

JOURNAL OF SYNAGOGUE MUSIC

JANUARY 1978 / SHEVAT 5738

VOLUME VIII

NUMBER 1

CONTENTS

THE TETRAGRAMMATON IN MUSIC	<i>Herbert Fromm</i>	3
HAVDALAH — A SABBATH PAGEANT OF FAREWELL	<i>Pinchas Spiro</i>	6
THE “ORGAN CONTROVERSY” RECONSIDERED	<i>Elliot B. Gertel</i>	12
ON CHURCH MUSIC	<i>C. S. Lewis</i>	27

DEPARTMENTS

REVIEW OF NEW MUSIC	<i>Morton Shames</i>	32
<i>“Three Sayings of Hillel”</i> <i>by Stephen Richards</i>		
MUSIC SECTION		34
<i>Torah Service from “Schirah</i> <i>Chadashah” by Hugo C. Adler</i>		

JOURNAL OF SYNAGOGUE MUSIC, **Volume VIII, Number 1**
January 1978 / Shevat 5738

EDITOR: **Morton Shames**

MANAGING EDITOR: **Samuel Rosenbaum**

EDITORIAL BOARD: **Jacob Barkin, Gerald H. Hanig, Morton Kula, Abraham Lubin, Benjamin Z. Maissner, Saul Meisels, Morton S. Shanok, Abraham Shapiro, Pinchas Spiro, Max Wohlberg.**

BUSINESS MANAGER: **Yehudah Mandel**

OFFICERS OF THE CANTORS ASSEMBLY: **Kurt Silbermann**, President; **Morton Shames**, Vice President; **Abraham Shapiro**, Treasurer; **Bruce Wetzler**, Secretary; **Samuel Rosenbaum**, Executive Vice President.

JOURNAL OF SYNAGOGUE MUSIC **is a quarterly publication. The subscription fee is \$12.50 per year. All articles, communications and subscriptions should be addressed to Journal of Synagogue Music, Cantors Assembly, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York 10011.**

Copyright © 1978, **Cantors Assembly**

THE TETRAGRAMMATON IN MUSIC

(An Imaginary Discourse Preceding the Playing of
Ernest Bloch's "Sacred Service")

HERBERT FROMM

Speaker:

As previously announced, I'll speak tonight about "The Tetragrammaton in Music". That such a theme would interest only a few people is something I fully expected. Thus, it is easy for me to avoid the trap laid for so many speakers when facing a small audience: scolding those present for those who did not come.

I shall even abstain from calling you "a special audience". If I did, I'd be falling into another trap. What sounds like flattery of the audience turns out in the end to be self-adulation of the speaker himself who assumes that only "a special audience" could appreciate his message.

Having disposed of these, the more obvious, traps, we are ready to turn to our theme which specifically considers Ernest Bloch and his Sacred Service, "Avodat Hakodesh." Its initial six notes



are heard throughout the work and are even marked by brackets to show their importance whenever they occur.

The first four notes are elementary, known for centuries as *cantus firmus* for counterpoint exercises, and used for their highest purpose as the opening statement of the Finale to Mozart's "Jupiter" Symphony.

Herbert Fromm is one of the best known and most individualistic composers creating music for the American Jewish community. Born in Kitzingen, Germany, he has lived in the United States since 1937. He holds a Master's degree from the State Academy of Music in Munich and holds an Honorary Doctorate of Humane Letters from Lesley College in Massachusetts. After 33 years of devoted service, he is now retired from the post of organist of Temple Israel in Boston.

He is the composer of a wide variety of works for orchestra, organ, the synagogue, art songs, chamber music, cantatas, choral cycles, etc. He is a member of the American Guild of Organists and was the recipient of the Ernest Bloch Award. His music is performed extensively, he lectures and writes and continues to compose.

The Tetragrammaton, being the most sacred, unspeakable name of God, has only four letters in its unvoiced Hebrew spelling: Y H V H, whereas our motif comes to six notes.

Still, I think that those six notes are a representation of the Tetragrammaton — not in its Hebrew spelling but in its transliteration: Y A H W E H. However, there is a problem that must be solved if my interpretation is to hold up.

In the six letters of the transliteration, the third and the sixth letter are the same. Not so in Bloch's motif, where the identical notes occur in the second and fifth, and the first and sixth place. why this discrepancy in what I take to be an instance of musical symbolism?

In order to explain why Bloch could not allow his six notes to correspond exactly with the transliteration of the Tetragrammaton, I must present some theological and historical facts.

The third of the Ten Commandments reads:

“Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord Thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh His name in vain.”

This law had consequences of which I shall give some examples.

1. The Bible tells us that the most holy Name of God could only be pronounced once a year by the High Priest on Yom Kippur.
2. When the Tetragrammaton appears in prayer or scripture, Jews unanimously pronounce it *Adonai* (Lord) and even change it to *Hashem* in secular use.
3. Another name of God, *Elohim*, may be pronounced in prayer but the fear of the Third Commandment is such that orthodox Jews change *Elohim* to *Elokim* if the word is used outside of prayer.
4. Even in English, religious Jews spell God as G-d to make sure not to be in conflict with the Commandment.

This brings us back to Bloch. His change in the six-note motif was, in my opinion, caused by obedience to the Third Commandment and the Jewish practice following that Law.

Voice from the audience:

I just cannot believe that Bloch made his choice for such reasons, I don't even think he was faced with a dilemma. Your thoughts never occurred to him, he simply took his motif as a composer who saw in it possibilities for elaboration.

Speaker:

However we look at it, we can say with certainty that the constant use of the six notes is not accidental. There can be no doubt that Bloch had something special in mind. He is dead, we cannot ask him. Even if he were here to tell us, we could not be sure that his answer was to be taken as Absolute Truth, and I am not convinced that he would support my interpretation. A composer of his type works by unconscious, perhaps even, atavistic impulses that rarely surface as reflection and thought. This leaves us with speculation.

Your simpler, more practical answer, has much to recommend it. Yet, I am not willing to abandon my chain of thought, which may be called a Talmudic approach to music. But it could well be that, by combining the two interpretations, we may be touching the hem of truth—a modest claim indeed.

Short Pause.

No audience reaction.

Speaker:

In spite of my ready compromise I still see doubt on your faces. Under these circumstances, the best I can do is to seek shelter under the last paragraph of a fantastic story by Nicolai Gogol, the Ukrainian-Russian writer of the early 19th century. Here is the quote:

“Nevertheless, in spite of all, and although one may admit, this, that and the other, and perhaps even. . . . Well, where in the world is there no nonsense? Whatever you may say against this story — there is something to it. Think what you will — such things occur. Rarely though. But they do occur”.

And now, pushing speculations, and apologies aside, we shall hear the music, or, in Gogol’s words, the story. . . .

HAVDALAH -A SABBATH PAGEANT OF FAREWELL

PINCHAS SPIRO

This is the story of the commissioning of a new musical pageant, and my own unique experience of collaborating with the composer in the process of giving life and form to a dream and an idea.

On March 19, 1977, we presented in our synagogue the premiere performance of Morton Gold's latest major work, "Havdalah: A Sabbath Pageant of Farewell." The large number of participants included a mixed choir, a children's chorus, soloists, narrators and a dance ensemble. The instrumental accompaniment consisted of organ, flute, piccolo, trumpet, timpani and percussion. It was such an uplifting experience that I felt compelled to write a letter to several friends and to share with them some of the details concerning Gold's new and remarkable accomplishment. Recently, I was asked by the editor of the Journal of Synagogue Music to submit the contents of that letter in the form of an article in order to share it with the entire membership. I have done so, but not without some hesitation.

The composer graciously credited me in the title page of the score of "Havdalah" with compiling and writing the text. I am not being overly modest when I say that my creative contributions to this new work are rather limited. Aside from the layout and the overall concept of the pageant, I wrote original material only for the opening Theme Song (Prelude), the Finale and for the narrations of Part One. The rest of the material was culled, adapted and rewritten by me from a great number of sources. The copyright for "Havdalah" is owned exclusively by the composer, Dr. Milton Gold; all inquiries regarding the purchase of the music and obtaining permission to perform it should be addressed to him at 16 Bradeen Street, Springvale, Maine 04083.

Let me first give you some background information on how the work came about.

Last year, our congregation celebrated its 75th Anniversary, and I submitted the proposal that we commemorate this event by commissioning a musical work that would not only enrich the cultural life of our own community, but would perhaps constitute a significant contribution to the Jewish musical treasure house. The enthusiastic endorsement of this idea by the congregation was due to the fact that it came on the heels of the overwhelmingly successful

Pinchas Spiro is the Hazzan of Tifereth Israel Synagogue of Des Moines and an innovative educator and composer in the field of Synagogue Music.

presentation of Morton Gold's Passover Oratorio, "Haggadah: A Search for Freedom." (See Journal of Synagogue Music, Volume VI, Number 3.) We approached Dr. Gold and were delighted when he accepted the commission.

Selecting the Havdalah ritual as the central theme of our project enabled me finally to realize an exclusive dream to which I had given a great deal of thought for a number of years. I have always been intrigued by the special fascination which the Havdalah ceremony holds for all who witness it. When all the lights are extinguished and only the crackling, dancing flame of the braided candle illuminates the participants, an aura of sublime mystery envelops the proceedings. It is an enchanted hour. Young people are particularly affected by it, and I have often heard from youngsters that their most cherished memories of summer camp are associated with the Havdalah ceremony. The surprising fact is that very little has been written, as far as I know, to accommodate this marvelous ceremony in a meaningful way.

