politically legible by the growing Jewish presence in the Yishuv and the inevitable trajectory toward independence. By 1938, on the eve of World War II and the Holocaust, no one was questioning that there had always been a Jewish music. In the wake of the Holocaust the inventing of Jewish music would enter a new phase, anchored in Israel and inspired by a national Jewish presence and an even broader international Jewish cultural awareness, and this phase, in turn, would remove all doubt that, in the future, there always would be a Jewish music.

ABRAHAM ZVI IDELSOHN: THE LIFE OF AN INVENTOR

The invention of Jewish music was the product of practice — the transformation of concepts about music into meaning expressed through performance — which meant that it increasingly motivated the ways in which musicians engaged the fundamental issues of Jewish identity in modernity. Invention, in this sense, was not an abstract way of imagining what music was or might be, but a conscious set of actions and responses that empowered musicians to shape Jewish music into what they wanted it to be. When I interviewed Israeli composers while preparing to write The Land Where Two Streams Flow (1989a), I formulated a number of questions that would nudge them to discuss the musical decisions they made when making the transition from European to Israeli composers. “What were the

⁶ The late Hans Lenneberg, who attended a Jewish Realgymnasium in Cologne during the 1930s, notes that it offered modern Hebrew as a component of its modern languages (personal communication 1991). This would have been impossible only two decades earlier.
characteristics of an ‘Israeli’ melody?” “What led you to choose a musical language that could reflect the diversity of the new land?” “What were your primary resources for choosing new materials?” Almost without exception, there was one common answer — or rather, one common theme — that each composer offered in response to these questions. Upon immigrating to Israel, each had turned to the ten-volume thesaurus published by Abraham Zvi Idelsohn between 1914 and 1932 and each had plumbed the collections which were made by Idelsohn and brought to the Hebrew University by the former music librarian at the University of Berlin, Robert Lachmann, to constitute the core of his Archive of Oriental Music, now the National Sound Archive at the Jewish National and University Library in Jerusalem (Gerson-Kiwi 1938). Here the composers found a marvelous stock of Jewish melodies. Here one could discover the authentic relationship between melody and the Hebrew language.

In the eyes of composers wishing to craft a new Israeli music, Idelsohn had performed an invaluable service. His collections, his anthologies, his scholarly writings, and his popularization of a new Jewish music had a profound effect on the composers, musicians, and scholars who immigrated to the Yishuv during the generation before Israeli statehood. Idelsohn not only shaped the new models for Jewish music, but situated these in the present, so that they could represent the vital presence of a Jewish music that was just waiting in the Yishuv, just ready to seduce those composers longing for a new musical language.

I should like to turn to Abraham Zvi Idelsohn at this point and to look in somewhat greater detail at his activities, his role as an inventor of Jewish music. On one hand, Idelsohn was typical of other musical inventors to whom I have referred thus far. He was trained as a cantor, for example; he composed not only new liturgical music, but tried his hand at composing in genres and forms in the mainstream, for example with his opera Yiftah (1922); and he indulged his scholarly bent by writing about Jewish music, sometimes making it difficult to separate his composer’s voice from his scholar’s voice (cf., e.g., the essays on Idelsohn in Adler et al. 1986). On the other hand, Idelsohn’s contributions came at a critical moment in Jewish musical modernism, at a moment during which modern Jewish history was linked to ancient Jewish history, at a moment when the dilemma of the Diaspora was being resolved by the return to erez yisra’el. Idelsohn’s special contribution to that moment was to seize it and to transform Jewish music into a metaphor for it.
Idelsohn differed from the earlier inventors in one fundamental way: he was the first to employ ethnomusicological techniques and methodologies. During 1910 and 1911, he employed a wax-cylinder recorder borrowed from the Austrian Academy of Sciences to make systematic recordings in Jerusalem, and then subjected them to linguistic and comparative-musicological analysis (Idelsohn 1917). He further transformed these recordings into transcriptions, ordered them according to Jewish community, and published them in the first five volumes of his Thesaurus from 1914 to 1929. Idelsohn subjected his recordings to numerous forms of analysis, sometimes by collecting different performances by the a single singer of the same piece. By transcribing these and noting their similarities and differences, Idelsohn located historical authority in oral tradition. Example 4 contains three such inscribed “versions” of the trope for the scroll of Esther in the Persian-Jewish tradition, the first version from Idelsohn’s initial linguistic study for the Austrian Academy of Sciences, the second two versions in volume three of the Thesaurus (1922). The authority of oral tradition, here, is much greater than that of written tradition, whose notational conventions can only be ambiguous and therefore serve as interpretations (see Ex. 4).

