In an imaginary conversation between an editor and the Yiddish folk songs that he published in Vilna in 1871, the editor addresses the songs themselves in his preface to the volume: “Many years have already passed since you were born,” he says to them. “You’ve been well-liked, and now the time has come to go be seen by the masses. Get thee out into the world!” But the worried little songs reply, “We are afraid to travel with our business out into the world. We’ve lived here a long time and do not know the road.”

But travel out into the world the songs did, thanks to this editor and others who published them. Extending the metaphor, I will argue that these songs, as employed in composing art music, did experience multiple exiles, just as they had feared, but that they also returned. I will posit that it wasn’t so much their traveling out into the world that changed their status. No, as the editor may have meant—and as he probably understood—it was their appearance in print. But as we will see, their new status would be nowhere near the end of the road for them; it was part of an ongoing journey.

In this essay, I assess whether the folk song has experienced “exile and return,” and I examine the effect that publishing has had on the Jewish folk song. I hope to demonstrate that the printed song and the sung song have managed to coexist in the same way that variations in the tune (and often even in the words) of any given song have always coexisted; that different versions of any tune have long been present in different communities, in different traditions, and on different continents; and that even the use of the songs as material for art music did not interfere with their lives as songs.

First, we must accept that long before any given folk song appeared in print, differences in the tune (and sometimes even in the words) already existed and that they depended on who was singing the song and where it was being sung. Interestingly, differences were also produced by the written tradition. John Spitzer has written about this phenomenon in the case of Stephen Foster’s “Oh! Susanna,” which was already being sung in various versions before it was published in 1848. As the song became more and more popular, variations in both tune and words began to be heard—and seen—in printed versions.

Spitzer observes that “oral and written transmission sometimes overlapped. Performers orally transmitted popular songs and tunes alongside of and interacting with written transmission.” And in discussing the transmission of
“Oh! Susanna,” he provides specific observations about the process: “as a composed and notated song moves into oral transmission, it undergoes predictable changes: its rhythms are altered to clarify the beat . . . its melody is altered . . . its pitches and rhythms are adjusted to conform to parallel passages.”

Are the changes introduced by oral transmission usually “inferior” to the original readings? Not necessarily. “In the case of ‘Susanna,’” Spitzer writes, “the tendencies of oral transmission have evidently improved the tune. They make the rhythm clearer . . . they make the tune easier to sing and easier to remember.” And, he concludes, “When composers fail to get it right the first time, perhaps singers and players have something additional and valuable to contribute to the compositional process.”

AN EXAMPLE FROM JEWISH FOLK SONG

As a case study, I will examine alternate versions of the words and tune for the short Hebrew folksong “Artza alinu” [We Have Ascended to the Land], which was composed in Palestine in the 1920s.

The two versions below were published within two years of each other in the mid-1930s in Chicago and Berlin; neither volume provides an attribution or a date of composition for the song. (There are also discrepancies in the transliteration of the Hebrew words, but these are not relevant to this discussion, and in any case, transliteration is highly dependent on the language of the country in which a song is published.)

The two tunes contain the same number of measures, and their contours are similar. Both divide neatly into three sections, each section four measures in length. The first discrepancy between them occurs in the text in measures 1 and 2: the Coopersmith version begins with the words “Artza alinu” [We have ascended to the land] in both of those measures, whereas the Schönberg version opens with the single word “Alinu” [We have ascended] in both measures. This discrepancy is heard again immediately, since the end of the fourth measure of each version has a repeat sign, indicating that those four measures are sung a second time in both versions.

The next four measures (mm. 5–8) display significant discrepancies between the two versions of the tune. In the Coopersmith version, the first two measures of this section are repeated exactly (the musical notation indicates that they are identical), and the third pitch in the first measure of the section (m. 5) is just an unimportant “passing tone” between the second and fourth pitches. In the Schönberg version, the last pitch in measure 6 connects the
tune to the next measure, and the pitches in the third measure of the section differ completely from those in the first measure rather than duplicating them, the way the Coopersmith version does.