Since the Havdalah ceremony by itself would hardly occupy a full evening's program, and since the real significance of the Havdalah ceremony and its deep impact can be understood only in relation to the complete Sabbath day experience which the Havdalah ceremony culminates, my concept of the presentation emerged in the following way. The event would take place on Sabbath afternoon in the synagogue. The proceedings would start with a traditional Minhah and Ma'ariv service which would be carefully scheduled to conclude shortly after sunset. At this point, we are suspended in time- between the end of the Shabbat and the beginning of the new week. That is when our musical Havdalah pageant begins.

The pageant starts with a prelude in the form of a Theme Song which establishes the time and the mood, pointing out the similarities between the beginning of Shabbat and its conclusion. The opening narration introduces Part One of the pageant by stating that while we are waiting for the three stars to appear, we should try to delay the departure of our beloved Sabbath, in the manner of the Hasidim, by recalling the pleasant memories of the day from one sunset to another.

Part One of the pageant is titled: "N'shamah *Y'terah*" (An Additional Soul). It is sub-titled: "***Sabbath Reminiscences.***" The narrations which recount the highlights of the night and the day are interspersed with suitable songs which either illustrate the mood or continue the story line. This section is held together by the four verses of Bialik's poem, "***Shabbat Hamalkah,***" which is in itself the

story of the Sabbath day in capsule form. I think that a striking effect is created by the similarity in the opening words of the first and last verses of that poem. Verse I: "The sun on the tree-tops no longer is seen; Come, gather to welcome the Sabbath, the Queen." Verse IV: "The sun on the tree-tops no longer is seen; Come, bid a farewell to the Sabbath, our Queen."

Part Two, "**Havdalah**" (Separation), is sub-titled: "**A Reluctant Farewell.**" It consists of the Havdalah service in its entirety. The Introductory Verses ("**Hiney El Y'shu'ati**") are chanted by the cantor and choir, alternately, in Hebrew and English. This section includes explanatory narrations concerning the blessings over the wine, the spices and the fire. These were intended to lend an educational value to the ceremony.

Part Three, "**M' lavah Malkah**" (Escorting The Queen), is sub-titled: "**Sabbath After-glow.**" In writing and compiling the text for this pageant, I have attempted to convey the feeling that the **havdalah** ritual represents, on the one hand, a reluctant farewell to the blissful Sabbath day that has just ended, and, on the other, that it is a hopeful and cheerful welcome to a new and happy week of creativity about to begin. Part Three concludes the pageant on a bright and joyous note.

When I contacted Dr. Gold regarding the details of the commissioned work, I was delighted by the genuine interest he displayed in the "**Havdalah**" subject. Because of the distance between Des Moines, Iowa and Springvale, Maine, our contacts were by phone and mail only. The number of letters and phone calls we exchanged is staggering. I am pleased to say that although we never actually met in person, we quickly developed a very close rapport and friendly working relationship with a free give and take.

Even as I started working on the script of "**Havdalah**", I already envisioned it in terms of a multi-media presentation to include dramatic readings, tableaux, interpretive dance sequences and possibly film-clips and slides. I communicated these ideas to Dr. Gold in the form of foot-notes to the script. I also indicated to him my personal preference that the work be written in a folk-style manner, with influences of **Shnbbat Z'mirot**, hassidic chants and traditional motifs. However, along with all my instructions and suggestions, I made it absolutely clear to the composer that in no way did I intend to infringe on his musical integrity and that I would leave the final decisions on all matters musical to his judgement.

The entire experience of collaborating with a composer was new to me. I must confess that when I finally received the finished

score from Dr. Gold, I dreaded opening and examining it. To understand my feelings you must realize that during the course of the considerable time that it had taken me to compile the script, I had formed very definite concepts and ideas about the score. Now that the moment of truth was here, could the finished product possibly live up to my great expectations? I cannot begin to describe to you the feelings of elation that I experienced upon discovering what Dr. Morton Gold had created! "Havdalah: A Sabbath Pageant of Farewell" was everything I had hoped it would be, and much more.

Even though Morton Gold is the composer of both "Haggadah" and "Havdalah," I am not going to make comparisons between these two works. I will only say that, in my opinion, both are works of great popular appeal. I will also point out that while "Haggadah" utilizes several traditional Passover motifs, the music cannot be categorized as typically Jewish. "Havdalah," on the other hand, is a completely Jewish work, through and through. The only possible exception to this statement is his melody of Bialik's "Queen Sabbath." But even here, I believe that this melody compares favorably with Minkowski's well-known melody for the same poem.

One of the outstanding qualities of "Havdalah" is its wealth of melodic charm. Each of its selections is a gem that can be used separately on many occasions. Among the selections that I am sure will eventually become popular folk-song classics are: "**Eliyahu Hanavi**", "**David Melech Yisrael**", "**Shavua Tov**" and "**Ba'olam Hazeh**." The chant "**Tsur Mishelo Akhalnu**" was written in the true Shabbat *z'mirot* fashion; the "**Yism'hu**" is a perfect example of hassidic-synagogue style, and the "**Shiru Zatonai**" is simply a glorious composition through which the composer expressed his joy in being able to sing unto the Lord a new song!

There is one selection about which I have some reservations. The selection is "**Shalom Aleikhem**" and, paradoxically, it happens to be one of the most exciting and brilliant pieces in the entire work. My reservations concern the snare-drum background which the composer has provided throughout the entire composition. Somehow, I cannot reconcile in my mind the military air which the snare-drum conjures up with the gentle text which speaks of the Angels of Peace.

In terms of difficulty, the choral numbers range from very, very easy to fairly difficult. The majority are easy. The harmonies are rich and interesting, but the melody line is invariably delegated to the sopranos. Since the harmonies are mostly of the vertical variety there is not enough melodic interest in the lower parts. An amateur

choir may find some numbers difficult to learn and memorize, (with the exception of the sopranos who have it easy at all times), but once they have mastered the material thoroughly the singers will find it most rewarding.

The work can be performed with organ (or piano) accompaniment, but I highly recommend the use of the optional additional instruments which add so much color and excitement to the performance. They involve only four additional players, and this is surely not an overwhelming problem for a well-mounted production. Incidentally, the composer told me that as he was composing the work he constantly thought of an orchestral sound. He indicated to me that some day he intends to provide a full orchestral accompaniment for the work. When he does, I will surely be the first to use it.

I have timed the tape-recording of the premiere performance and timed the sections: Prelude plus Part I — 39 minutes; Part II — 19 minutes; Part III — 16 minutes.

A great deal of flexibility is possible in the presentation of the material included in “Havdalah.” The ideal way is to present it on a Saturday night, following a Minhas-Ma’ariv service, as described earlier. It makes for a complete evening’s program in terms of duration and it also has the psychological advantage of performing the **Havdalah** ritual in the right atmosphere and at the appropriate time. It might be an interesting idea to precede the performance of the pageant with an early Minhah and a leisurely **S’udah Sh’lishit**, perhaps combined with a study session or a Sabbath Institute.

The pageant itself is so designed that it can be presented in a variety of combinations. For instance, it is possible to start with the Prelude (Theme Song), skip all of Part One (“Sabbath Reminiscences”) and go directly to Part Two, the **Havdalah** ceremony. For a conclusion, one can use all of Part Three (“**M’lavah Malkah**”), or simply finish with the rousing “**Shavua Tov**” which has a great ending. Part One can be performed as a complete program by itself. It might be suitable for a special Friday evening program. Several other combinations are possible.

An item of interest: In preparing for our premiere performance, the person in charge of printing and distributing the programs kept them sealed in a bag with several boxes of cloves for a full week. When the programs were distributed, there was a delicious aroma of **b’samim** throughout the synagogue which greatly enhanced the **Havdalah** atmosphere.

Our premiere presentation of “Havdalah — A Sabbath Pageant of Farewell” concluded in a very special way. Immediately following

the stirring Finale, the entire musical ensemble broke into a lively and joyous reprise of “*David Melech*” and “*Shavua Tov.*” While everyone in the synagogue stood and clapped hands rhythmically, the dancers started a dance in the aisles where they were joined by many in the audience in a genuine display of the hassidic “*M'laveh Malkah*” spirit.

THE "ORGAN CONTROVERSY" RECONSIDERED

ELLIOT B. GERTEL

The so-called "organ controversy" is a uniquely "modern" issue in Jewish Law. To follow the responsa literature on this subject is to gain insight into the structure of the modern responsum, particularly when "liberal" positions are advocated. We shall structure this paper around the most recent responsum on this subject-and the best, to date. We shall analyze that responsum, indicate where it reflects the argument of earlier works, cite its weaknesses as pointed out by contemporary works and by earlier works which argue against similar stances, and, finally, offer a new approach to the organ question.

THE PROBLEM OF PRECEDENT

In "The Organ and Jewish Worship: A Proposal," Rabbi Phillip Sigal argues that the "question of instrumental music in Jewish worship lay dormant for many centuries. This quiescence misled our ancestors into believing it utterly wrong. It became a negative *minhag*, a 'customary practice in absentia,' if I may coin a phrase, *not* to use organ music." (93) Sigal argues that since vocal music and instrumental music have always been of "equal importance" and "simultaneous usage" in Jewish life, the return of vocal music to the synagogue should have entailed a spontaneous revival of instrumental music in the Temple. Both kinds of music had been prohibited out of mourning for the Temple. (Yet we are told in one *Mishnah* that music was banned out of mourning for the dissolution of the Sanhedrin,² an event which took place much later than the destruction of the Temple!)