Because linguists at the Austrian Academy of Sciences were particularly interested in the languages of the modern Middle East and their relation to the classical languages of the region, Idelsohn created pronunciation keys and engaged in cross-cultural comparison of Hebrew pronunciation in different communities. The linguistic charts were based on field recordings, usually wax cylinders for which Idelsohn’s field consultants read special texts or simply pronounced words so that Idelsohn could determine the variants between dialects of Hebrew. The field recordings went through further transition as they passed from transcriptions in his 1917 report to the Academy of Sciences to charts that appeared later in the Thesaurus and other publications (see Ex. 5).

7 My point here is not to argue whether Idelsohn was a trained ethnomusicologist or, even, whether he was a good ethnomusicologist, but rather to draw attention to the fieldwork technologies that he employed, technologies that were at the cutting edge in 1911. Accordingly, his field collections possessed allowed him to make claims for authority and, far more important, for the authenticity of the music he published. For an assessment of Idelsohn as an ethnomusicologist see Gerson-Kiwi 1986.

8 These recordings, from 1910–11, are in the Phonogrammarchiv der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna.
Philip V. Bohlman
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wēj-hi bi-mēj š-ḥaš-wēj-rūṣ hu š-ḥaš-wēj-rūṣ ha-

mu-lēj hū-du wē-ad kuṣ šā-wa wē-ṣa-rim u-mēj-ō mēj-di-no.

bā-jo-nūm bā-hējim kū-ṣē-CHKNO. Wēj ha-mū-lēj š-ḥaš-wēj-rūṣ al ki-sēj mal-hū-tū ā-

ṣār bē-lu-šān hā-bi-ro.

bī-ṣa-naṭ śo. luṣ-ā. mē-lē-hū o-so mi-tā lē-hōl sō-row wā-wō-dow, ḫēj pō-ras u-mē-daj ha-par-tā-mim wē-so-

rej ha-mā-di-nūṣ lē-fō-now.

bā-ḥa-ḥu-tē ši-ā šār bē-wūd mal-hū-tū

wē-ṣi jē-kor tīf. ḫ-ṣār gū-dū-lo-ṣu jō-mim na-bim šā mun-im am-āt jum. etc.
1. Konsonanten.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figur</th>
<th>Transkription</th>
<th>Aussprache</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>spiritus lenis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>deutsches b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>deutsches v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>franz. dj, in der Provinz Aden wie weiches deutsches g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>weicher als etwa gj, das arabische ghain, etwa wie g in gesagt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>deutsches d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>ähnlich wie engl. th in this, arab. daj =</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>deutsches h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>wie engl. w, arab. wa = ,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>wie franz. z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>wie arab. l = c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>wie arab. l = b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>deutsches n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>scharfes s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>deutsches p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>deutsches f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>wie arab. sad = ṣ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>scharfes Gaumen-r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>emphatisches g, das eigentliche süd-arabische qaṣf. Vgl. Vollers, Volks- und Schriftsprache, S. 10ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>deutsches t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>engl. th in thank, arab. t in der Schriftsprache t = ت</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Näher stellt sich das Lautsystem der jemenitischen Aussprache in folgender Übersicht dar:

Idelsohn’s ethnomusicological acumen extended even into the latest systematic realms, for he subjected his recordings to interval measurements after consulting with Erich von Hornbostel in 1913, when Idelsohn worked on his field recordings during a visit to Vienna. In many cases, we find that Idelsohn used at least three different systems of measurement: the conventional measurement of wave frequency; the establishment of an interval value in cents; and the representation of the “tone” or “timbre” resulting from changes of tone color within a single tone, Helligkeit, or “brightness,” to use the terminology of comparative musicologists like Hornbostel and Carl Stumpf (see Schneider 1991).