In the last four measures (mm. 9–12), the pitches in the two tunes match exactly. The only difference is the indication in the Schönberg edition that the first four measures of the tune are to be repeated following the last printed measure. All in all, there is a remarkable array of discrepancies in a tune only 16 measures long (or 20 measures if the repeat indicated in the Schönberg is honored).

OTHER ELEMENTS OF JEWISH MUSICAL TRADITION

Of course, what I have said about Jewish “folk song” does not apply only to folk song; it also applies to all the music associated with Jewish culture, of which folk song is only one element.

Another important source of Jewish tunes is our synagogue liturgy, those tunes associated with Shabbat and holiday worship, which is largely sung. There are prayer tunes: tunes associated with particular prayers that do not seem to vary much from place to place—the Kol Nidre, for instance, which is actually a bunch of tune fragments strung together, is invariable; it doesn’t matter much where (within the Western tradition) you hear it. Then there is nusakh, which I am using here to refer to the style of the set of tunes for the prayers associated with a particular tradition or geographic location. We tend to adopt the nusakh of the group in which we are davening.

Finally, there is trop, the sets of tunes for chanting Torah, haftorah, and the five scrolls: Shir haShirim [Song of Songs], Megillat Esther [the book of Esther], Eicha [the book of Lamentations], Koheleth [Ecclesiastes], and Megillat Rut [the book of Ruth]. Tunes for the trop elements vary too depending on geography, but because trop is typically being used by one person at a time rather than a group, the elements you use are probably the ones you learned for your bar or bat mitzvah or when you first learned to leyen.

Returning to the question of transmission, how do tunes travel from one generation to another? The earliest stage is oral transmission: a parent sings a lullaby to a child, a person sings to his or her beloved, a leader teaches a song to a group. There are many positive aspects to oral transmission: it allows for creativity, and it is available to anyone who can carry a tune (and I have long argued that everyone can be taught to do so). People with musical talent lend their own touch to extant songs; the very talented ones invent songs. Of
course, there are negative aspects too: oral transmission permits mistakes—if we can call them “mistakes,” such as forgetting the tune or somehow changing it (but see above for a discussion of transmission).

**BEYOND ORAL TRANSMISSION**

When we move beyond oral transmission, the next mode of transmission is transcription, actually writing down the tunes; this is different than singing from memory, which allows for changes. (Transcription—and musical notation in general—came very late to the Jewish community, and for reasons unknown to me, we continue to argue about its value and importance.) But not everyone has the skill to decipher a transcribed tune—it employs a set of symbols that have to be learned, so the two options, oral and written, continue to coexist to this day.

Here, following the lead of the 1871 editor we met in the first paragraph, is my anthropomorphic analogy. The transcribed version of a song runs into an oral version that has never been transcribed. The transcribed tune says, “There’s something just slightly different about you; is it the tune? Is it in the words? Maybe you repeated something in the middle?” The oral version replies, “Oh, do you like it? My singer introduced it just yesterday.”

But the transcribed song was here to stay; it had several advantages. For those who do know musical notation, it simplified learning a song. It extended both the audience for the song and the number of participants in the song. One disadvantage was that transcription codified the song to some extent, but transcription has long coexisted with oral transmission, with the result that, as we have already seen, the version of a song in one collection almost always differs from the version in another. So perhaps we can say that our exiled songs never really went into exile.

One stage that followed transcribing songs was creating an accompaniment for an extant song; here I imagine one song running into another on the sidewalk: “Long time no see,” says song #1. “My oh my,” says song #2, “how interesting! You’re on a bicycle.” “Oh yes,” replies song #1, “I don’t do the walking myself anymore; this conveyance supports me.”

A few months later, our song #1 runs into an instrumental version. “I recognize you,” says song #1, “but there’s something different.” “Yes, I’ve quit singing. I’d like you to meet Mme. Violin, it’s her job.” “But what about the words?” asks song #1. “Never mind the words. Have you heard Mme. Violin? Listen to her version of the song; it’s really quite special.”
And my last fantasy is song #1 attending a concert. He waits at the stage door to congratulate the performers, and out comes the cello. “Am I crazy,” asks song #1, “or was there something about that last piece you played that sounded a little bit like me?” “You’re absolutely right,” replies the cello. “My composer admires you so much that he borrowed your first four measures! I was wondering whether you would recognize me! What did you think? Did you like it? Do you think other people will like it? Let me tell you about my composer!”