Sigal argues that a Talmudic instrument, the *magrephah*, may even have been similar to our modern organ.' He thus calls for the "restoration" of the use of the organ. The question of whether the organ was used in the Temple is, however, by no means cut and dry. It figured greatly in the early polemics on the subject. David Deutsch, in *Die Orgel in der Synagoge: Eine Erörterung* (Breslau, 1863) one of the few cool and collected traditionalist polemics against the use of the organ, cites the Jerusalem Talmud,' which notes that

Elliot B. Gertel is a student at the Rabbinical School of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America who has contributed to a number of Judaica periodicals.

Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish equated the *ugab* (organ) with the *arbelos*, and that Rabbi Shimon ben Gamliel asserted that the *arbelos* was not used in the Temple. Deutsch concludes from Talmudic evidence that the *halil* and not the *ugab* was used in the Temple. (26-7) Yet even the *halil* was not used on the Sabbath because it was not regarded as a sacred instrument, like the *kinnor* and the *nevel* (Mishnah Sukkah 5:1).⁵ Deutsch therefore insists that since the *ugab* – the closest among ancient instruments to the modern organ – was never used in the Temple, there is no such thing as a “restoration” of the organ to synagogue worship.

Deutsch’s argument seems quite solid. It is certainly superior to the assertion of Samuel Krauss, a later defender of the use of the organ, that musical instruments ought to be permitted on the Sabbath, despite Rabbinic prohibitions, because the Rabbis once forbade any kind of noise on the Sabbath, including clapping hands and dancing (Yom Tov 5:2).⁶ Such argumentation, however, can hardly be taken seriously, for there is definitely much resistance in Jewish practice to the use of musical instruments, as the rather forced arguments over what was an organ, would seem to indicate.

I dare say, however, that it is irrelevant whether or not there was an organ-like instrument in the Temple, or whether it would have been permitted, were it in existence. As we shall see, the halachic problem is not one of precedent, but of subsequent resistance to instrumental music, more by Rabbinic authority than by the people. It is very difficult to compare any ancient instrument, even with several pipes, to the modern pipe organ – “die Königin der Instrumente,”⁷ the most sophisticated musical instrument in all of recorded history.

THE QUESTION OF MOURNING

Sigal argues against the view of Rabbi Uzziel that the organ was, in addition to being an imitation of Gentile customs, a violation of our ancestors’ oath not to forget Zion (Psalm 137:5), which restrains us from engaging in any form of worship practiced in the Temple. While Sigal should have argued that the Rabbis would never base an halakhah on a verse of the Psalms, he asserts, quite curiously, that according to Rabbi Uzziel’s argument, we should cease saying the *Shema* and the *Birkat Ha-Kohanim*, since these, too, were part of Temple worship. Yet this rather exaggerated and sarcastic form of argumentation leads us nowhere.

With more relevance, Sigal cites the *Shulhun Arukh*, **8 where** we learn that although the Rabbis prohibited the playing of all

instruments after 70 C.E., and proscribed all music, including the singing of the *Kiddush*, the people persisted in singing the *Kiddush* and other prayers at services. Rabbi Moshe Isserles added that for a *mitzvah* (such as cheering bride and groom at a wedding party) both vocal and instrumental music are permitted. Sigal regards this course of events as evidence that music “cannot be removed from society,” and that the Rabbinic decrees which banned music “violated the principle of not decreeing anything by which the public cannot abide.”

This conclusion that the ban on all musical instruments was ill-fated, is quite convincing. Indeed, Boaz Cohen, in a classical study of various responsa on music among Jews, concludes as follows:

To sum up briefly, in Tannaitic times, the Jews abstained from music as a token of mourning. During the Amoraic period the rabbis strove with might and main to dissuade the people from indulging in song, especially [at] wine parties when women furnished the entertainment. The Geonim upheld the Talmudic law on the subject, and took steps to enforce it. They permitted music which was not of a sensuous character, at weddings. R. Isaac Alfasi summarized the view of R. Hai, and that became the norm for Maimonides and subsequent codifiers. In spite of the rigor of the law, music could not be suppressed and not only did the Jews borrow melodies from the peoples among whom they lived for secular purposes, but they also imported various tunes for their divine services. The law prohibiting music was never fully observed, because it ran counter to human nature. 9

SOUNDS ON THE SABBATH

In the second part of his *teshuvah*, Rabbi Sigal asserts that, the prohibition against using an organ on the Sabbath ought to be invalidated in view of the principle that anything required for the performance of a *mitzvah* is permissible on the Sabbath. (We already saw this argument applied with reference to the cheering of bride and groom by Rabbi M. Isserles.) Thus, the *kinnor* could be repaired for Temple worship on the Sabbath.¹⁰ *Rashi* noted that music was considered a *makhshir*, an implement for the sacrificial offering, and hence repairing the *kinnor* was permissible. Sigal concludes that although prayer, and not music, is the essential element (*ikkar*) of modern worship (he here cites Rabbi Moshe Sofer, in a *teshuvah* against the use of the organ), those who use the organ today as an implement for prayer ought to be allowed to repair it.

The Shulhan Arukh 12 forbids the production of musical sound on the Sabbath, except, as the *Magen David* notes,¹⁾ for the purpose of *simchah* (ritual “joys” such as the cheering of bride and groom). As Sigal notes, the *Beir Heitiv* permits the making of sound by a sick person (probably as a signal), and even declares that it is surely permissible for the bells on the Torahs to make sounds during the procession of the Law, since this, like dancing, is *mitzvah*-related.

Sigal concludes that since there is no greater *mitzva* for our time than public worship, and since the playing of music can enhance that *mitzva* for many people, it must be encouraged. He notes that music on the Sabbath has been equated in halakhic literature with *makeh b'patish*, “hitting with a hammer,” the thirty-eighth category of activities prohibited on the Sabbath (because they were part of the building of the Tabernacle).” Sigal appropriately points out that the Talmud does not include the playing of music among these categories, nor would playing the organ come under the category of *makeh b'pntish*, which entails only the finishing touches put on a manufactured article. Sigal also mentions the classic observation of *Rashi* 15 that music is prohibited on the Sabbath because it is something *nolad*, “created.” Yet, as he notes, *nolad* was not included among the thirty-nine categories of forbidden labors, and it dates as a prohibition from the fourth century, and not from Tannaitic and Mishnaic sources. Furthermore, observes Sigal, “the production of sound on an instrument is no more *nolad* than the creation of sound by voice.”

It is only as an afterthought to the above reasoning that Sigal refers to the oft-cited halakhic contention that the prohibition of music was due to a *gezerah*, a decree of Rabbinic extension of the Sabbath laws, known as *shvut*. Apparently, the Rabbis were afraid that if one played a musical instrument on the Sabbath, he may have to stop to repair it on the holy day. Sigal believes that this argument is easily refuted because (1) an organ must be repaired by specialists, and rarely by the organist (if that organist be Jewish); (2) the *gezerah* against, *all* music has itself been relaxed; and (3) a rule of *shvut* may be revised anyway if we know that the original reason for it is now invalid.

Unfortunately, Sigal mars his argument by invoking what he confesses to be a “revolutionary” assertion. Since Rabbinic rules of *shvut* did not apply in the Temple (e.g., the *shofar* could be blown therein), then those rules should not, apply in the modern sanctuary, which is the *mikdash* of our day. This argument is actually not so

“radical” or original, since it was first advanced by a Rabbi Lowengard during the Frankfort Rabbinical Conference of 1845.¹⁶

Nor does Sigal argue adequately by nullifying the laws of *shvut* with his synagogue-as-sanctuary argument, for the rules of *shvut* have never been strict about music on the Sabbath, anyway. Boaz Cohen notes that while the *tosafot* suggest that the use of music on the Sabbath and Festivals was banned *mi-shum shvut* (“because of *shvut*”),¹⁷ “we find no such direct interpretation in the Tannaitic sources.” Cohen asserts that *shvut* may have not applied in the Temple only because it was considered part of the sacrificial cult (*Sukkah* 51a), but was not even permitted there during the *Simhat bet Sho'avah* when this occurred on the Sabbath, because it was not essential to Sabbath worship. Even in Amoraic times, when the prohibition of instrumental music on the Sabbath was assumed, it was not directly attributed to *shvut*. There is even a question as to whether the sounding of the *shofar* violated *shvut* (*Shabbat* 114b) or is a form of *hokhma* (agility) rather than *melakhah* (work). But the most stringent authorities, like Rabbi Eliezer, who argued against producing *any* sounds on the Sabbath (including unnecessary speech!) - a view combatted by those authorities who forbade *only* musical sounds — do not explicitly forbid music on the grounds of *shvut*.¹⁸

Boaz Cohen's fine study therefore calls into question Sigal's entire reasoning about *shvut*. There really was no need for him to put the modern synagogue in the same category of the Temple of old - an affirmation found in early Reform rhetoric, grounded in opposition to Jewish national yearnings - since the prohibition of music on the Sabbath is probably not a form of *shvut* to begin with!