His process of transforming oral tradition into written monuments was therefore scientifically — ethnomusicologically — correct. Because it was scientifically correct, Idelsohn could ground his field recordings in a larger system of Jewish music, that is to say he could “prove” ethnomusicologically that there was a system of Jewish music. He could then turn to the music of each community — whether in Europe, North Africa, the Middle East, or Central Asia — and demonstrate the connectedness of that community’s music to the music of all other communities. And, of course, he could show this was Jewish music. Even the European volumes of the Thesaurus, Traditional Songs of the South German Jews (Idelsohn 1932a) and Songs of the Hassidim (Idelsohn 1932d), relied to some extent on oral tradition, its transcription into written tradition, and its resilience during long stretches of history. Volume seven, for example, is not a random or even selective cross-section from the south German minhag, but rather Idelsohn’s publication of collections assembled by several notable south German cantors. Idelsohn recognized that these cantors were themselves preserving the traditions through their manuscripts and the performances of these, and that these acts of preservation constituted Jewish music history.

He could therefore make the argument in the volume’s “Preface” that “only [in south and southwest Germany] was the ancient synagogue song transmitted in unbroken fashion, whereas in the north and east synagogue song had been strongly influenced by eastern European and modern elements” (Idelsohn 1932a: v).9

9 Written traditions, in both manuscript and published form, were used for several of the volumes in the Thesaurus, notably parts of volumes six, seven, and ten. Idelsohn did not, therefore, limit his efforts to oral tradition, but rather privileged it as the means whereby the long history of the Diaspora could be narrated through musical practices.
In his construction of Jewish music history, Idelsohn relied almost entirely on an historiographical trope that had three basic components: isolation during the Diaspora of one community from another; preservation through oral tradition; and revitalization in the Modern Era. The combination of isolation and preservation through oral tradition is frequently found in traditional folk-music theory; it characterized Bartók’s thinking, for example, when he finally canonized the “Old Style” of Hungarian folk song. Idelsohn went a step farther, namely in his attention to revitalization, and it is precisely this step that leads me to apply the creative concept of invention to his publications of Jewish music. His primary concern was with music that recovered an ancient history and did so through the active performance of a living tradition. In several of his earliest writings Idelsohn took the stance of an activist toward the recovery and reinstitution of “Jewish music,” which he asserted could only happen with a consolidation of traditions through the in-gathering of the Yishuv (cf. his essays “On Jewish Music” [1920] and “Our National Music” [1922]; for summaries of early articles devoted to Jewish music in the Diaspora and the Yishuv see Schleifer 1986).

Idelsohn treats the music history of each community he recorded in Jerusalem with a similar discourse. He writes of Yemenite Jews: “According to their tradition the Yemenite Jews immigrated to the Arabian Peninsula soon after the destruction of the First Temple (586 BCE). At any rate, we can be certain that they played a leading role in Arabia long before the time of Muhammed, particularly in the southern part of the peninsula. It can be stated without any doubt whatsoever that they were never directly influenced by any other Jews” (Idelsohn 1917: 5). Likewise the Persian Jews had lived in isolation, this fact further bolstered by Idelsohn’s invocation of biblical authority: “The Bible reports to us that there were Jews living in Persia already after the destruction of the First Temple.... We can further presume that they never once left Persian soil to return to Jerusalem” (Idelsohn 1917: 6). The Babylonian, or Iraqi-Jewish community provided Idelsohn with the most incontrovertible evidence of an unbroken tradition of music: “The oldest Jewish settlement outside of Palestine, for which there is historical proof, is most surely the Babylonian.... The oral tradition of the Babylonian Jews could never have been broken, for upon the closing of the Talmud academies in Sura and Pumpadita, the bearers of Jewish culture moved to Baghdad and built there a home for Jewish tradition and learning” (Idelsohn 1917: 6).
The nature of the preservation and revitalization of oral tradition predetermined for Idelsohn that Jewish music was religious. He divided his field recordings into three genres: biblical cantillation; synagogue melodies; and songs outside the synagogue. The margins of Jewish music are therefore defined in relation to the center. At first glance, these categories might seem entirely unexceptionable. But examining Idelsohn’s wax cylinders challenges what we might imagine the three categories to include. We witness this in a Yemenite song Idelsohn describes in his field notes as being of “religious content” (see Ex. 6). “Alhamdu lillāhi” is, of course, in Arabic, and Idelsohn’s field notes contain both an Arabic transcription of the text and a transliteration of this into Latin script. The transliteration, or at least the copy of it here, appears to be in Idelsohn’s hand; the transcription, however, is not, but rather clearly in the hand of a native speaker. Indeed, “Alhamdu lillāhi” has religious content, with clearly Muslim and local Yemenite influences, but there can be no question that including it as an example of Jewish music — with many, many other songs in Arabic and Persian — might have raised more than a few eyebrows in 1914. Some singers on the recordings even framed their performances with traditional Muslim invocations, such as “‘allahū akbar!”

