

The Hebrew musical accents (*te`amim*)

A brief report on the origin, history, and interpretation of the accentual system would be useful as an introduction to the reading of the two systems of “accentuation” (*te`amim*) found in the Hebrew Bible, and also as an answer to questions about the validity and implications of Suzanne Haik-Vantoura’s work, which uniquely permits us to understand what these marks are all about.

The *te`amim*

The Hebrew Masoretic Text contains (among other things) three basic sets of symbols related to verbal meaning: the consonants, the vowel-points (with associated graphemes such as the *maqef* or hyphen and the *dagesh* or dot), and the accents (*te`amim*). The name for the accents, *te`amim* (singular *ta`am*), comes from the verb *ta`am*, “to taste, discern, appreciate, etc.” Sometimes the accents are called *ta`amê miqra’*, “the accents of reading” (*miqra’* is “scripture” in the sense of what is *recited* rather than *written*). In effect, the *te`amim* are meant to enable the reader and the listener to *discern and appreciate the sense* of the often-ambiguous Hebrew words.

¹ Mr. Wheeler has been associated with Suzanne Haik-Vantoura since 1982, and as Corresponding Agent for the Institution Roi David, since 1984. He was editor and co-publisher of the English translation of Haik-Vantoura’s book, *La musique de la Bible révélée* (2nd ed., Dessain et Tolra, 1978; English translation as *The Music of the Bible Revealed* (BIBAL Press/King David’s Harp, Inc., 1991); the English translation included additional notes which Haik-Vantoura published separately and privately in French.)

Before Haik-Vantoura’s death in October 2000, seven recordings (an eighth has been produced since) and musical scores covering about one-fourth of the Hebrew Bible (including all the Psalms and Megillot) were produced. Regrettably, most of this material is either out of print or very difficult to obtain outside of France. However, Mr. Wheeler has made as much of the musical score material available as feasible online, and is developing several Web sites on the subject matter, including *kingdavidsharp.org*, *rakkav.tripod.com*, and, in conjunction with the Berkeley Institute of Biblical Archaeology and Literature (BIBAL), parts of *bibal.net*. Haik-Vantoura’s own Web site, in French and English, is still extant as *institutionroidavid.com*.

For those interested in the subject, the English book and the original recording that went with the original French book (*La musique de la Bible révélée*, Harmonia Mundi France CD) are readily available. Ordering information for these and other products is given on the first and second Web sites listed above.

The system of accentuation and vowel-pointing in our Masoretic Text is properly called “Tiberian”, after the scribes of Tiberias, Galilee who copied it.² The “Tiberian” accentuation is found in two systems. In Hebrew these are designated as

- the *Te`amim 'Emeth* (the word *'emeth*— *'aleph-mem-tau*— is an acrostic for Job-Proverbs-Psalms, the books in which this system is found), which Haik-Vantoura designated as the *psalmodic*; and
- the *Te`amim Kaph-'Aleph* (*kaph-'aleph* being the Hebrew numerals for “21”, referring to the 21 other books of the Bible plus the prologue and epilogue of Job), which Haik-Vantoura designated as *prosodic*.

“Prosodic” does not refer to “prose”, as opposed to the “poetry” of the other three books, as is sometimes thought. “Prosody”, in its dictionary meaning and in the one intended here, refers to the features of poetic text such as rhyme, rhythm, meter, mora, accentuation, and so forth. The prosodic system is simply the foundational one, with more graphemes in use in more complicated relationships with each other and with the words, and is actually much more complex than the psalmodic. Not surprisingly, the most complex relationships between the *te`amim* and the words are found in the Pentateuch.

The earliest securely dated MS. containing the “Tiberian” accents and vowel-points is the “Codex of the Prophets” by Moshe ben Asher, completed in 895 AD. Some manuscripts and fragments may date as early as 820-850 AD or even earlier. Moshe ben Asher stated in the colophon to his Codex that he copied the verbal text, with its accents and vowels, “as it was understood by the Community of Prophets”— probably a reference to the medieval Jewish sect of Karaites. In a separate poem called “The Song of the Vine”, ben Asher claimed that a family of Second Temple priests known as the Elders of Bathyra (apparently, the Herodians of the New Testament) had “established the accents of Scripture, giving [its] sense and interpreting its word.” Ben Asher likewise waxed rhapsodic about the multiple significance of the word *te`amim*, pointing significantly to both the *exegetical* and *tonal* functions of the accents.