In his critique of Rabbi Sigal's *teshuvah*, Rabbi Samuel Rosenblatt also misses the mark by regarding the prohibition of music on *Shabbat* as a form of *shvut*.¹⁹ He is correct, however, in noting the faultiness of Sigal's equation of the synagogue with the Temple, since these were never given the same status even when the synagogues existed at the same time as the Temple.²⁰ Whatever our “modernist” prejudices against the sacrificial cult, no adherent of “historical Judaism” can ever assert that the Temple and synagogue held the same status in Jewish life. As Rabbi Rosenblatt further points out, “it must be borne in mind that not only the performance of acts regarded as *shvut* was permitted in the execution of the Temple service, but even choices designated as outright labor (*m'lakhah*) [such as kindling fire for the sacrifices]. No such right

to make fire, for whatever purpose, has ever been accorded to any synagogue since the time of the destruction of the Temple." 21

Rosenblatt also challenges Sigal's suggestion that the use of the organ can be equated with the instrumental music once considered part of the mitzvah of Temple worship. He asserts that there can certainly be fervor in prayer without organ music, and that Sigal exceeds "in his reasoning all legitimate bounds of hermeneutics" when he declares that instrumental music, which may have been essential to weddings, is also essential to synagogue worship. 21a This argument is probably an appropriate refutation of Sigal's subjective equation of accompaniment of the prayers to the historic *mitzvot* of cheering bride and groom and beautifying the sacrificial cult. Yet Rosenblatt's very refutation of a subjective argument is also quite subjective, grounded as it is in the view that the organ is foreign and even alien to Jewish worship.

THE CHARGE OF IMITATION OF THE GENTILES

We come, finally, to the issue of *hukkat ha-goyim* (imitation of "Gentile statutes"), with which Sigal deals more briefly than the other objections to the use of the organ—quite interesting when one considers that most polemics against the use of the organ invoke this issue at greater length than any other! Sigal cites Rabbi Solomon Freehoff's observation that the organ was never universally used in Church worship (the Papal Chapel in Rome had no organ), and that the Church borrowed the organ from the synagogue. 22

Unfortunately, Sigal rather superficially shirks the charge that use of the organ is a form of *hukkat ha'goyim*. He does point out that, according to the Talmud, a practice found in the Torah can never be classified as such, even if appropriated by the Gentiles. (*Avodah Zarah 11a*) . "Since both vocal and instrumental music are known in the Torah and are inherent elements of Jewish worship, it would appear that they cannot be categorized under Leviticus 8:3," Sigal writes. (103) Yet the problem is specifically a matter of the *organ*, not of vocal or instrumental music as such. So much has the organ been associated with the Church that most of the questions raised about its use (mainly in the nineteenth century, but some previously) were not so much concerned about playing it on the Sabbath, which most authorities regarded as forbidden, but with playing it on *weekdays* for national holidays, weddings, etc. Rabbi David Hoffman, an outstanding nineteenth-century (German) Orthodox authority, preferred that the organ not be used in the

synagogue for national events, hut that, other, less "Gentile" instruments be employed..'

There is indeed a big fuss made in nineteenth-century Orthodox literature over the organ as the perfect example of aping the Gentiles. In his commentary to Leviticus 18:5 (the prohibition against mimicking alien cults), Rabbi Samson Raphael Hirsch of Frankfort explicitly prohibited the use of the organ as a Gentile practice.

Rabbi David Hoffman compares musical instruments in Jewish worship to the *matzevot* (shrines) that were lovingly and licitly erected by the Patriarchs, but were later forbidden by the Torah (actually, by Deuteronomic law 24 as *avodah zarah* (pagan practice).” Yet Hoffman does note and admit that the Prague rabbinate permitted in *one* synagogue the use of the organ for the accompaniment of *zemiroth* prior to the chanting of Psalm 93. (This would mean that, the preliminary psalms and the L'kha Dodi hymn were also accompanied by the organ!) The reason for such a concession to use of the organ, as Hoffman understands it, is that since music was employed for the cheering of bride and groom, how much more fitting was its use for the greeting of Bride Sabbath herself! Indeed, a *zemirah* (Sabbath-hymn), the words of which Hoffman cites at length, compares the Kabbalat *Shabbat* service to a wedding. The Prague authorities therefore declared instrumental music appropriate for the Inauguration of the Sabbath.²⁶

But why was Bride Sabbath greeted with an *orgnn*, of all instruments? Abraham Berliner cites many places where organ music was played in the synagogue, particularly in Italy.“ Yet even he does not know exactly what to make of it. Ahraham Idelsohn notes that a Prague synagogue, built in 1594, “was equipped with an organ and a special orchestra organized to play and to accompany different songs including *L'kha Dodi* on Friday evening, which number was elaborated into a concert of more than an hour's length. The same concerts were held in almost all the nine synagogues of Prague, including the "*Alt-Neu-Schul*" in which a new portable organ, built by a Jewish builder. Rabbi Maier Mahler, was installed in 1716. There is a report of instrumental music in the synagogues around the beginning of the eighteenth century in the communities of Nikolsburg, Offenhach, Furth, etc.“²⁸ Idelsohn attributes this proliferation of organ consoles to (1) the Kabbalistic stress upon the importance of receiving the Sabbath with music. which began with Isaac Luria (1534-1572): and (2) to the custom in the German Protestant Church to perform cantatas of instrumental and choral selections before the Sunday service.²⁹ Thus, both external and

internal influences led to the greeting of the Sabbath Bride with music. Note that this occurred in just about every Prague synagogue and not just, in one, as David Hoffman argued.

Whatever the reason for “cantatas” in the synagogue on Sabbath Eve, the organ was almost universally chosen as the appropriate instrument of accompaniment and entertainment. This deeply disturbed Hoffman. Why such a “Christian” instrument,?

Hoffman’s answer is logical, but amusing: The organ was used in Prague during the sixteenth century because it was not yet an instrument indigenous to the churches! This “historical theorizing” is a necessity to Hoffman, who constructs an elaborate analysis of *hukkat ha-goyim* on the basis of a contradiction between *Sanhedrin* 52b and *avodah zarah* 11a. The former claims that funeral pyres lit in honor of kings is not exclusively an imitation of Gentile idolatry, since there is a reference to “the burnings of your fathers” in Jeremiah **34:5**. The latter declares that the Rabbis do not allow such burnings, since they are an instance when death provides an opportunity for *avodah zarah* (idolatry). Hoffman cites five attempts by traditional authorities to reconcile these texts, and finds in each a proscription of the use of the organ in the synagogue:

(1) Even if something is not condemned by the Torah as idolatry, but if it later acquires that connotation, then it must be forbidden. Organ music, even if it had its analogue in Temple worship, is now associated with non-Jewish cults. (Here, Hoffman takes the opportunity to revise his previous, far-fetched analogy between the organ and the *matzevot*. While the latter are specifically forbidden by the Torah after having been permitted, the former is *never* specifically forbidden in the Torah. Hoffman therefore cites authorities who make it prohibited by association.)

(2) The Torah forbids all acts which may lead one to idolatry. If something is associated with idolatry, but is also grounded in nature and human needs, it is not necessarily forbidden. **The** organ, however, is used exclusively in non-Jewish cults.

(3) Lighting the funeral pyre was originally a practice common to all ancient people, but no longer. Likewise, music during worship was once common to all peoples, but faded from Israelite worship after the destruction of the Temple. Now both customs are associated only with non-Jewish cults.

(4) There is great doubt as to whether the organ is actually mentioned in the Torah, or included among Biblical instruments, just as the custom of kindling the funeral pyre is not specifically mentioned in the Torah. Thus, there is no reason to call for the

“**revival**” of a tradition which does not derive from clear Biblical commandment or precedent.

(5) The organ, like the pyre-ritual, is not simply something borrowed from outsiders (which in itself does not necessarily make it prohibited), but is something now used by outsiders and for no other purpose than their alien rituals.³⁰

Hoffman adds a dimension to *hukkat ha-goyim* which I have not found in most polemics against the organ. In addition to the above reasons for proscribing its use, he asserts that it is to be shunned because it is advocated by “*apikorsim*” – those who deny the fundamentals of Judaism (as he understands them!) One should avoid the organ, even if it is not really a part of foreign cults, because its use is advocated by those who make breaches in the Law by publicly advocating changes in the liturgy, by denying the coming of a personal Messiah, etc. To use the organ is to perpetrate a sin which can only lead to others. Hoffman further notes- and not without historical basis – that the organ is but one symbol of the denial of the importance of Jerusalem and of the need to mourn for it, since one plays music in the synagogue when it was to be associated only with the Temple. The organ was advocated for this reason by those who substituted the Emancipation for the ancient prophetic visions.’ Yet I believe that this argument hardly applies to anyone who has historical sense enough to realize that we cannot deny the ancient Temple its special place in the Jewish memory, and that music in the modern synagogue need no longer be taken as a symbol of such denial, but of a human penchant for music in worship which cannot be suppressed.

In a similar vein to Hoffman, but in a more pithy manner, David Deutsch delineates two categories which fall under *hukkat ha-goyim*, one of which is permitted, and one which is not:

(1) A non-Jewish custom with no religious purpose and no relationship to foreign cults may be permitted only if there is some common sense purpose, and if it also has Biblical precedent.