ART MUSIC EMPLOYING FOLK MATERIAL

And who was that composer? In this fantasy, the composer was a member of the Society for Jewish Folk Music (for “folk,” think “ethnic”), founded in St. Petersburg, Russia, in 1908. The group’s primary goals were composing, performing, and publishing art music based on Jewish material: folk song, nusakh, and trop.

Two major factors were responsible for the fact that the group developed initially in St. Petersburg. One factor was, quite simply, the presence of Jewish students at the conservatory there; in spite of the 3 percent quota on Jewish enrollment that governed university-level education in Russia prior to the 1905 revolution, the school in St. Petersburg had always been open to both Jews and women.9

A second factor was that the St. Petersburg conservatory students benefited from the support and the influence of composer Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov, who taught there until his death in 1908. Art music on Jewish themes was a logical extension of the late nineteenth-century nationalist musical style championed in Russia by the group of composers known as “the five,” of whom Rimsky-Korsakov was the last active member.10 The composer encouraged each of his students, not only by example but explicitly, to exploit his or her own ethnic heritage in composition.

Although the works published by the societies in St. Petersburg and Moscow constitute the most important legacy of this movement, the society in St. Petersburg, the group we know the most about, also organized concerts and concert tours, public lectures, and music classes. The group’s concerts were presented at various secular locations in St. Petersburg, in addition to the conservatory. And over the period from 1908 to 1917, the Society for Jewish Folk Music published eighty works by its member composers.11

Reviews in the influential journal Russkaia muzykal’naia gazeta [The Russian Musical Newspaper] and in the monthly “Chronicle” issues of the
journal *Muzykal’nyi sovremennik* [Contemporary Music] reported how large the audiences were and how thrilled they were by the new music. Members of the society also served on the editorial board of *Muzykal’nyi sovremennik*, and several of them published essays in its columns.12

The society in St. Petersburg inspired a group that was organized in Moscow about five years later. That group began as a branch of the mother organization, but after the October Revolution it was renamed the Society for Jewish Music. The Moscow group’s focus was primarily on performance rather than publishing. However, as early as 1918 it began to publish works by a few of its member composers, primarily those of Joel Engel (1868–1927) and Alexander Krein (1883–1951).13 The latest Society for Jewish Music publication I have seen bears the publication date 1919; its back cover lists eighty works.14

By the mid-1920s, both the St. Petersburg group and the Moscow group had ceased publishing, and many of their members had already left Russia for Europe, Palestine, or the United States. The goal of publishing had been adopted by two new groups, Jibneh and Juwal, both of which began in Berlin in 1923.15 In 1925 those publishers were acquired by Universal Edition in Vienna, where Abram Dzimitrovsky (1873?–1943) of their Russian department handled all the music on Jewish themes.

By the mid-1930s, of course, it was clear to Universal that it would no longer be publishing or selling music by Jewish composers. In a short article published in *The Reconstructionist* in 1943, musicologist/composer Judith Kaplan Eisenstein wrote that “Dzimitrovsky salvaged every bit of music he could and sent it on to America.”16 There he reconstituted Jibneh as Yibneh and revived its activities until his death in 1943. At that point, the plates and printed sheet music were purchased by the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation, and Judith Kaplan Eisenstein, Rabbi Mordecai M. Kaplan’s oldest daughter, ran the publishing company until 1950.

**ART MUSIC BASED ON FOLK MATERIAL: AN EXAMPLE**

The remainder of this essay is devoted to demonstrating how Judith Kaplan Eisenstein employed Jewish tunes in a cantata, titled “What Is Torah.” It was the first in a series of cantatas that she and her husband, Rabbi Ira Eisenstein, wrote and published in the 1940s and early 1950s.17 “What Is Torah” was first performed during services for Shavuot 1942 at the Society for the Advancement of Judaism, Rabbi Kaplan’s synagogue in New York, and was published the following year.18
The cantata is a narrative piece of music, a genre that first appeared in the late seventeenth century. It is perhaps best known from the cantatas of J. S. Bach, which were sacred vocal works in multiple movements for chorus and usually soloists accompanied either by organ or by small orchestra. The form never really died out, but it had a noticeable revival in the mid-twentieth century. The musical examples that follow are drawn from “What Is Torah,” the Eisensteins’ earliest cantata and the only one that has been professionally recorded.