Dr. Rochelle Altman has recently commented on some Dead Sea Scroll fragments that appear to have accents similar to some found in the “Tiberian” notation.³ Musicologist and Hellenist Denise Jourdan-Hemmerdinger notes that there is a pre-Christian system of Greek accentuation

² There were two synagogal accent systems as well, used in Palestine and Babylonia and dating from the 4th-7th centuries AD. These were designed, it appears, to annotate local synagogue traditions.

³ In particular, *geresh*, one of the superlinear *te`amim* (those found above the Hebrew words).

which has all the graphic forms found in the “Tiberian” *te`amim* (though differently arranged), supporting the idea that the “Tiberian” accentuation is likewise pre-Christian.

The accentuation itself is a transcription of a system of conducting vocal music by means of gestures of the hand and/or fingers. Such a musical system is called *chironomy*. A number of the original gestures were preserved in a Yemenite Hebrew source dating from the 12th century, translated into French as the *Manuel du Lecteur* (“Reader’s Manual”, one of many medieval manuals of its type). However, while a number of ancient synagogues use gestures in parallel with the written graphemes (the custom being noted in Jewish literature since the first century), none seem to use the original gestural system.

The masoretic paradigm for the accentuation

The Masoretic and post-Masoretic Jewish sources are clear that the *te`amim* are both *musical* and *exegetical* in significance.

The *te`amim* define the melody to which the Scripture is sung in public reading; they also mark the stressed syllables in the reading (these two aspects, melody and rhythm, are *musical*). But they also show which words are at the ends of verses and phrases and which ones are to be connected within phrases (this aspect is *exegetical*). In effect, the accentuation is but a magnification of the natural vocal inflection of speech, with its implied punctuation and phrasing. So Moses “spoke all the words of this *song*” by such a “speech-song”, called *cantillation* (Deuteronomy 31:30). So David wrote: “Your statutes have been my *songs* (*zemirot*, songs accompanied by harp or lyre) in the house of my pilgrimage” (Psalm 119:54).

It is typically believed today that the interpretations of the *te`amim* the Masoretes (beginning with Moshe ben Asher’s son Aharon, fl. 930 AD) and their grammarian successors to the present represent the original *exegetical* meaning of the “Tiberian” *te`amim*. Likewise, it is typically believed today that one or another form of synagogue chant represents more or less closely the original *musical* meaning. It is true that the Masoretes and grammarians, with the cantors of the synagogue, understand the *significance* of the notation. But does it follow from this that they understand the actual *meaning*?

The “Tiberian” notation appears as it were “out of nowhere”, fully formed, by the end of the 9th century.⁴ Only after that does the first *tentative* study of the interrelationships between the

⁴ There was a famous biblical manuscript called “Jericho”, now lost, found ca. 800 in a cave near the Dead Sea. Its discovery and study, along with other manuscripts from the same cache, by the Karaites at Jerusalem apparently triggered the work of the Masoretes. *Within as little as 20-50 years* and no more than 95 years, the oldest codices containing the “Tiberian” notation fully spelled out appear.

te`amim appear, in a treatise by Aharon ben Asher, ca. 930.⁵ Only by the 12th century, in the *Manuel du Lecteur* and similar reader's manuals, do we find a relatively systematic set of "grammatical rules" for the *te`amim*. And only by the Renaissance are those rules brought to more or less the state of completeness that they have today. Even now, specialists using computers⁶ study different manuscripts to test and affirm these rules and the consistency of their application.

The "Masoretic paradigm" first stated by Aharon ben Asher is accepted as valid by virtually everyone in the field of Masoretic studies. That paradigm divides the *te`amim* into three classes:

1. the "disjunctives",⁷ which are found on words that end a verse or phrase;
2. the "conjunctives", those that are found on words within a phrase; and
3. the so-called *ga`ya*, a vertical sign often considered not a *ta`am* at all, which is neither disjunctive nor conjunctive but acts as a sort of "bridle" on how quickly one sings a syllable (thus its alternate name, *meteg*).

But as others have noted in the past, this paradigm does not explain most of the physical features of the accentuation or of its relationship to the words. (How much this is true we will illustrate shortly).

Also, while the accentuation itself appeared fully formed by 895 AD, it took no less than three centuries to come up with a seemingly coherent explanation of its grammatical rules.⁸

Is this not evidence that the Masoretes and later grammarians worked with a notation of which they understood the *significance*, but not the actual *meaning*?