(2) A non-Jewish custom with a religious purpose, related to an alien culture, is absolutely prohibited even if there is a common sense reason to it. Deutsch regards the organ as entirely of non-Jewish influence, and reiterates some of the arguments, cited above, which dwell on the limited use of organ-like instruments in the Temple.³²

Despite their overblown rhetoric about *hukkat ha-goyim*, Orthodox authorities are surprisingly willing to imitate Gentile sensibilities in other matters. It is ironic and amusing that in the responsum im-

mediately before the one which castigates the use of the organ even on weekdays, David Hoffman asserts that tobacco smoking should be forbidden in the synagogue at any time because the Gentiles do not allow it in **their** Churches, “and it would be a **hillul ha-shem** (desecration of God’s Name) if we permit such behavior while the Gentiles prohibit it.^{32a} A clear case of keeping up with the Gentiles!

It seems to me that Sigal responds effectively to the charge of David Deutsch and others that the organ is **exclusively** a Church instrument: “That may have been true in 1883 [when Deutsch wrote his responsum]. In our day the organ is used for a variety of purposes, even as a form of intermission entertainment. When you add to this fact that it is neither a prerequisite nor inherent in Christian worship, whether Catholic or Protestant, that argument becomes wholly untenable.” (102)

Sigal concludes his own discussion of **hukkat ha-goyim** by citing the **Shulhan Arukh** (the **Taz on Yoreh Deah 178:1**) which declares that the Rabbis may choose to permit certain practices in dress and fashion which imitate the fashions of the nobility. Citing some of Saul Lieberman’s research, Sigal adds that the Rabbis often gave in to certain pagan practices which the people could not surrender, and that they tried to “Judaize” those practices. Thus, Sigal concludes that the organ falls into neither category which Isserles, following **Tosafot on Avodah Zarah** 11a, describes as violating **hukkat ha-goy**: imitating exclusive forms of pagan worship, or participating in its orgiastic, a-moral practices. Furthermore, Leviticus 18:3 refers to pagan practices, but not to music in worship. And even if it were basic to Christian worship, we still have the precedent of those Rabbis who appropriated even pagan practices! (104)

Samuel Krauss, a defender of the use of the organ, observed that it was absurd of Orthodox scholars to accuse Reform leaders of adopting the organ because it was a Christian practice. After all, Abraham Geiger, the founder of German Reform Judaism, was as fierce a polemicizer against Christianity as he was against Jewish Orthodoxy, and said that he would battle all blind attempts to ape the Christians. He did advocate use of the organ, however, because he felt that it was called for by good taste.)’

The proscription known as **hukkat ha-goyim** may, I believe, be dismissed as a rather weak argument against the use of the organ, which today is associated not only with Church music, but is regarded as **the** concert instrument **par excellence**, and has enhanced synagogue music now for more than a century and a half. It has

been said that the modern pipe organ is capable of producing more varied sounds than a full symphony orchestra.

Any critical study of the texts dealing with *hukkat ha-goyim* will indicate that this is not really a halachic category, but a *matter of aesthetics*, subject to the tastes of individuals. This brings us to the fourth and final subject of our excursus- the question of aesthetics, which is rarely discussed in most polemics.

THE ISSUE OF AESTHETICS

In his brief polemic against the Sigal *teshuvah*, Rabbi Samuel Rosenblatt insists that even if it could be proved that Jewish Law was not completely opposed to the use of the organ (a view he does not share), we would still be obliged to prohibit its use because of the precedent of *minhag* (custom), which after so many centuries is stronger than law itself!³⁴ Yet this argument hardly seems appropriate once we consider that *minhagim* have generally originated with the local usages of the *people*, whereas the "*minhag*" of not using instrumental or vocal music was imposed upon the people by Rabbinic authorities, who were never really obeyed because their imposition was contrary to human nature!

Phillip Sigal seems to touch upon more fertile ground in his citation of the *Taz* to the effect that "when the Torah says nothing on the subject, the Rabbis are entitled to determine what would be called *hukkat hngoyim* and might choose to permit certain practices," such as imitating the fashions of the nobility. (103) Here, we see that the issue is clearly one of aesthetics. Unfortunately, Sigal did not develop this argument further. Yet, in the study by Boaz Cohen to which we referred above, we find that aesthetics had a great deal to do with the relaxing of the prohibition on instrumental music, especially where weddings were concerned. In the Middle Ages, music became *indispensable* to German Jewish weddings. Boaz Cohen cites this incident from the beginning of the fifteenth century:

. . . . In one of the German states the wife of the Prince died and a year of mourning was declared, during which period music was forbidden. At that time a wedding was to have taken place in the locality. The people, perplexed as to the propriety of celebrating a Jewish wedding without music, sent an inquiry to R. Jacob Mollin as to how to proceed. The rabbi replied in very definite terms that music was absolutely essential at a wedding and advised them to perform the ceremony else-

where. Consequently they went from Eppenstein to Mayence in order to comply with the rabbi's decision.'

Cohen further notes that it was a Polish Talmudist, Rabbi Joel Sirkes (16th-17th century) who permitted the adoption of Gentile airs, not chanted in church, for synagogue music, and that eighteenth century Italian authorities cited Sirkes when they permitted the use of well-known love songs and dance tunes for Jewish worship.³⁵

Toward the end of his study, Boaz Cohen cites what he regards as the "remarkably liberal view" of Rabbi Israel Moses Hazan (nineteenth-century Italy), who describes in one of his teshuvot the efforts of various renowned scholars and cantors of Smyrna to frequent Christian churches and to seek out the most humbling melodies for use during the *Kaddish* and *Kedushah* of Rosh Hashanah. This practice was justified by the Geonic view that as long as the cantor chants in Hebrew, he may use any melody.³⁷

What Cohen does not cite, however, are the views of various Sephardic authorities who permitted the use of the organ on weekdays. Rabbi Shem-Tob Samun (Lenghorn) and Yaacov Recanatte (1759-1834) permitted the use of the organ,' and their decision was accepted (albeit reluctantly) by some of the most illustrious and saintly Sephardic scholars of later years." As Dr Jose Faur, Professor of Codes at the Jewish Theological Seminary has noted, nineteenth-century Sephardic authorities permitted the hiring of Gentiles to play on the Sabbath during a religious celebration (such as circumcision) on the grounds of *shvut de-shvut leshem mitzvah mutar* -the argument that a Gentile may be called to perform an act proscribed by the rules of *shvut* when there is a *mitzvah* of celebration to be performed. Yet we noted above that even the prohibition of music on the grounds of *shvut* is quite weak, once the sources are closely examined! Faur also cites several references to the use of Gentile musicians by the Sephardim on the Sabbath, as well as to their use on the holy days in the synagogue itself, during the interlude when the Torah was returned to the ark.

In examining two important Sephardic *teshuvot* which oppose the use of the organ, Faur notes that a Rabbi Chayim Palaggi, although personally against the use of the organ, did not specifically denounce that instrument as *asur* (halakhically forbidden), and that a Rabbi. Yaacov Shaul Elyashar (1817-1906), a staunch but not very convincing opponent of the organ, was more influenced by Ashkenazic than by Sephardic authorities.⁴⁰

From the studies of Boaz Cohen and Jose Faur, we may conclude that while both Ashkenazic and Sephardic communities could

not be restrained by the old prohibition against vocal and instrumental music, it was the Sephardic world which was the most tolerant of, and amenable to, the music of its neighbors. Faur explains: "It was the general standard of Sephardi rabbis that Jewish participation in the cultural activities of society at large was to be encouraged as long as it did *not* conflict with fundamental Jewish values and institutions. If conflict arises, the preservation of Jewish values and institutions must take precedence." 41 What Faur suggests is that in halakhic questions which relate exclusively to taste and to aesthetics, the Sephardic authorities saw no reason not to share general preferences (even in church music!), since the creative arts are universal in their appeal and in their effect.

Throughout these pages, we have repeatedly seen the weaknesses of the various "halakhic" arguments against the use of the organ in the synagogue, whether on weekdays or on the Sabbath and Holy Days. We noted that the prohibition of instrumental and vocal music, out of mourning for the Temple, proved historically to be an excessively stringent measure which the people circumvented early after its enactment. We saw that various Sabbath prohibitions, including *shvut*, which have long been invoked against the use of the organ, simply do not apply when carefully examined. And finally, we reviewed the arguments on the basis of "imitation of Gentile statutes," which were always subjective, often ambiguous, and sometimes humorous. At the same time, we saw that the modern *teshuuot* which support the use of the organ can be equally subjective, and often invoke forced and unnecessary rationalizations, such as the alleged use of the "pipe organ" in the Temple and the suggestion that the modern synagogue ought to be equated with the Temple in halakhic literature.

When all is said and done, however, the decision to use or to proscribe the organ is entirely a aesthetic decision. From the Sephardim, we ought to learn that matters of aesthetics are universal, and that the category of "imitation of Gentile statutes" cannot be invoked when the creative arts are involved, lest the Jew be cut off from all valid artistic expression in his worship. Those who continue to find the organ alien and annoying have every right to reject it on similarly aesthetic grounds. After all, the aesthetic of a cappella worship is embraced by Isalm, many Christian churches, and other religions. Neither instrumental music or its absence can be regarded as specifically "Jewish" or "pagan." Both alternatives are grounded in aesthetics shared by many peoples and religions, ancient and modern.

There are no teshuvot which reveal more subjectivity than the modern responsum on the use of the organ. Few issues have invoked as many halachic responses to what is in fact beyond the scope of halachah, and grounded in the world of aesthetics. These *teshuvot* demonstrate that, where issues which reach beyond the halachah are concerned, it is best to employ halachic arguments only for halachic issues, and to be open-minded or at least honest regarding issues which are basically aesthetic in nature.*

* At the close of this essay, the author would like to acknowledge his indebtedness to Rabbi Stanley Platek, who offered various bibliographical suggestions, and encouraged this project. He is also grateful to Mr. Ben Silberman, for helping him to study some of the German sources.