A rather different history and context are evident in another example of Jewish music from Idelsohn’s wax cylinders, this one example of religious music “outside the synagogue” (see Ex. 7). This performance by an ‘ud player in maqam saba no doubt muddied the issues of authenticity in 1917, when Idelsohn published a transcription of it. Here the issue is even less a matter that we encounter a bashrav performance from the Arabic classical system that we would not properly understand strictly instrumental music, with no text in either Hebrew or Arabic, as religious, much less Jewish.

The scope of Idelsohn’s project — indeed, of his entire career — was much larger. The critical issue here is not whether this performance itself expresses something fundamentally Jewish, but rather that it belongs to a larger musical system that encompassed Jewish music. The ‘ud player, Haim Ashriqi, is called “Sephardi” in Idelsohn’s field notes; the musical style suggests that he was Egyptian or Levantine. Idelsohn also records other performances on the ‘ud, which clarify his intent even more, and I refer here to the cylinders that include the systems used for tuning the ‘ud and several maqamāt. These maqamāt, in Arabic music theory generated by tunings of the ‘ud were also employed by Idelsohn’s consultants during fieldwork. Idelsohn needed a way to explain why his “unbroken traditions” in the Yemenite, Persian, and Babylonian communities were Jewish. He needed to
clarify the system in which they had been preserved musically and within which Jewish musicians could move about with contextual flexibility. And he needed to explain the revitalization of these traditions vis-à-vis the modern context, namely the musical culture of Palestine in the first decades of the twentieth century.

Example 7. Transcription of ūd performance, maqam šabā, Idelsohn 1917: 119
The reception of his Thesaurus, as embodying musics at once religious, Jewish, appropriately Palestinian, diverse, and systematically unified, proved that he achieved his goals. The ethnomusicological fieldwork, organization of repertories according to communities, and the construction of Jewish music in Israel as a metaphysical in-gathering from the Diaspora — even made possible by the isolation of thousands of years of dispersion — has become a powerful paradigm for much Jewish-music scholarship and the fundamental interpretation of contemporary Jewish music as a juxtaposition of old and new. In the initial generation after statehood this was especially the case, when scholars such as Edith Gerson-Kiwi recorded the songs of new immigrants as they descended onto the tarmac at Lod Airport. Even in more recent scholarship it finds itself reproduced in ethnomusicological publications such as the volume entitled, *Music in the Ethnic Communities of Israel* (Bohlman and Slobin 1986). The ethnomusicological correctness of Idelsohn’s invention, though at time justifiably critiqued for its methods and conclusions, nonetheless resonates in much contemporary Jewish-music research.

**THE COMPONENTS OF JEWISH MUSIC**

All the musical repertoires that eventually flowed together as components of Jewish music were transmitted orally until the eve of the era of invention. Orality is a particularly striking feature of traditional Jewish musics — even more so than in the cases of many other musical repertories — because literacy is an essential component of Jewish life.\(^{10}\) It is safe to say, moreover, that literacy is extraordinarily widespread, indeed normative, in Jewish society. The oral traditions of music in Jewish communities on the eve of the Modern Era were, in fact, inseparable from literate traditions. With the Modern Era, however, the relation between oral and written traditions began to shift, to become skewed and consequently to require adjustments that would bring them back into balance. The case of public prayer and liturgy in the synagogue illustrates this point. The Hebrew texts for synagogal prayer and liturgy are to be found in books, from which they are read and sung. Music, that is the melodies for prayer and liturgy, are not notated in the books, but are rather transmitted orally; many melodies are well-known, that is, they form a shared, community repertory, while others