Let us conduct what Albert Einstein called a "thought experiment". Let us assume that the Masoretes had received (as they said) a notation which they knew had both musical and exegetical meaning. Let us also assume (as the evidence strongly suggests) that the original meaning was unknown to them and their grammarian successors. Not being musicians

⁵ The *Diqduqê ha-Te`amim*, "Grammatical Rules of the Accents".

⁶ Such as the late Gerard E. Weil and James D. Price.

⁷ My readers in the Word Count Group will note how the "disjunctives" in particular are important in the word studies conducted by Dr. Christensen and others in the Masoretic Text.

⁸ Not that this stopped various scribes, beginning with Aharon ben Asher and another scribe named ben Naphtali, from coming up with various opinions as to how this or that part of Scripture should be accented, sometimes (it appears) even contrary to the received tradition. Leningrad Codex B-19, the oldest complete codex after the Aleppo Codex of Aharon ben Asher, shows graphemes of multiple erasures and rewrites of its accentuation, apparently with the aim of making the accentuation more "grammatically self-consistent".

themselves, and being used to the synagogue chant of their time (which chant likewise was more exegetical— after a fashion!— than musical in nature⁹), they would have naturally assumed the exegetical meaning was paramount. Being clever and careful, they would have sought out a “Rosetta Stone” by which the notation could be deciphered.

In order to decipher an unknown notation, one must have two things:

1. One must know the significance of the unknown notation itself;
2. One must have a parallel text containing a common meaning with which to compare the unknown notation.

On the actual Egyptian Rosetta Stone we actually have a trilingual text: Greek and two forms of Egyptian. The Greek script was known, but neither Egyptian hieroglyphic script. Champollion, guessing that certain markers indicated parallel meanings in the Greek and the Egyptian, was able to decipher the full meaning of the latter bit by bit. In effect, the Greek and the Egyptian hieroglyphic texts together formed a true “bilingual” text.

When one has a “virtual bilingual” text, by contrast, one has two parallel texts that have information in common, yet the two texts are of different genres. Here, we have a musical/exegetical text (the *te`amim*) and a verbal text (the Hebrew text). Both have verses and phrases— in short, *syntax*— in common. So the Masoretes began their analysis (in effect, their decipherment) of the *te`amim* on these premises:

1. They took the significance of the *te`amim* as musical and exegetical, but treated the *exegetical* function as primary;
2. They compared the syntax of the *te`amim* as a notational system against the syntax of the Hebrew verbal text.

According to the premises of their paradigm, the very distinctions between the *te`amim* themselves were made, each *ta`am* defined according to its supposed function.

Let us continue (in our “thought experiment”) in the Masoretes’ footsteps, starting with the same premises:

1. The *te`amim* are both musical and exegetical, but the *exegetical* function is primary;

⁹ At that time, it was a simple “aide-memoire”: a rising and falling phrase with at best some melodic ornaments at the ends of verses and phrases (cadences). The marginal notes of the Masoretic Text and the reader’s manuals refer to this kind of chant— not to the much more ornate style that developed with the rise of professional cantors in Europe.

2. The syntax of the *te`amim* as a notational system is parallel to and shares information in common with the syntax of the Hebrew verbal text.

From the perspective of exegesis, some *te`amim* graphemes are found at the end of verses and phrases and some within phrases (i.e., there are *disjunctive* and *conjunctive graphemes*). Yet also, some graphemes are found above, some below the words (i.e., there are *superlinear* and *sublinear graphemes*). Moreover, there is no strict relationship between the placement of a grapheme above or below the words and its placement at the end of a verse or phrase. In fact entire verses may be marked by sublinear graphemes only, and entire half-verses and phrases too, while only certain phrases may be marked by superlinear graphemes only. This implies that complete musical phrases may be marked by sublinear graphemes, but not by superlinear graphemes.

Already one comes to what looks like a *reductio ad absurdum*, disproving premise 1) (the *te`amim* are *primarily* exegetical), for this finding implies the *musical* function predominates. In order to save the first premise, one must add another:

3. The placement of graphemes above and below the words is both grammatically and musically irrelevant.

One sublinear grapheme, the vertical *silluq* (“end, final”), is found marking the final stressed syllable at the end of virtually every verse. It would therefore be the strongest “disjunctive”. Well and good. But an identical grapheme, by far the most common of all when taken with *silluq* (or even alone), is found on the lesser stressed syllables in words found everywhere within phrases and at the end of phrases and verses. The grapheme itself is found in close association with every other grapheme (even commonly on the same word with *silluq* itself, sometimes twice). Once again we come to an apparent absurdity: how can the same grapheme be the strongest “disjunctive” in one place and be anything *but* a “disjunctive” (or even a “conjunctive”) everywhere else?¹⁰ Once again we are forced to add an assumption:

4. Graphemes with the same form but different placements within a verse must have different functions and therefore represent different “accents” or *te`amim*.