NOTES

- 1 Conservative Judaism, Spring-Summer 1963.
- 2 *Mishnah Sotah* 9: 11.
- 3 See *Tumid* 5:6.
- 4 *Sukkah*, ch. 5.
- 5 See, also, A. Idelsohn, *Jewish Music*, p. 12.
- 6 Samuel Krauss, *Zur Orgelfrage* (Wien, 1919). pp. 12 ff.
- 7 *Ibid.*
- 8 *Orakh Hayim* 560:3.
- 9 Boaz Cohen, "The Responsum of Maimonides Concerning Music," in *Law and Tradition in Judaism* (N.Y.: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1959), p. 181.
- 10 *Mishnah Eruvin* 10: 13 and *Eruvin* 102b.
- 11 On *ibid.*
- 12 *Orakh Hayim* 338:1.
- 13 On *ibid.*
- 14 He cites Dayan Gruenfeld, *The Sabbath* (London: Soncino, 1954). pp. 51ff.
- 15 On *Eruvin* 104a.
- 16 See David Philipson. *The Reform Movement in Judaism* (many eds.), p. 182.
- 17 Boaz Cohen, "Sabbath Prohibitions Known as Shebut," in *op. cit.*, pp. 157-8. See *Tosafot* on *Sukkah* 50b.
- 18 *Ibid.*, p. 158.
- 19 *Conservative Judaism*. Spring-Summer 1963, pp. 108-9.
- 20 *Ibid.*, p. 109.
- 21 *Ibid.*
- 21a *Ibid.*
- 22 Sigal cites Rabbi Solomon B. Freehoff's apt observation that the organ was never universally used in Church worship. See *Reform Jewish Practice I*, p. 43. Krauss notes this, p. 20.
- 23 David Hoffman, *Melamed La-Ho'il* (N.Y., 1954). p. 18.

²⁴ See Yehezkel Kaufman. *The Religion of Israel*, tr. Moshe Greenberg (N.Y.: Schocken, 1966). pp. 173 ff.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

²⁷ See A. Berliner. *Bav'at Ha-ugav bebeit hak'nesset*, in *Ketavin Nivbar-in* (Palestine, 1945), vol. I, pp. 173 ff. See also, Samuel Krauss, *Korot Batei Hat-fillah be-yisrael* (N.Y.: Histadrut Ha-ivrit, 1955), pp. 301 ff.

²⁸ Idelsohn. p. 205.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 205-6.

³⁰ Hoffman. op. cit., pp. 12-13.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 11. This was also noted by Jonathan M. Brown, in *Modern Challenge to Halakhah* (Chicago: White Hall for Hebrew Union College, 1969). p. 89.

³³ Krauss, op. cit.

³⁴ In *Conservative Judaism* Spring-Summer 1963.

³⁵ Boaz Cohen, pp. 177-8.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 178.

³⁷ Cited by Jose Faur. in "Sephardim in the Nineteenth Century: New Directions and Old Values," *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* (Jerusalem, 1977), pp. 49-50. Boaz Cohen discusses it on p. 179.

³⁸ Faur, p. 49.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 50.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

ON CHURCH MUSIC

c. s. LEWIS

C. S. Lewis (1898-1963) held the Chair of Medieval and Renaissance English Literature at Cambridge University. He won a reputation as a brilliant lecturer, teacher and scholar. He was also the author of a large array of books, both popular and scholarly. Lewis wrote science fiction, and essays on religious and philosophical themes with equal grace and success. He was a devout Christian who enjoyed propounding the force of Christian ideas.

Being himself a man of deep religious faith his essays on religious themes are, many of them, universal in outlook and apply equally, in principle, to all faiths.

We believe that much of what Mr. Lewis has to say will be meaningful to our readers.

The essay "On Church Music" is used by permission of the publisher of "Christian Reflections," a collection of essays published by the Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., copyright in 1967, and edited by Walter Hooper.

I am a layman and one who can boast no musical education. I cannot even speak from the experience of a lifelong churchgoer. It follows that Church Music is a subject on which I cannot, even in the lowest, degree, appear as a teacher. My place is in the witness box. If it concerns the court to know how the whole matter appears to such as I (not only *laicus* but *Zaicissimus*) I am prepared to give my evidence.

I assume from the outset that nothing should be done or sung or said in church which does not aim directly or indirectly either at glorifying God or edifying the people or both. A good service may of course have a cultural value as well, but that is not what it exists for; just as, in an unfamiliar landscape, a church may help me to find the points of the compass, but was not built for that purpose.

These two ends, of edifying and glorifying, seem to me to be related as follows. Whenever we edify, we glorify, but when we glorify we do not always edify. The edification of the people is an act of charity and obedience and therefore in itself a glorification of God. But it is possible for a man to glorify God in modes that do not edify his neighbour. This fact confronted the Church at an early stage in her career, in the phenomenon called 'speaking with tongues'. In I Corinthians XIV, St. Paul points out that the man

who is inspired to speak in an unknown tongue may do very well, as far as he himself is concerned, but will not profit the congregation unless his utterance can be translated. Thus glorifying and edifying may come to be opposed.

Now at first sight to speak with unknown tongues and to sing anthems which are beyond the musical capacity of the people would seem to be very much the same kind of thing. It looks as if we ought to extend to the one the embargo which St. Paul places on the other. And this would lead to the forbidding conclusion that no Church Music is legitimate except that which suits the existing taste of the people.

In reality, however, the parallel is not perhaps so close as it seems. In the first place, the mode after which a speech in an unknown tongue could glorify God was not, I suppose, the same as the mode after which learned music is held to do so. It is (to say the least) doubtful whether the speeches in 'tongues' claimed to glorify God by their aesthetic quality. I suppose that they glorified God firstly by being miraculous and involuntary, and secondly by the ecstatic state of mind in which the speaker was. The idea behind Church Music is very different. It glorifies God by being excellent in its own kind; almost as the birds and flowers and the heavens themselves glorify Him. In the composition and highly-trained execution of sacred music we offer our natural gifts at their highest to God, as we do also in ecclesiastical architecture, in vestments, in glass and gold and silver, in well-kept parish accounts, or the careful organization of a Social. And in the second place, the incapacity of the people to 'understand' a foreign language and their incapacity to 'understand' good music are not really the same. The first applies absolutely and equally (except for a lucky accident) to all the members of the congregation. The second is not equally present or equally incurable perhaps in any two individuals. And finally, the alternative to speech in an unknown tongue was speech in a known tongue. But in most discussions about Church Music the alternative to learned music is popular music-giving the people 'what they like' and allowing them to sing (or shout) their 'old favourites'.

It is here that the distinction between our problem and St. Paul's seems to me to be the sharpest. That words in a known tongue might edify was obvious. Is it equally obvious that the people are edified by being allowed to shout their favourite hymns? I am well aware that the people like it. They equally like shouting ***Auld Lang Syne*** in the streets on New Year's Eve or shouting the latest music-hall song in a tap-room. To make a communal, familiar

noise is certainly a pleasure to human beings. And I would not be thought to despise this pleasure. It is good for the lungs, it promotes good fellowship, it is humble and unaffected, it is in every way a wholesome, innocent thing-as wholesome and innocent as a pint of beer, a game of darts, or a dip in the sea. But is it, any more than these, a means of edification? No doubt it can be done — all these things can be done-eating can be done — to the glory of God. We have an Apostle's word for it. The perfected Christian can turn all his humblest, most secular, most economic, actions in that direction. But if this is accepted as an argument for popular hymns it will also be an argument for a good many other things. What we want to know is whether untrained communal singing is in itself any more edifying than other popular pleasures. And of this I for one, am still wholly unconvinced. I have often heard this noise; I have sometimes contributed to it. I do not yet seem to have found any evidence that the physical and emotional exhilaration which it produces is necessarily, or often, of any religious relevance. What I, like many other laymen, chiefly desire in church are fewer, better, and shorter hymns; especially fewer.

The case for abolishing all Church Music whatever thus seems to me far stronger than the case for abolishing the difficult work of the trained choir and retaining the lusty roar of the congregation. Whatever doubts I feel about the spiritual value of the first I feel at least equally about the spiritual value of the second.

The first and most solid conclusion which (for me) emerges is that both musical parties, the High Brows and the Low, assume far too easily the spiritual value of the music they want. Neither the greatest excellence of a trained performance from the choir, nor the heartiest and most enthusiastic bellowing from the pews, must be taken to signify that any specifically religious activity is going on. It may be so, or it may not. Yet the main sense of Christendom, reformed and unreformed, would be against us if we tried to banish music from the Church. It remains to suggest, very tentatively, the ways in which it can really be pleasing to God or help to save the souls of men.