“What Is Torah” demonstrates the Eisensteins’ (especially Judith’s) encyclopedic knowledge of Jewish music and provides an excellent example of a work that fulfilled the goals of the Society for Jewish Folk Music, the group discussed above. All the elements of Jewish music that the society wanted to employ are represented in this cantata: folk song, nusakh, and trop.

Most of the fragments and entire examples heard in a performance of “What Is Torah” would have been familiar to listeners in 1942, if not to today’s audiences, and many of the sources for the musical material are listed in a foreword to the volume. However, there are a few pieces of material that are not identified; there are also fragments that may not be obvious, and I have identified those. For the sake of completeness and for performers and audiences in future generations and/or other cultures, I have listed all the fragments as they appear in the work and as they are described in the authors’ foreword. I further identify any that were not thoroughly identified, and I add several that were not listed.

The opening motive is a simplification of the shofar call tekiah [a single blast]. The authors write only that “The trumpet call is derived from the Shofar calls.” This motive is used throughout the cantata to begin a new section, just as shofar calls are used in the synagogue to announce a new year. And every time the motive is heard, it is followed by a solo speaking voice inquiring “What is Torah?” Only twice does the motive vary: in measures 263–265, the final pitch is extended by one measure, and in measures 373–375, close to the end of the cantata, the opening fifth is heard three times, perhaps to recall the shofar call shevarim [three short blasts] rather than the tekiah.

The body of the cantata opens with the akdamut tune, the melody for a lengthy Aramaic piyyut [Jewish liturgical poem] that is traditionally chanted prior to the first aliyah on the morning of Shavuot. (The same tune is heard in the kiddush for Shavuot as well as for Sukkot and Pesach.) About this, the authors write simply that “the opening song, ‘In the Wilderness’, [is derived] from the chant of ‘Akdamut,’ associated with the Shabuot festival.” The tune
is presented initially in its nonmetric original (mm. 2–5) but is then expanded into a metric song for chorus (mm. 6–25), labeled in the foreword to the volume as “The opening song: ‘In the Wilderness.’”

With hardly a pause (indicated only by a fermata over the previous note), the chorus then launches into “Zemer l’simchat yisrael” [A song of (taking) joy in Israel], which the authors describe as “from a song by Joel Engel, its text taken from a medieval poem in the Simchat Torah service.” Unidentified in the foreword, Engel (1868–1927) was an important figure in the early twentieth-century movement to compose art music on Jewish themes, although he was not himself a member of the St. Petersburg Society for Jewish Folk Music mentioned earlier. This song first appeared in Engel’s volume Shirei yeladim [Songs for Children], and the words are from the second stanza; the text of the first stanza is identical except that it begins with the words “Hitkabtsu malachim [Gather, angels].”

A long episode of dialogue follows in which the text is assigned first to individual voices in an unaccompanied question-and-answer format and then to half the chorus (m. 42) in unison over piano accompaniment. Next we hear the last sentence of the Torah account of the sixth day in the story of creation sung by the chorus. But the normal trop for the end of an aliya is replaced by the “festive” mercha tipcha mercha sof pasuk [a series of prescribed tune elements], which is also the tune used for hazak, hazak [be strong, be strong] sung when the scroll is lifted on reaching the end of a book of the Torah. This is described as follows in the preface: “‘Vay’hi erev,’ and all other cadences using this melody, from the coda verses in the cantillation of the Pentateuch.”

That tune segues directly into the beginning of the kiddush for Friday night to match the text, sung by the chorus and labeled only “‘Vayehulu,’ from the Friday evening service.” The tune is regularized rhythmically and provided with a piano accompaniment; after the first six measures, the choral singing is overlaid by spoken narration describing Shabbat.