This premise comes up repeatedly when dealing with other graphemes, both in prosody and in its psalmodic subset.¹¹ And so in this case, the grapheme is called by its ancestral name (*silluq*)

¹⁰ Thus when this grapheme is found anywhere but on the last stressed syllable of a verse, it is called *ga`ya* or *meteg* and alleged to be unrelated to *silluq*.

¹¹ Notorious in this respect is *munach*, which has no less than *five* different grammatical functions attributed to it by the later Masoretic “reader’s manuals” and by the later forms of synagogue chant as well. Some of those functions are supposed to be more or less disjunctive, others more or less

when found at the very end of a verse and *ga`ya* or *meteg* everywhere else (even if found once or twice on the same word as *silluq*); and the two are assigned completely different meanings in the Masoretic paradigm.

In some cases one finds graphemes which are found both above and below the words. These are not difficult to distinguish by their position as separate *te`amim*. But sometimes a sublinear grapheme is found in the same grammatical position as a superlinear grapheme, yet it has a different form and is placed on a different syllable indicating a different rhythm. In such a case, it is assumed to have the same grammatical function and a slightly different musical function. Thus we have yet another premise:

5. Graphemes with different forms but similar placements within a verse must have similar functions and therefore represent musical variants of the same “accent” or *ta`am*.

One could go further, and show that the Masoretic paradigm does not attempt to explain (in most cases) the exact forms of the various graphemes, their placements relative to a syllable, their exact order (in the case of the conjunctives) within a phrase, or even the meaning of their ancestral names.

Rather, the paradigm itself redefines graphemes which by all indications were once but one *ta`am* as two or more *te`amim*, or vice versa, and renames them accordingly, thus giving more names to the overall system than there are graphemes in the system.

The Masoretes themselves and their successors only knew of the simplest forms of synagogue chant, and attempted to define a very few graphemes as markers of it (the lists of what grapheme represents what musical meaning vary from source to source). Once the notation itself was published, the synagogues step by step adopted their chants to fit the rules the Masoretes and grammarians derived for the notation. The process proceeded farthest among the Ashkenazic Jews of Europe, in the Torah reading. Such chants can by no logic (and despite frequent claims to the contrary) represent the *original* musical meaning of the *te`amim*.

Other deciphering paradigms

Since at least the Renaissance, many have concluded that the Masoretes, grammarians and synagogues did not preserve the original meaning of the “Tiberian” *te`amim* and have sought to decipher them independently. Their efforts failed, however, in that they either did not start from the correct premise as to the significance of the notation or they did not start with the correct

conjunctive. The secondary names attributed to the *ta`am* are supposed to denote these untranslatable nuances of function. In modern treatises only two names are generally given, *munach* and *legarmeh*.

“virtual bilingual” with which to compare it. Many indeed realized the notation was primarily musical rather than exegetical, but their standard of comparison was synagogue chant, or one or another form of Christian chant, or even the music theory of their own day (or of their own imaginations). One modern Hebraist began with the Hebrew verbal text as his standard of comparison, but assumed the accentuation was a marker of simple vocal inflection rather than of melody.

These attempts have failed for the same reason we know (or ought to know) that the Masoretic paradigm has failed: *none of these deciphering paradigms explain all the salient features of the notation or of its relationship to the words*. Were such standards applied to a notation found by archaeologists, the results would universally be held as questionable to say the least.

The musical paradigm

Given this perspective, the late Suzanne Haik-Vantoura started from the following premises, which constitute a new beginning-point:

1. The *te`amim* are both musical and exegetical, but the *musical* function is primary;
2. The syntax of the *te`amim* as a notational system is parallel to and shares information in common with the syntax of the Hebrew verbal text.

As analyzed under these premises, the first thing that one notices is the sublinear and superlinear placement of the graphemes. Entire verses, half-verses and phrases of the Bible are annotated with sublinear graphemes, which means that their function predominates musically over that of the superlinear graphemes. The sublinear graphemes may therefore be deciphered first as a set.