---

10 For observations on Jewish literacy as reflected by Hebrew libraries in the Jewish home in central Europe prior to the modern era, see Pollack 1971.
require specialists, prayer leaders or *ba'alei tefillah*, who nevertheless perform by reading from the written texts.\(^{11}\)

The encroachment of German into community life that began in the centuries preceding the Haskalah, to take a case well-known to Jewish liturgical scholars concerned with the disjuncture of Jewish history in the modern era (see Elbogen 1993: 297–333), disturbed the balance between orality and literacy even in the synagogue where the language began also to appear in prayer and liturgy by the early nineteenth century. Because the relation between melody and text was skewed, traditional melodies no longer “fitted” quite the way they did prior to the nineteenth century. To adjust to the disturbance of the balance between oral and written traditions, cantors, notably Louis Lewandowski in Berlin and Salomon Sulzer in Vienna, set about to “compose” entirely new liturgies, borrowing from the traditional and creating some new aspects of musical style, for example polyphony, and organ and instrumental accompaniment (see Ex. 8a + 8b). These attempts at adjusting to the disturbed balance between orality and literacy, however, only served to skew that balance even more, increasing the roles of musical specialists, but, and this is the most important point, rendering the tradition increasingly dependent on written traditions. Publishers began to print and distribute the new liturgies, and new choral and instrumental ensembles in individual communities proliferated at an extraordinary pace. By the mid-nineteenth century, the next step in the process of invention had been achieved as oral musical traditions had formed into a written musical language.

With the emergence of a written musical language it quickly became possible to invent “Jewish repertories.” I use the concept “repertory” here to refer not only to a shared body of melodies in a given community, but rather to a corpus that could be mass-produced through publication and thereby canonized through its availability to all in written form. With the

\(^{11}\) Traditional Jewish synagogal traditions provide one of the clearest cases of an oral tradition that has survived through many centuries as a repertory both widespread throughout society and in the hands of “musical specialists.” In addition to the *ba'al ha-tefillah*, who is a lay person elected to lead the singing of prayers because of his pleasing voice, a prodigious memory, or simply religious and social prestige, the *hazzan* also serves as a musical specialist. Further study of Jewish musical traditions might contribute considerably to the debates on oral transmission of Christian chant, refocusing arguments about the presence or absence of specialists, the extent of literacy, or the degree of contact among musico-religious communities. In European Jewish communities until the Modern Era, oral tradition depended on the overlap and coexistence of all these factors.
composed repertories of the nineteenth-century composer-cantors, we witness one kind of invented repertory. Attempts to collect Jewish folk music and the appearance of Jewish urban popular music also relied on forms of publication that transformed oral traditions into written traditions and then disseminated them (cf. Bohlman 1989b). It is hardly surprising that, during the late nineteenth century, a period described by Eric Hobsbawm as undergoing the "mass-production of traditions" (1983b), the first collections of Jewish folk song appear, a Jewish broadside and cabaret tradition becomes all the rage in Berlin and Vienna (Bohlman 1989b), and "Ha-tiqva" takes its place as a Zionist anthem.12

With new repertories come new musical specialists, who are necessary to maintain them. The collections of Jewish folk music, for example, spawned several new musical specialists.

Ethnographers and fieldworkers can be identified for the first time. Max Grunwald, a rabbi from Hamburg, who spent the last decades of his life in Vienna, created the first "Society for Jewish Folklore" — in fact, the first folklore society of any kind in Germany — and published volumes of his Jahrbuch für jüdische Volkskunde, in which both individual field collections and entire ethnographies appeared (Grunwald 1924/1925). Russian collectors, such as S.M. Ginsburg and P.S. Marek, associated with the St. Petersburg Society for Jewish Music, cobbled together the Yiddish repertories of the Pale (1901); Moshe Beregovski later added Ukrainian-Yiddish repertoires to these in his publications of "old Jewish folk music" (1982). Publishers, too, began to specialize in the production of Jewish music, whether the small, popular presses that churned out Jewish broadsides in Vienna, or the large houses like Schocken that included musical works among its series (e.g., Nadel 1938) and Universal Edition, which created an entire series, the Jibneh/Juwal Edition, to publish Jewish art music in the 1920s.