Following the next trumpet call (mm. 77–78), the chorus sings “Lamidbar” [To the desert], which the foreword describes only as “from a Yemenite song.” The tune has been identified as a folk melody; the words, however, are from a poem by Alexander Pen (often Penn) (1906–1972), a poet born in Russia and active in communist circles in prestate Israel.

After a repetition of the hazak hazak tune (mm. 96–99) and a long interlude (mm. 99–125), we hear “Ashirah ladonai” [Let us sing to the Lord], described in the foreword only as “from an eastern oriental melody.” That “oriental melody” was found and arranged for four voices with piano
accompaniment by composer and musicologist Erwin Jospe (Berlin, 1907; Ramat Ha-Sharon, 1983) when he was music director at the Anshe Emet Synagogue in Chicago; it was first published in 1947. The version of the melody in “What Is Torah” assigns the soprano line to the chorus; the piano accompaniment is very simple.

“Ashirah ladonai” ends without a ritard in measure 131 and is followed by a shofar call and three measures of busy piano accompaniment, pianissimo behind dialogue (mm. 133–135). That pattern breaks off, and a measure later the piano switches to a progression of chords in which the top pitch moves upward by half steps (with the exception of mm. 142–143), beginning on D sharp and ending on B natural. Against this background, the chorus recites a series of commandments (printed in capital letters in the text), drawn from the “holiness code” in Leviticus 17–26 and from the Ten Commandments.

In the midst of that recitation (m. 144), the chorus chants (in English) “Remember: you were slaves in the land of Egypt” to a tune fragment resembling elements of trop. The fragment is not identified in the foreword, and I have so far been unable to identify it. The recitation then continues, ending in measures 157–163 with the words “Ye shall be holy,” followed by the chanting of the Shema [“Shema Yisrael” (Hear O Israel), a declaration of faith] to the tune used for Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur.

After another repetition of the question “What is Torah?” the piano accompaniment becomes denser, with steady triplet chords on all four beats, initially in both hands, through measure 170. At that point, the triplets are restricted to the left hand in the piano, and for a few measures the accompaniment is less intense. The triplets are replaced (in m. 175) by sixteenth notes with accents, initially on every beat in the left hand and then on every beat in both hands. That pattern continues through measure 179 and switches to just the first beat in measure 180. In measure 182, the chorus breaks in with what the foreword refers to as “V’natan lanu [and He gave us], from the folksong Baruk [sic] elohenu” [Blessed is our God].

The musical unit that appears next (mm. 198–205) is identified only as “a lament from a Yemenite song.” And measures 209–211 provide a rare instance of a musical motive for which the cantata mentions no source at all. That motive is an almost exact quotation of the first two measures of the folksong “Oyf’n pripetchik” [On the Hearth], with words by Russian Jewish poet Mark Warshavsky (1848–1907). Warshavsky published the song in Warsaw in 1900 in an anthology titled Judische Volkslieder, where it is labeled “Der Alef Bejss” [The Alphabet].
That quotation from “Oyf’n pripetchik” introduces a three-measure motive (mm. 211–213) based on the lernsteiger [study chant] featured in a song by Moise Mil’ner (1882–1953). The authors identify the motive and describe it as “‘Kometz alef oh’ [the letter aleph with the vowel kametz (is pronounced) “oh”] from the famous song by Milner.” The song, known either as “In heder” [In School] or “Der alef-beis,” was originally published by the Society for Jewish Folk Music in St. Petersburg in 1914. The two motives, one from “Oyf’n pripetchik” and the other from “In heder,” continue to alternate, brilliantly intertwined, through measure 232.

The next piece of motivic material is drawn from what the authors identify as “the Kabbalist’s chant, from a Hasidic melody used by Engel in his incidental music to the Dybbuk.” The motive is first heard in the third measure of the first violin part of the first movement, “Mipneh Mah” [Wherefore?], of Joel Engel’s Suite aus der Musik zu der dramatischen Legende von An-ski “Hadi-buk” (opus 35). In measures 234–249 of “What Is Torah?,” it is hummed by the chorus as background to spoken text and continues behind the text, slightly altered, in the piano through measure 253.