As it happens, there are eight common sublinear graphemes, three of which are found most commonly on or near cadences (the ends of verses and phrases: the major “disjunctive” points). One of these (the most common grapheme of all) is found at the end of every verse, but also in combination with every other grapheme in places all over the verse. It is also found repeated several times on a word, especially at the ends of verses. A grapheme that has so many different placements and associations in a musical verse can only represent a single note: by definition, the *tonic or final degree* of a musical scale. This suggests that all the other sublinear graphemes are likewise notes of a scale. Yet there are *eight* common sublinear graphemes in prosody and *seven* of them in psalmody. This too is strongly suggestive. Eight is the number of degrees in a normal octave. Seven is an octave minus one degree, significant of itself. Does the Hebrew verbal syntax support the idea that the eight common sublinear graphemes of prosody are degrees of a scale?

As it turns out, indeed it does. Upon testing thousands of verses, Haik-Vantoura determined that *silluq* (the vertical grapheme), *atnach* (found at the half-cadences) and *munach* (found at the suspensive cadences and also within phrases) are the 1st, 4th and 5th degrees of a tonal scale, respectively. Their placement and function within a verse or phrase fit the *natural proclivities* of those degrees as the human ear perceives them. We already know that the 1st or tonic is where the verse ends (and often begins); this is only natural. Yet it is equally natural for the melody to return to the tonic again and again in order to “bridle” its flow on a word or syllable, or to repeat the tonic note two or three times on a word for emphasis. Likewise the 4th degree is naturally suited to *divide* a verse, or to *define* the antecedent of what follows in a verse. Whereas the 5th degree indicates either a *suspension* (at the cadence) or a *continuation* (within a phrase), acting musically as a “dominant” in either case.

Thanks to the use of interminable statistical tables¹² and to rigorous comparison of hypotheses with the Hebrew verbal syntax, Haik-Vantoura was able to eliminate one possible meaning after another for each sublinear grapheme in prosody and to put them in proper order within the scale.¹³ With that additional framework in mind, she was able to decipher the superlinear graphemes one by one, still against the Hebrew verbal syntax. The psalmodic system (which shares many graphemes with the prosodic system) was deciphered in like manner. The resulting deciphering key (first published in 1976 in book and LP form) correlates the written form, the ancestral name and the musical meaning of each *ta`am* as defined by the musical paradigm. Upon examination, I discovered that the existing descriptions of the hand-gestures behind the graphemes also correlated with the graphemes’ names, forms and musical meanings, giving me enough information to reconstruct the entire original chironomy.¹⁴

Summary of the mechanics of the musical system

1. The sublinear graphemes represent *degrees of the scale*. When one is written, its value is sustained on that syllable and all the following syllables until another sublinear sign appears.

¹² These were parallel to those that must have lain behind the Masoretic readers’ manuals, as the latter have lists of what “*te`amim*” as defined by the Masoretic paradigm may follow in what order and where examples of such sequences are found.

¹³ In time she was able to do likewise for the rare sublinear graphemes within prosody and psalmody. James D. Price pointed out an error in her decipherment of the rare sublinear sign in prosody, merkha ketufah; it is a combination of two common sublinear graphemes, not of a sublinear and superlinear sign as Haik-Vantoura thought. Once corrected according to Dr. Price’s input, however, the resulting melodic interpretation was greatly improved.

¹⁴ As published on my web site, kingdavidsharp.com.

2. The superlinear graphemes represent *melodic ornaments of one to three notes* on the syllables they mark. Their pitch is always relative to that of the preceding sublinear sign. For example, *zaqef qaton* always means “go down one note from that indicated by the preceding sublinear grapheme”. If it follows *munach* (5th degree), it means “go down to the 4th degree”. If it follows *silluq*¹⁵, it means “go down to the 7th degree below the 1st degree.”
3. In prosody, the tonic note is on the 3rd degree of the octave (not on the 1st and 8th as in modern Western music). In psalmody, the tonic note is on the 2nd degree (the bottom two graphemes of the prosodic scale having been removed and replaced by another grapheme).
4. In prosody, the rhythm is that of normal speech somewhat magnified. In psalmody, the rhythm is one beat per syllable, rather like Gregorian chant. This is inferred by the relationship of the verbal rhythm to the melodic syncopation, as there are no special rhythmic graphemes in the *te`amim*.
5. Like many ancient notations (especially those transcribing chironomy), the *te`amim* only define the genre of the scale,¹⁶ not the mode or scale type¹⁷ used in any one text. Fortunately, the system was evidently designed so that the experienced reader may infer the modality by how the melody relates to the verbal grammar.¹⁸ The wrong “mode” (and there are very few possible choices in any given text) will give too much emphasis to unimportant words and not enough to important ones. The right mode will not only give the proper grammatical emphasis, but it will also make the verbal meaning of the words “come alive”.
6. The “resolution” of the ornaments must sometimes be inferred as well. Here again, the system was evidently designed so that the experienced reader will quickly reconstruct

¹⁵ Which, remember, is one and the same as “*ga`ya*” in Haik-Vantoura’s paradigm.