There are two musical situations on which I think we can be confident that a blessing rests. One is where a priest or an organist, himself a man of trained and delicate taste, humbly and charitably sacrifices his own (aesthetically right) desires and gives the people humbler and coarser fare than he would wish, in a belief (even, as it may be, the erroneous belief) that he can thus bring them to God. The other is where the stupid and unmusical layman humbly and

patiently, and above all silently, listens to music which he cannot, or cannot fully, appreciate, in the belief that it somehow glorifies God, and that if it does not edify him this must be his own defect. Neither such a High Brow nor such a Low Brow can be far out of the way. To both, Church' Music will have been a means of grace; not the music they have liked, but the music they have disliked. They have both offered, sacrificed, their taste in the fullest sense. But where the opposite situation arises, where the musician is filled with the pride of skill or the virus of emulation and looks with contempt on the unappreciative congregation, or where the unmusical, complacently entrenched in their own ignorance and conservatism, look with the restless and resentful hostility of an inferiority complex on all who would try to improve their taste -- there, we may be sure, all that both offer is unblessed and the spirit that moves them is not the Holy Ghost,

These highly general reflections will not, I fear, be of much practical use to any priest or organist in devising a working compromise for a particular church. The most they can hope to do is to suggest that the problem is never a merely musical one. Where both the choir and the congregation are spiritually on the right road no insurmountable difficulties will occur. Discrepancies of taste and capacity will, indeed, provide matter for mutual charity and humility.

For us, the musically illiterate mass, the right way is not hard to discern; and as long as we stick to it, the fact that we are capable only of a confused rhythmical noise will not do very much harm, if, when we make it, we really intend the glory of God. For if that is our intention it follows of necessity that we shall be as ready to glorify Him by silence (when required) as by &outs. We shall also be aware that the power of shouting stands very low in the hierarchy of natural gifts, and that it would be better to learn to sing if we could. If any one tries to teach us we will try to learn. If we cannot learn, and if this is desired, we will shut up. And we will also try to listen intelligently. A congregation in this state will not complain if a good deal of the music they hear in church is above their heads. It is not the mere ignorance of the unmusical that really resists improvements. It is jealousy, arrogance, suspicion, and the wholly detestable species of conservatism which those vices engender. How far it may be politic (part of the wisdom of the serpent) to make concessions to the 'old guard' in a congregation, I would not like to determine. But I do not think it can be the business of the Church greatly to co-operate with the modern State in appeasing inferiority complexes and encouraging the natural man's instinctive hatred of

excellence. Democracy is all very well as a political device. It must not intrude into the spiritual, or even the aesthetic, world.

The right way for the musicians is perhaps harder, and I, at any rate, can speak of it with much less confidence. But it seems to me that we must define rather carefully the way, or ways, in which music can glorify God. There is, as I hinted above, a sense in which all natural agents, even inanimate ones, glorify God continually by revealing the powers He has given them. And in that sense we, as natural agents, do the same. On that level our wicked actions, insofar as they exhibit our skill and strength, may be said to glorify God, as well as our good actions. An excellently performed piece of music, as a natural operation which reveals in a very high degree the peculiar powers given to man, will thus always glorify God whatever the intention of the performers may be. But that is a kind of glorifying which we share with 'the dragons and great deeps', with the 'frosts and snows'. What is looked for in us, as men, is another kind of glorifying, which depends on intention. How easy or how hard it may be for a whole choir to preserve that intention through all the discussions and decisions, all the corrections and disappointments, all the temptations to pride, rivalry and ambition, which precede the performance of a great work, I (naturally) do not know. But it is on the intention that all depends. When it succeeds, I think the performers are the most enviable of men; privileged while mortals to honour God like angels and, for a few golden moments, to see spirit and flesh, delight and labour, skill and worship, the natural and the supernatural. all fused into that unity they would have had before the Fall. But I must insist that no degree of excellence in the music, simply as music, can assure us that this paradisaical state has been achieved. The excellence proves 'keenness'; but men can be 'keen' for natural, or even wicked, motives. The absence of keenness would prove that they lacked the right spirit; its presence does not prove that they have it. We must beware of the naive idea that our music can 'please' God as it would please a cultivated human hearer. That is like thinking, under the old Law, that He really needed the blood of bulls and goats. To which an answer came, 'Mine are the cattle upon a thousand hills', and 'if I am hungry, I will not tell *thee*.' If God (in that sense) wanted music, He would not tell us. For all our offerings, whether of music or martyrdom, are like the intrinsically worthless present of a child which a father values indeed, but values only for the intention.'

REVIEW OF NEW MUSIC

“Three Sayings of Hillel” (Do not Separate Yourself, Do Not Judge, In a Place) **for Tenor, SATB chorus, organ accompaniment, by Stephen Richards, Transcontinental Music Publications, New York.**

Stephen Richards has taken three meaningful texts from *Pirkei Avot* and has adorned them with strong musical settings. If we are to judge from this work, Mr. Richards proves himself to be a gifted composer, with a talent and feeling for combining music with words.

“**Do Not Separate Yourself**” is marked by a distinctive rhythmic pattern with the voices and accompaniment moving in response to each other. The middle section is a solo for the tenor in which the mood becomes lyrical in a beautiful *legato* melody, set to the original Hebrew. (The choral section is set to the English text). Under the solo, Richards has provided the organ with an interesting ascending bass scale adding intensity to the solo voice. Following the solo, the composer returns to a rhythmical *tempo*, although marked *ppp*. Having started *in* A minor, the composer concludes the piece in F# minor as the chorus softly intones, “Do not separate yourself from the community.”

The second of the three sections, “**Do Not Judge Your Fellow Man**,” opens with an interesting accompaniment under a *legato solo* for the tenor who, in Hebrew, intones “**Al tadin et haverkha ad shetagia lim'komo**”. This is quickly taken up by the chorus which repeats the phrase in English, “Do not judge your fellow man until you have been in his place.” The final section, which proves to be the most interesting, is in the form of a fugue written for the chorus reiterating the words. The solo voice brings the piece to a close. It is interesting to note that here again the key is A minor, but the solo line concludes the work in a joyous E major.

In contrast to the first two sections, the third piece is marked, “Very intense”, and has the quality of a religious chorale. There are soprano and alto solos, along with the tenor, chorus and organ. The soprano and alto solos intone the first section of the text, which is then taken up by the chorus in a reprise of the melody. Under the tenor solo, “**Bamakom she-eyn anashim hishtadel lihiyot ish**,” the choir sings, “In a place where there are no men, strive to be a man.” As is the case in the second piece, the tenor solo brings

the work to a close in A minor, the same key in which the **cycle** began.

A chorus of even moderate competence should find this work of Stephen Richards a welcome addition to the repertoire. Not only are the choral parts beautiful, but the solos are lovely. The accompaniments will prove interesting and challenging to the organist or pianist.

“I Will Bethroth You,” for Tenor solo, SATB and organ accompaniment, by Max Sinzheimer, Transcontinental Music Publications, New York.

This piece proves to be a charming arrangement of a most beautiful text. Mr. Sinzheimer has managed to capture its beauty in a free flowing antiphonal setting for solo and chorus. The work is written very simply in the warm key of G minor.

For synagogue choirs anxious to find new music for weddings, this composition should be a welcome addition.

Morton Shames

Morton Shames is the hazzan of Temple Beth El, Springfield, Mass., Vice President of the Cantors Assembly and Editor of “The Journal of Synagogue Music.”

MUSIC SECTION

Hugo C. Adler was born in Antwerp in 1894, grew up in Hamburg, Germany. After a period of study in Cologne where he prepared for a career in education and music he was appointed Cantor of the Central Synagogue in Manheim. As a student of Ernest Toch his creative talents flowered into a number of oratorios, "Job," "To Zion," "Balak and Bilaam," and "Akedah."

He emigrated to the United States in 1939. After a short period in New York he became Cantor at Temple Emanuel in Worcester, Massachusetts, a position he held with great distinction for fifteen years, until his death in 1955.

He was a prolific composer, and arranger, and has hundreds of synagogue compositions to his credit. He is the father of the noted American composer, Samuel Adler.

The Torah Service which follows is from an out-of-print publication of some of Hugo Adler's finest compositions, published in Leipzig in 1935 by M. W. Kaufman, well known publisher of major Jewish works in pre-war Germany. The collection, "SCHIRAH CHADASHAH" is sub-titled "A Suite of Hebrew Choruses." A number of the selections were published individually after Adler's escape to America, but to the best of our knowledge, this Torah Service, according to the German *minhag*, has never been available elsewhere in America.

The service is published here thanks to the generous permission of Samuel Adler who owns the copyright and reserves all rights for future publication and performance.

זמרות לכבוד התורה לימים הנוראים

Thorgesänge an den hohen Festen
für Chasan, gemischten Chor und Orgel

Thera Hymns on the High Feasts
for Chasan, Mixed Choir and Organ

Des Chants de Thera pour les Grandes Fêtes
pour Chasan, Chœur Mixte et Orgue

Praeludium

The musical score for the Praeludium consists of three systems of music. The first system is marked *Grave* and includes dynamics *sf* and *mf*. The second system includes the instruction *un poco più mosso*. The third system includes the instruction *poco a poco come prima e ritenuto*. The score is written for voice, choir, and organ.

Wa j'hi binsoa...

The musical score for the vocal part of the Praeludium includes the following Hebrew lyrics: *Wa. j' - bi bin - so - a ho - o rot, me - jo - mer mo - jab b*. The score is marked *allegro* and includes the instruction *alt. chor.* at the end.