At measure 254, the chorus sings “Vos is die beste schoire? Yankele vet lernen Toire” [What is the best stuff? Yankele is going to study Torah]. In the foreword, the authors cite the first phrase of the text as the song’s title and refer to its source only as “a Yiddish lullaby,” and in measure 254 the score says “like a lullaby.” The tune is actually the first phrase of a lullaby that begins with those words, although they also appear in several other lullabies. In the cantata, that phrase is followed by the chanting of the text “That the spirit of knowledge may blossom and flourish,” employing the tune for hazak hazak. A shofar call and the question “What is Torah?” follow. The piano continues, segueing into an accompaniment for the text “It is the Temple site,” chanted to “the cantillation of the Book of Lamentations, used on Tish’a B’Ab.”

The next piece of musical material is another example not mentioned in the foreword. It is “Eliyahu hanavi” [Elijah, the Prophet], a song from the Pesach seder that often concludes the short service marking the end of Shabbat. In the cantata, it is sung only once (beginning in m. 296), and even that instance is background for a recitation. According to at least one musicologist, the song we know by that name was actually the refrain that followed individual stanzas now rarely sung; it was well known in America by at least the beginning of the twentieth century and among East European Jews probably earlier than that.
The chorus sings again beginning at measure 316: the text there is “La-
avodah ve-la-melakah” [to work and to labor], which is both the refrain and
the title of what the authors describe as “a modern Palestinian song.” It is now
credited, by Motti Regev and Edwin Seroussi, as a setting by Nahum Nardi
(1901–1977) of a children’s poem by Hayim Nachman Bialik (1873–1934).\(^{28}\)
The authors refer to Nardi as an “urban” (as opposed to a “kibbutz”) composer,
and they describe the song as “a classic Eretz Yisraeli song that praises hard
work and labor as the cornerstones of the Zionist project.”

That song is the last one identified in the preface. However, three more
pieces of music are sung before the cantata ends. The authors may have felt
that identification was unnecessary because the pieces were so familiar, but
citations are provided here for the sake of completeness and for the benefit of
those in future generations or other communities or countries.

In measures 342–350, the chorus sings the opening verse of the well-
known African American song “Go Down, Moses,” first published by the Jubil-
lee Singers in 1872. Although the song is now usually considered a spiritual,
it began—according to one account—as early as 1862 as an anthem for the
“contrabands” (escaped slaves or others who identified with the Union forces
during the American Civil War).\(^{29}\)

At that point, a two-measure transition leads into the first verse of “Amer-
ica the Beautiful,” a song whose words were written in 1895 by Katharine Lee
Bates (1859–1929), later a professor of English at Wellesley College.\(^{30}\) And
although its tune, composed by Samuel Augustus Ward (1848–1903), a church
organist and composer, now strikes us as indivisible from the poem, until 1926
Bates’s words were sung to various tunes including “Auld Lang Syne”!

Following the teruah shofar call in measures 373–375, the piano
reprises—behind dialogue (mm. 376–384)—the unmetered Akdamut tune
from measures 2–5 that followed the shofar call opening the work. The cantata
ends with the hazak, hazak tune underlying the text, “For it is our life and
the length of our days,” followed by the complete Hebrew quotation, “hazak,
hazak, ve-nithazek” [be strong, be strong, and let us be strengthened].

EXILE AND RETURN

As I hope I have demonstrated, one of the wonderful aspects of music is that
tunes do not ever get “used up”—they get shared. They can coexist in many dif-
ferent incarnations: the little tunes we met on the first page were nervous about
appearing on the world stage, but their wares turned out to be of interest to many. Even better, they were not obliged to give up their wares: they both kept them and shared them. As a result, they continued to exist both in their original form and in multiple other forms, and they continue to be available not only to those of us who sing them but also to the composers who employ them.