¹⁶ Technically, either “diatonic” or “diatonic-chromatic”: essentially the diatonic scale, but with the possibility of “altering” some notes. Imagine playing on the white keys of the piano to get the basic scale, yet being able to replace, say, G with G sharp to get the “mode” so characteristic of the reconstructed Pentateuch chant and of much Jewish folk music to this day.

¹⁷ C D E F G A B C is a different *mode* or scale “type” from C D E F# G A B C, even though the scale “genre” is the same (diatonic/diatonic-chromatic).

¹⁸ In fact the melodic modality and the verbal grammar are closely parallel and share common information.

the right rendition; the ornamentation (as part of the overall rhythmic syncopation of the melody) is related to the verbal accentuation¹⁹ and also to the punctuation.

Summary of the implications of Haik-Vantoura's thesis

Space forbids more than a brief summary of the implications of Haik-Vantoura's work. Among the most important are the following:

1. The melodies preserved by the *te'amim* (in the Letteris Edition, Haik-Vantoura's base text) are structurally interwoven with the words they support in such a way that they form a *syntactical whole*: what the ancient Greeks called a *melos* (a "gestalt" of music and words).²⁰
2. The existence of such a *melos* indicates that the melodies and words were written by the same authors at the same time and transmitted together accurately. In effect, the musical system formed part of the "fence around the Torah" that kept it from becoming seriously corrupted by scribal errors.
3. The *melos* found in various books reflects not only the personalities of their various authors, but the historical circumstances in which they live, as their own works and those of others describe them. As with any poet-composer at any time, the various biblical authors (especially Moses and David) had certain idiosyncratic preferences in musical and lyrical style.
4. The *melos* of the Hebrew Bible confirms the essential unity of each of the biblical books, sections or chapters that are ascribed to one author (e.g., the Pentateuch, the Psalms of David and of other Psalmists, Isaiah, the Song of Songs, etc., etc.). It also shows links between different books or chapters ascribed to the same author, even across the lines of prosody and psalmody (e.g., the Song of Songs, Proverbs, Psalm 127 and Ecclesiastes by Solomon, or the Song of the Ark, The Bow and many Psalms by David).
5. The rediscovered melodies enable us to address exegetical questions that have hitherto remained debatable, even insoluble (some simple examples being the technical musical terms of the Psalms, the validity of their titles, and *selah*, a sung exclamation which is now definable as "Weigh this!").

¹⁹ Again, the two are closely parallel and share common information.

²⁰ Such vocal music is called "melogenic". Music with such characteristics is by definition the music of high culture in any time and place.

6. The rediscovered melodic system fits not only what we know of the *conducting systems* of antiquity, but the *harp and lyre tuning and playing techniques* of antiquity.
7. The rediscovered melodic system confirms that there were *two* levels of sacred music in ancient Israel, particularly in the Second Temple period: that of the Temple (professional music, and therefore melogenic), and that of the synagogue (primitive or folk music, and therefore either logogenic, pathogenic or a mixture of the two).²¹
8. The rediscovered melodic system shows that there was indeed an *indirect* link between Temple music, the most ancient forms of synagogue music and early Christian music. Pilgrims to the Temple heard, remembered, and took with them fragments of the Temple music to their local synagogues, and the early Christians picked up those fragments either there or on their own visits to the Temple.²²
9. The rediscovered melodic system allows us to discuss *common threads* between the various forms of art music of antiquity and later periods leading to the present. In particular, the rediscovered music contains compositional techniques apparently lost at the end of classical antiquity and not rediscovered in the West until the Renaissance and Baroque periods. It also allows us to address afresh the question of *ethos* or “moral force” in music, as important for the practicing sacred or secular musician as it is for the philosopher or historian.

For the purposes of BIBAL’s Psalms Project, it is especially important that in Haik-Vantoura’s paradigm, no *ta`am* is *strictly* “disjunctive” or “conjunctive”. This definition (which comes from the Masoretic paradigm) is actually far too simplistic. One may indeed find the same *ta`am* used in different places with different functions. For that matter, there are fairly frequent cases where the sequence of *te`amim* leading up to a particular *ta`am* would lead you to expect (from examples elsewhere) that the last *ta`am* would be “conjunctive”, yet the *ta`am* actually acts as a “disjunctive”. Reverse cases are also known to exist.