Adonaj z

Chason:
A - do - naj a - do - naj

pp A - do - naj A - do - naj
pp A - do - naj A - do - naj
pp A - do - naj A - do - naj
pp A - do - naj A - do - naj

Adagio

Chason 1^{ma}
el re - du - nit Ti - do - nur, e - rob a - na - jim si - ran de - sed na - em - mes
el rachum si - do - nur, e - rob a - na - jim si - ran de - sed na - em - mes

pp el re - du - nit Ti - do - nur, e - rob a - na - jim si - ran de - sed na - em - mes
pp el rachum si - do - nur, e - rob a - na - jim si - ran de - sed na - em - mes
pp el re - du - nit Ti - do - nur, e - rob a - na - jim si - ran de - sed na - em - mes
pp el rachum si - do - nur, e - rob a - na - jim si - ran de - sed na - em - mes

pp no - ser de - sed la - a - la jim, no - se

sf marc.
e - rob a - na - jim si - ran de - sed na - em - mes
e - rob a - na - jim si - ran de - sed na - em - mes

no-va no-va, f, o-ru, ni-do-ro-oh ni-cha X Po

oh, ni- no-va - hoh ni- no-va - hoh: (m)

rit. Largo

A H
adonej II

no-va - noj, a-do - noj, el no - du-ru, ni-cha - ru-ru - o-ra-d-a - po - ju- ni-ru-ru-ru - ru-ru - ru-ru -

no-va - noj, a-do - noj, el no - du-ru, ni-cha - ru-ru - o-ra-d-a - po - ju- ru-ru-ru-ru - ru-ru - ru-ru -

no-va - noj, a-do - noj, el no - du-ru, ni-cha - ru-ru, o-ra-d-a - po - ju- ni-ru-ru-ru - ru-ru - ru-ru -

Tempo di Lento

no più più mosso

no-va - noj, ni-cha - ru-ru - o-ra-d-a - po - ju- ni-ru-ru-ru - ru-ru - ru-ru -

no-va - noj, ni-cha - ru-ru - o-ra-d-a - po - ju- ni-ru-ru-ru - ru-ru - ru-ru -

no-va - noj, ni-cha - ru-ru - o-ra-d-a - po - ju- ni-ru-ru-ru - ru-ru - ru-ru -

no più più mosso

molto rit.

ברוך שנתן חיה
Baruch Shemuni Perek

Allegro

Be - ruch she-ne - san ha - nah
 Be - ruch she-ne - san ha - nah, El - she -
 Be - ruch she-ne - san ha - nah, El - she - mo gi - ra - el hik -
 Be - ruch she-ne - san ha - nah, El - she - mo gi - ra - el hik -

Allegro

El - she - mo gi - ra - el hik - du - sho - so.
 gi - ra - el hik - du sho - so.
 hik - du - sho - so, hik - du sho - so.
 du sho - so, hik - du sho - so.

ברוך שנתן
Baruch Shemuni Perek

Chosen

Sh' - me gi - ra - el a - do - nej a - lo - he - nu a - do - nej e - dod

Choro.

Sol-mo jis-ro a-de-naj a-lo-he - nu, a-de-naj a - dhad.
 Sol-mo jis-ro - el a-de-naj a-lo-he - nu, a-de-naj a - dhad.
 Sol-mo jis-ro - el a-de-naj a-lo-he - nu, a-de-naj a - dhad.
 Sol-mo jis-ro - el a-de-naj a-lo-he - nu, a-de-naj a - dhad.

Lento molto
 pp

תורה אלוהים
 Ehad uahdam

Choron

E - dhad e - lo - he - nu, go - dol a - de - nit - nu ko - dhadh ni - no - ro ad - mo.
 E - dhad e - lo - he - nu, go - dol a - de - nit - nu ko - dhadh ni - no - ro ad - mo.
 E - dhad e - lo - he - nu, go - dol a - de - nit - nu ko - dhadh ni - no - ro ad - mo.

Lento assai

E - dhad e - lo - he - nu, go - dol a - de - nit - nu, ko - dhadh ni - no - ro ad - mo.
 E - dhad e - lo - he - nu, go - dol a - de - nit - nu, ko - dhadh ni - no - ro ad - mo.
 E - dhad e - lo - he - nu, go - dol a - de - nit - nu, ko - dhadh ni - no - ro ad - mo.

Lento
 pp

a - de - naj ni - no - ro - ma - mad, u - ni - no - ro - ma - mad ad - mo jad - don.

nu a-do-naj e-lo-he-nu n'i-hish-ta-sha-nu la-ho-dam naj-fer, ko — dash hu,
 nu a-do-naj e-lo-he-nu, n'i-hish-ta-sha-nu la-ho-dam naj-fer, ko — dash hu,
 nu a-do-naj e-lo-he-nu n'i-hish-ta-sha-nu la-ho-dam naj-fer, ko — dash hu,
 nu a-do-naj e-lo-he-nu n'i-hish-ta-sha-nu la-ho-dam naj-fer, ko — dash hu,
 ru-ma-nu a-do-naj e-lo-he-nu n'i-hish-ta-sha-nu l'har kod-sha, ki ko-dash, ki ko —
 ru-ma-nu a-do-naj e-lo-he-nu, n'i-hish-ta-sha-nu l'har kod-sha, ki ko-dash, ki ko —
 ru-ma-nu a-do-naj e-lo-he-nu n'i-hish-ta-sha-nu l'har kod-sha, ki ko-dash, ki ko —
 ru-ma-nu a-do-naj e-lo-he-nu, n'i-hish-ta-sha-nu l'har kod-sha, ki ko-dash, ki ko —
 dash a-do-naj e-lo-he-nu
 dash a-do-naj e-lo-he-nu
 dash a-do-naj e-lo-he-nu
 dash a-do-naj e-lo-he-nu

אשרי חנם
Ashrei Hama

mf
Ash-re ho-ann jo-d'e e d'ru-ah, a-da-moj b'or po-me-cho j' ha-le-ann: chun:

Moderato assai
Ash-re ho-ann jo-d'e e d'ru-ah, a-da-moj b'or po-me-cho j' ha-le-ann j' ha-le-ann.
Ash-re ho-ann jo-d'e e d'ru-ah, a-da-moj b'or po-me-cho j' ha-le-ann j' ha-le-ann.
Ash-ry ho-ann jo-d'e e d'ru-ah, a-dang b'or po-me-cho, a-da-moj b'or po-me-cho j' ha-le-ann j' ha-le-ann.
Ash-re ho-ann jo-d'e e d'ru-ah, a-dang b'or po-me-cho, a-dang b'or po-me-cho j' ha-le-ann j' ha-le-ann.

אשרי יושבי
Ashrei Yoshei

Chorale
Ash-re yoshei-ne se-cho, ad j' ha-le-lu-cho se-cho se-cho.
Ash-re yoshei-ne se-cho, ad j' ha-le-lu-cho se-cho se-cho se-cho.

Moderato assai
Ash-re yoshei-ne se-cho, ad j' ha-le-lu-cho se-cho se-cho se-cho se-cho.
Ash-re yoshei-ne se-cho, ad j' ha-le-lu-cho se-cho se-cho se-cho se-cho se-cho.
Ash-re yoshei-ne se-cho, ad j' ha-le-lu-cho se-cho se-cho se-cho se-cho se-cho se-cho.
Ash-re yoshei-ne se-cho, ad j' ha-le-lu-cho se-cho se-cho se-cho se-cho se-cho se-cho.

7133 131311
 Mahanaimi Yiftach

moderato (Zufrieden)

pp

Chorus

Ma-sach-nu ni-vo-rech job, me-at-tah ni-od o-lam

meno più mosso

Ma-sach-nu ni-vo-rech job, me-at-tah ni-od o-lam

mf

f Ma-le-lu-jah, hal-le-lu-jah, hal-le-lu-jah.

Ma-le-lu-jah, hal-le-lu-jah, hal-le-lu-jah.

mf o-lam

hal-le-lu-jah, hal-le-lu-jah, hal-le-lu-jah.

f

עץ חיים היא
 by Sholem Kr.

First system of musical notation. The vocal line (top staff) includes the lyrics: "Ez cho - jinn hi la - mo - cha - si - Airm". The piano accompaniment (bottom staves) includes dynamic markings *mp* and *mf*.

Second system of musical notation. The vocal line includes the lyrics: "No, n' - si - no - der no mi - u, shen, el no - der no der - der". The piano accompaniment continues with rhythmic patterns.

Third system of musical notation. The vocal line includes the lyrics: "no am n' - der n' - si - no - der no, n' - der n' - si - no - der no sho - lom sho - lom, n' -". The piano accompaniment features a steady bass line.

Fourth system of musical notation. The vocal line includes the lyrics: "der n' - si - no - der no sho - lom". The piano accompaniment ends with a *pp* dynamic marking. The instruction "attacca Choro:" is written to the right of the piano part.

122477
Hindus

ritagio moto

Na-ahí - né-nu a-do - raj é - lé. cho ní - má - abu - nah, dah -
 Na-ahí - né-nu a-do - raj é - lé. cho ní - má - abu - nah, dah -
 Hahdí - né - nu a-do - raj é - lé. cho ní - má - abu - nah, dah - tésh jo - mé - nu k' -

cap.

dah jo - mé - nu k' - k' - dah, cho - dah jo - mé - nu, jo - mé - nu dah - dah jo - mé - nu k' -
 dah jo - mé - nu k' - k' - dah, cho - dah, jo - mé - nu, jo - mé - nu dah - dah jo - mé - nu
 dah jo - mé - nu k' - k' - dah, cho - dah, cho - dah jo - mé - nu, jo - mé - nu, dah - dah jo - mé - nu k' -

rit. dim. poco a poco e marc.

ké - dah
 ké - dah
 ké - dah