In conclusion, I return to my initial contention that the tunes addressed by the editor in 1871 went into exile initially as the result of appearing in print and subsequently by being adopted by composers. As we have seen, the story is far more complicated than that. I have come to think of the use of the tunes by composers as both an exile and a return, just as the title of this volume suggests, albeit unwittingly.
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1. Peysakh-Eliyahu Badkhn, *Kanaf renanim oder zeks folkslider* [Songbird, or Six Folk Songs], quoted and translated in James Loeffler, *The Most Musical Nation: Jews and Culture in the Late Russian Empire* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010). A similar image appears in Loeffler’s description of Yiddish writer Y. L. Peretz’s visit to St. Petersburg in 1910. On the use of folk songs in art music, Peretz is said to have observed “But on the long road to cold Petersburg the songs will freeze a little bit” (Loeffler, *The Most Musical Nation*, 171).


3. Spitzer, “Oh! Susanna,” 102. Spitzer’s abstract (146) ends with “oral and written aspects were mixed in the transmission of ‘Susanna.’”

4. Ibid., 117.

5. Ibid., 132.

6. Data about the song’s 1920s origin appears at “Artza Alinu—We Went Up to Our Land—Song Lesson—Shmuel Navon,” All Readable, http://www.allreadable.com/dd8eKLJD.


10. The other four composers were César Cui, Aleksandr Borodin, Mily Balakirev, and Modest Mussorgsky.

11. Most sources—e.g., Albert Weisser, *The Modern Renaissance of Jewish Music* (1954; reprint, New York: Da Capo, 1983), 68, G. V. Kopytova, *Obshchestvo evreiskoi narodnoi muzyki v Petersburge-Petrograde* [The Society for Jewish Folk Music in Petersburge-Petrograd] (St. Petersburg: n.p., 1997), 68—attribute eighty-one works to the society, but the work listed as no. 81—a version for cello and piano by Solomon Rosowsky (1878–1962) of his *Hebraische (Chssidische) Melodie* [Hebrew (Chasidic) Melody] published for viola or English horn and piano as no. 79—does not appear to have been published. The Solomon Rosowsky Collection (Archives, Jewish Theological Seminary of America) includes several manuscript drafts but no printed copy of a work for cello and piano with that title.


16. Judith K[aplan] Eisenstein, “Music Notes,” *The Reconstructionist* 8, no. 3 (March 20, 1942): 19. It is my impression that Judith thought Universal had given Dzimitrovsky not only the entire stock of published works on Jewish themes but also the plates for reprinting the works. But he may have purchased the material. An English-language document on the letterhead of Associated Music Publishers, Inc., in New York, dated September 2, 1941, and signed by Hugo Winter, the former managing director of Universal in Vienna, states that the publishing house had sold “The Jibneh Edition” to “Mr. A. Dzimitrowsky [sic]” in April 1933 (this letter is in the possession of the author). That date is confirmed by a letter written in 1938 in which cellist and composer Joachim Stutschewsky indicates that Jibneh became the property of “a friend of ours” in 1933; it seems clear that he is referring to Dzimitrovsky. The letter, addressed to Salli Levi, the prime mover in the World Centre for Jewish Music in Palestine, appears in Philip V. Bohlman, *The World Centre for Jewish Music in Palestine, 1936–1940: Jewish Musical Life on the Eve of World War II* (Oxford, UK: Clarendon, 1992).


20. WorldCat lists three professional recordings of “What Is Torah.”


24. For more information about “Oyfn pripetchik,” see “Oyfn Pripetchik,” The National Library of Israel, http://web.nli.org.il/sites/NLI/English/music/daily_song/Pages/deralephbet.aspx. Some sources claim that Warshawsky was also the composer.

25. Tel Aviv (Palestine)/Berlin: “Juwal,” Verlagsgesellschaft für Jüdische Musik, 1926. The work is scored for clarinet, string quartet, string bass, and percussion.

26. Ruth Rubin, *Voices of a People: Yiddish Folk Songs* (New York: A. S. Barnes, 1963), 37–38, provides this text and indicates that the tune appears in Yehuda Leib Cahan, *Yidishe...*
folkslider hit melodies (New York: Yiddish Scientific Institute, 1957), no. 339. However, that volume does not include a tune for that text.