Rather than being a hierarchy of “disjunctives” and “conjunctives” as such, the melodic system is a complex of *four* (defined another way, *five*) interacting factors which influence one’s understanding of verbal meaning. For example, the *degree of the scale* that marks the cadence

²¹ That is, either completely dominated by the words (logogenic), completely dominated by melodic ornaments (pathogenic), or oscillating between the two extremes without becoming either (yet never becoming melogenic for that matter).

²² Nevertheless most of the many parallels between ancient synagogue and ancient church music cannot be traced back to the Temple. Much of both must have been borrowed from the Gentiles, as history records and as comparative musicology affirms.

of a verse, half-verse or phrase marks the punctuation point of that cadence. Yet the *sequence of degrees* leading up to that cadence (the melodic *texture*, parallel to the verbal *state of action*) influences how one is to understand that punctuation point (as a comma, period, semicolon, question mark, exclamation point, etc.).

Reception of Haik-Vantoura's thesis

When Haik-Vantoura's original French book was first published, it included the preliminary reviews of a very long list of renowned specialists in France and Israel: musicians, composers, musicologists and even Hebraists and Masoretic scholars. Some of the latter (including Gerard E. Weil²³) even acknowledged with the rest the expressiveness of the musical results and its correlation with certain forms of synagogue chant. The 1978 edition of the book received the Prix Bernier, the highest award of the Institute of France.

One of the most notable respondents was the late Chief Rabbi of France, Jacob Kaplan, renowned for his knowledge of Jewish tradition and his personal character. As he wrote in his reply, and as Mme. Haik-Vantoura and her translator Dennis Weber clarified for me, he put his *full weight of Rabbinic authority* behind her work— and he was *astonished* (as Dr. Weber told me) that others did not follow suit. As one reads on Haik-Vantoura's own Web site, the Rabbinic community in Europe and Israel— though *not* the musical community in those places to my knowledge— has essentially turned its back on her work at this point.²⁴

Reception in America of Haik-Vantoura's work among the Jewish, Christian and academic communities has likewise been mixed. In 1985 I attended the one American concert sponsored by Haik-Vantoura (in San Francisco) and met her and Dr. Weber for the first and only time. As they told me, and as I noted myself, some were skeptical and some were interested indeed. As one rabbi in the latter category said, "If this were not the music of the Temple, *it should have been!*" "The problem is getting 100 rabbis to say that," added Haik-Vantoura.²⁵ Yet since the publication of other recordings and the 1991 English book, plus articles by myself in various journals, interest in the subject has been growing.

²³ Who told her in writing that her work was "very dangerous" to his own computer-based analysis, which assumed the *te'amim* are *non-musical* and which was based strictly on the Masoretic paradigm.

²⁴ What Dr. Benjamin Dufchesne, who was interviewed in 1986 by NPR on Haik-Vantoura's work, thinks now is anyone's guess. He was then head of the Rabbinical School in Paris, and was deeply impressed (as was his audiences) by Haik-Vantoura's renditions on the first recording.

²⁵ Again, different cantors I've encountered have had different reactions— mostly positive, but not all (at least in the technical sense). Few indeed, though, have had anything but praise for the beauty of my own renditions of the reconstructed music. For my part, I published an article in a respected journal, *The Journal of Jewish Music and Liturgy*, which seems to have been well-received.

Besides myself, Esther Lamandier in France and Haik-Vantoura's longtime assistant Gilles Tiar in Israel continue to perform Haik-Vantoura's music. SAVAE, an early music ensemble in San Antonio, Texas, has recently released a recording (*Ancient Echoes*) containing a creative rendition of the "Priestly Blessing" (Numbers 6) by Haik-Vantoura, and may do more of her *oeuvre* in the future. Among music and Bible teachers, Dr. Frank Garlock and Dr. Samuel Bacchiochi (among several others) in the United States have mentioned the work with great favor. The Associates for Biblical Research and Southwest Radio Church, among the first to announce Haik-Vantoura's work in the U.S., have been very supportive. Sales of and interest in the one recording still available in the U.S. have been good and consistent for that genre of recording, even so many years after its original publication.