12 That "Ha-tiqvah" was invented into being a national anthem is evident in the debates concerning its provenience that many of the first folk-song volumes include. Although the text has a single author, Naphtali Herz Imber, the melody's similarity to well-known folk songs and at least one well-known art-music composition, Smetana's Ma Vlast, unleashed considerable speculation aimed at establishing authentic roots (cf. List 1978: 42-45). Idelsohn expressed his dismay that, during his early field research in Palestine, "Ha-tiqvah" was one of the only songs known by Jewish children (Idelsohn 1921).
Todah W'simrah.

Vierstimmige Chöre und Soli
für den israelitischen Gottesdienst
mit und ohne Begleitung der Orgel
(ad libitum)
componirt und herausgegeben
von

L. Lewandowski

Weitand Königt. Preus. Professor und Musikdirektor
und Dirigent der Synagogen-Chöre an der jüdischen Gemeinde
zu Berlin.

Erster Teil: Sabbath.

Example 8a. Title page of L. Lewandowski, Todah W'zimrah, 1876.
The new Jewish repertories took their place in new social and cultural contexts, transforming these in the process. This was an extremely important step in the inventing of Jewish music, but it created a Jewish public sphere for the performance of Jewish music. The lavish publications of liturgical music, to take one example, loosened the ties of these compositions to ritual, making it appropriate to shift them to secular settings. Choruses and instrumental ensembles that originally performed the
new repertories in the synagogue frequently began to perform also in the secular sphere, and it was not uncommon for them to abandon the synagogue completely in favor of a public musical market place. In my studies of the Jewish music history of Mannheim, for example, I found this to be the case for both the “Liederkranz,” the city’s Jewish Männerchor and the Stamitz-Gemeinde, the city’s leading chamber orchestra, whose members were probably entirely Jewish in the early decades of this century and certainly so in the 1930s, when the Nazis forced the Jewish community to reabsorb the Stamitz-Gemeinde into its cultural organization, the Jüdischer Kulturbund (Bohlman 1985; Bohlman 1989a: 79–99).

Paradoxically, the shift of musical life to an increasingly secular and public sphere made it possible to locate music within Jewish religious tradition, that is to invent its position in traditional Jewish societies. The paradox arose, of course, because a real separation of music from Jewish traditions or within Jewish traditions was not possible until the Modern Era. Prayer was prayer, liturgy was liturgy, biblical cantillation was biblical cantillation. They were not prayer, liturgy, or biblical text conveyed through music. Music was not a separate sonic phenomenon, but rather embedded in the phenomena of worship. The location of music in Jewish tradition required a new historical, actually an historiographic, language, and again the cantor-composer invented this language. In his Veredelung of synagogue music in the 1852, Ehrlich called attention to the massive orchestra and chorus of 4,000, among them women, who had performed in ancient Israel. He extolled the rich musical life, the complex musical forms, and the music education required by pre-Diaspora Jewish traditions. Ehrlich was among the first in a long line of cantors who wrote musicologically, and it was with scholars like Idelsohn (see, e.g., 1929) and Jacob Schönberg (see, e.g., 1926) that this line was to culminate, that is with cantors who contributed almost exclusively to a musicological discourse on the eve of the Holocaust.

The growing Jewish musicological discourse succeeded remarkably in historicizing music and tradition, setting Jewish music in a particular

---

13 See Bohlman 1984 for an examination to the “Jewish music history” of the Stamitz-Gemeinde. In Herrmann’s music history (1954), written for the chamber orchestra after its reconstitution in the wake of World War II, the Jewish music history of the Gemeinde virtually disappears.