My own assessment of the response to Haik-Vantoura's thesis is this: To the extent that reviewers have understood the historical and musical logic behind her decipherment, *to that extent* they have supported her results.²⁶ One suspects that "preferring old wine to new" has as much to do with the negative reception of many as anything, for one has to unlearn literally *millennia* of false assumptions to "get to the heart" of the matter musically and historically. Haik-Vantoura, having never learned those assumptions in the first place,²⁷ has done what *no one else* has done: given a complete, coherent and simple explanation of the features of the "Tiberian" accentuation and its relationship to the words.

Future research

In closing, it must be said that besides the publication of more biblical texts (and the republication of others), the greatest need in the academic sense is research on the background of the Letteris Edition used by Haik-Vantoura. I have compared its accentuation in a number of critical places, especially in Psalms, with the Ginsberg Edition, the BHS, the old Rabbinic Bible (Ben Chayyim text), the Snaith Edition, and a number of other editions both ancient and modern. Of all of these, only the Ginsberg Edition is reasonably close overall to Letteris, and even there it has significant variants in Psalms. Yet in virtually every case, the reading in Letteris is superior under Haik-Vantoura's key to that of any other edition. This does not seem to be an artifact of the analysis, for there is always the syntax and meaning of the verbal text to use as a cross-check— and generally the variants themselves are "law-abiding" within the rules

²⁶ Even James D. Price admits this. On the one hand, he has stated that most of his fellow Hebraists don't accept Haik-Vantoura's thesis because it flies in the face of synagogue chant. On the other hand, he acknowledges that most Hebraists don't have the musical background to follow her logic.

²⁷ While she grew up in the synagogue community, she herself was a Reform Jew. She started not from the Orthodox perspective, but from that of French musicologists at the time (as published in, of all things, a French encyclopedia of music): the *te`amim* are ancient, musical and (then) of unknown meaning.

of the accentuation. Why is Letteris so superior²⁸ even to Leningradensis, the second-oldest complete Masoretic manuscript extant?²⁹

Dr. Norman Snaith (editor of the Snaith Edition) suggested in an old article that a particular 11th-century manuscript now in Germany might have been the source text used by Meir ha-Levi Letteris in the late 1800's. A seminarian friend persuaded the relevant museum to make a microfiche of the MS. and to loan it, and I was able to compare it with Letteris. As Snaith indicated, it had accentual readings found in Letteris that are found in no other printed edition seen by either of us. However, the manuscript itself is so non-standard³⁰ that I judge it could not possibly be the source of the Letteris Edition. That edition appears from internal evidence to be *self-consistent* in its spelling, vowelization and accentuation, suggesting a single-manuscript source; yet we do not know what that source is now.

With that particular problem solved, much could be investigated not only in terms of reconstructing the "music of the Bible" and its exegetical significance, but in terms of textual criticism of the accentuation of the Masoretic Text itself. I do not think one person, or one lifetime, will begin to address all the questions that could be raised on the technical level.

Conclusion

Nevertheless, the evidence we have is consistent with this conclusion: *The Hebrew Bible was created, taught and transmitted as a specialized form of "art song"*. It was written not by merely literary authors but by *inspired poet-composers*, who used *universal principles of music composition* for a *specific purpose* in a *specific culture*. It was originally meant to be *sung aloud*, and in principle to *plucked-string accompaniment* (Psalm 119:54), just as the New Testament in principle was originally meant to be *read aloud* (Revelation 1:3).

²⁸ Leaving aside certain obvious typographical errors which Haik-Vantoura followed scrupulously in her scores.

²⁹ I don't have a facsimile of the Aleppo Codex, the oldest complete MS. before it was partially burned. Haik-Vantoura was able to compare Letteris with such a facsimile, found at the National Library in Paris, checking places I recommended to her and finding matches between the two there. (It may be that in terms of accentuation, Letteris' source MS. may be superior even to the Aleppo Codex, though they seem to be similar overall in that respect.) She had also made comparisons of her own with the Bomberg Bible and the Codex of the Prophets before her French book was published. The Letteris Edition was recommended by none other than Gerard E. Weil, whose own source text was the BHS.

³⁰ Not only does it omit words in important places, but it has the so-called "expanded Tiberian pointing", a non-standard accentuation which uses additional graphemes and unorthodox sequences of graphemes. It is known that the "Tiberian" notation at first intermingled with the Palestinian and Babylonian notations before finally supplanting them. Is this MS. an example of such a "mixed" MS.?

Not merely the Psalms and songs of the Hebrew Bible are “vocal music”, then. The entire Hebrew Masoretic Text, “from Moses to Chronicles” (or “from Moses to Malachi”, in the Christian canonical order), has that distinction.