14 The importance of the cantor as musicologist, or at least as musical scholar engaged in an historiographic discourse, is evident in the letters from cantors to the World Centre for Jewish Music in Palestine in the 1930s (see Bohlman 1992). Evidence from the 1920s and 1930s suggests that rabbinical, cantorial, and educational institutions, such as the teacher’s academy in Würzburg and the Rabbinical Seminary of Budapest, were producing scholars who fully devoted themselves to “Jewish musicology”.
position vis-à-vis Jewish tradition. We recognize that position today because it also contributes to the ways in which musicologists have attempted to establish links among early synagogal traditions and those of the western and eastern Christian churches, for example in the work of Johannes Wolf (1913–19) and Eric Werner (1959); not surprisingly, Idelsohn addressed this theme frequently in his writings. These historiographic arguments were only possible because of the valorization of the past, indeed the ancient past, of Jewish music. Musical scholars of the nineteenth century proposed the conditions under which this ancient presence might be possible; scholars of the twentieth century believed they had discovered these conditions in the Oriental communities — Yemenite and Bukharan communities living in isolation for over two millennia — that their encounter with modern erez yisra’el made possible. To historicize Jewish music these scholars conflated past and present, in effect deliberately seeking the presence of the historical present in the past.

These various stages and processes of inventing would have been incomplete, however, had the Jewish music resulting from them not been disseminated back to the Jewish community, had it not been reproduced and reintroduced into modern Jewish musical life. To some degree, I have to admit to the tautological nature of this statement. For example, by transforming oral traditions to written ones, collectors, composers, and publishers also mass-produced them; the means and the results of production were therefore bound together. Admitting this, I should like to argue that the role played by the dissemination of these traditions was one of situating Jewish music in everyday musical life. By extension, the consumption of these traditions — buying the new collections, singing Jewish songs in new contexts, acquiring the skills necessary to perform the new repertories, for example learning modern Hebrew — was essential to inventing. It is at this point, in other words, that we witness music making history; it is at this point that recognize that the individual in everyday life is actively performing the new texts of Jewish music to transform them into representations of their own history. Idelsohn’s Sefer Širat yisra’el (The Jewish Song Book, 1951), the home-use texts in the Schocken Bücherei during the 1930s (e.g., Nadel 1938), and the Yiddish and Hebrew sheet music of the 1920s and 1930s, all these consciously revitalized musical traditions of the home, the extended family, and the individual community. All these represented an in-gathering of communities from the Diaspora and a return to erez yisra’el. All these synthesized diverse traditions by consciously calling them “Jewish.” The Jewish family in Berlin, Chicago,
or Jerusalem, then, could sing from the same repertories, could perform music from the same cultural traditions, and could empower the same music history to express its Jewishness.

**JEWISH MUSIC MAKING HISTORY: PAST, PRESENT, AND THE “WAY IT SHOULD BE”**

The exploration of the modern sites in which Jewish music was invented will surely be very unsettling for those familiar with many prevalent themes in Jewish historical thought. Few themes of Jewish historiography are as symbolically important as the assertion that the present is an extension of the past and that Jewish history has a centripetal pull toward Israel. By no means do I attempt to use the present article to undermine this assertion, but I nonetheless attempt to subject the nature of the relation between present and past to a different type of critical scrutiny. Modern Jewish music may offer no more than a reflection of the past, although it is a modern historical imagination that made that reflection possible, even necessary and extraordinarily important for understanding the complex nature of what Jewish music is and has been. Most striking is the powerful *mentalité* that willed this reflection into being and then invested it with historical meaning, shared historical meaning.

Similarly, the representation of the historical past with specific musical symbols preserved by music in oral tradition also undergoes a challenge. Perhaps no single construction of music-historical symbols discussed here makes that more evident than Idelsohn’s use of Arabic music to show the connections with the past. Idelsohn based his historical construction on the isolation of Babylonian or Yememite Jews from other Jewish communities, but we hear in the wax cylinders that he brought from the field that these communities were not isolated from the music of their non-Jewish neighbors. A bashrav played on the ‘ud does not, then, symbolize the earliest stratum of Jewish music, which it would by definition postdate by well over a millennium. It does, however, symbolize a remarkable ability of Jewish communities in Muslim lands to negotiate culturally with their neighbors. Similarly, the liturgical repertories composed by Sulzer and Lewandowski symbolize a musical and cultural negotiation with nineteenth-century Romanticism, not a reconstruction of the music of the Second Temple.

The diversity of Jewish music therefore symbolized change, not stasis, and accordingly challenges yet another theme fundamental to Jewish
historiography, the notion of tradition rendering Jewish society unchanging. If we apply the terminology of structuralist historiography to this pattern, Jewish society was “cold,” it was anchored to and by tradition and myth, whereas the world around was “hot.” I do not espouse structuralist models of history, but I might point out that the binary opposition of myth and history that they claim was, in fact, characteristic of some modes of Jewish historical thought until the Modern Era, and we witness them in the assertions that the connection between any Jewish music of the present with that of the past is timeless. The inventing of Jewish music, however, could not have taken place in a timeless, myth- and past-bound society, for it dynamically articulated responses to change within and without Jewish society.

Accordingly, yet another tenet of some modes of Jewish historical thought stands on shaky ground, namely the assertion that any engagement with the Other inevitably brings about assimilation and victimization. The musics I have discussed in this article were anything but assimilated; in fact, they intentionally resisted assimilation. Jewish musical culture had never been more diverse than it was in the early decades of the twentieth century, indeed on the eve of the Holocaust. And this fact, moreover, illustrates why I believe that inventing Jewish music also embodied forms of resistance to victimization. At a moment in modern Jewish history when the forces outside the Jewish community made victimization most imminent, the intensive musical activity of the community resisted victimization most vigorously. Jewish musical life was never more vital, never more inventive, than on the eve of the Holocaust. The meaning of Jewish music as cultural identity and historical presence was never more trenchant.

The ways in which I use Jewish music to question certain assumptions common in Jewish historical thought are by no means the only challenges voiced in this article. Surely, there is an even greater challenge to Western music-historical thought, a challenge that motivates many of the scholars writing in this volume to study Jewish music at all. The musics I address here are unfamiliar to most Western musicologists and ethnomusicologists outside of Israel. They do not constitute a canon of Jewish music; they do not appear in chapters devoted to Jewish music in our music history textbooks; they are musics most musical scholars do not hear; they are musics “without a history” (cf. Wolf 1982). My purpose here is not to return these musics to history; nor do I return history to them (cf. Gossett 1992). I have, however, focused throughout the article on music history, but about a very different music history. This Jewish music history, ironically, unfolded
at the same time and in the same places as modern music history in the West. Many of its historical agents were also active in that modern music history. Their responses and the inventive processes they set in motion were, however, vastly different. We would also surely find that the historical responses and inventive processes characteristic of women, workers, and societies enduring colonial and political repression were vastly different. Understanding these responses and processes — taking account of them as musical scholars — would also, I think, make it possible to hear these musics. Turning our attention to the ways in which they were invented to give identity, to distinguish self from Other, and to embody meaning can only clarify the many and diverse ways in which music makes history (cf. de Certeau 1988).

Just how, then, did Jewish music make Jewish history? First of all, Jewish music inevitably took its forms from an awareness of the past, but it did so with a creative eye turned toward the present and the future. The fundamentally inventive forces that led to the creation of a modern Jewish music, distinguishing its modern historical context, were the same that shaped a modern Jewish identity and a modern Jewish history. Of course, this notion of shaping identity and history requires that history no longer be perceived as something that was “out there,” facts waiting to be discovered, recorded, ordered, and presented as if “that’s the way it was.” Music, too, is not something that was “out there” or “back then,” waiting to be discovered in its authentic forms and presented as if “that’s the way it was.” Music history and its meanings for us are far too creative, far too vital and shot through with difference, simply to await our acts of discovery. Music makes history because it cannot be reduced to the way it was, but rather in its diversity provides a way of understanding the past and present; it might even fulfill Aristotle’s third condition, providing a way of “representing things...such as they should be.” It was for these reasons that composer-cantors in the nineteenth century, Jewish folk-song collectors and ethnomusicologists in the early twentieth century, and Israeli composers in the half-century since statehood turned to music — to Jewish music — to invest it with the meanings that would empower it to make their own history.
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