

Religious Ambiguity in the Life and Works of Ernest Bloch

DAVID Z. KUSHNER

As a young man on the threshold of a career, Ernest Bloch was forced by circumstances to confront his innermost beliefs about religion. In a letter to his parents, he writes as follows:

I am certainly not a believer, nor an atheist either. I find it as absurd to want to *prove* there is a God as to prove there that there isn't. One will never know except that Man is miserable, full of vanity, wicked and false, who reverts back to the beast when he is let free. The anarchists make an *angel* of him!

No, I myself believe in a certain fatality, a harmony of the whole *which makes me accept all that happens*, but which will not stop me from recriminating. That's why I am furious when I get upset at the past. What is, is, and was meant to be. To find out if God exists or not is not my business or anybody else's. In any case, if He exists it isn't the fellow that religions portray.

He must be great and impassive like Nature and her elements. I become Pantheist!¹

The remainder of this two-part letter attempts to console his parents and asks them to accept their daughter's decision, as to do otherwise would destroy her happiness.

Bloch also offers other insights into his own thinking:

¹ Ernest Bloch expressed his views on religion on 8 May 1900, at the age of 19, in a letter to his parents. Written in Frankfurt, where he was then studying with Ivan Knorr, the letter was prompted by the news that his sister Louette, five years his senior, was planning to have her baby girl baptized in the Calvinist faith.

... You know for a long time that I admire deeply the doctrine of Christ and that I admire Jesus from the depth of my heart, as being the *only* man who conformed and acted by his principles—the only one who practiced what he preached. And I affirm that *nobody* since he existed has truly followed his precepts, *nobody*, absolutely *nobody*, and he who does not scrupulously carry out the acts of a doctrine cannot pretend to be an adherent of that doctrine. Therefore, in spite of the epithet “Christian,” nobody in the world is one.²

After pursuing his studies further in Munich and in Paris, and witnessing the premiere in the latter city of his lyric drama, *Macbeth*, on 30 November 1910, and the resultant intrigues and cabals,³ the disillusioned musician returned to Geneva, where he worked in the family store selling tourist merchandise. He conducted orchestral concerts in Lausanne and Neuchâtel, and resumed his discussion of Jewish concerns with Edmond Fleg.⁴

Fleg, a writer of poems, plays, and essays, provided the French-texted libretto for Bloch’s *Macbeth* as well as the French translations for the composer’s settings of *Psalms 114, 137, and 22*. As early as 1906, Bloch wrote a revelatory letter to his collaborator:

The original letter is in the Ernest Bloch Collection in the Library of Congress. Excerpts, translated from the French by Suzanne Bloch, appear in the *Ernest Bloch Society Bulletin* 13 (1981): 1.

² Ibid.

³ Among the reviewers who saw positive and promising attributes in *Macbeth* see Pierre Lalo, “La Musique,” *Le Temps*, 31 December 1910, 3; and Ildebrando Pizzetti, “Ernest Bloch,” *Musicisti Contemporanei* (Milan: Fratelli Treves, 1914), 193, 210. For historical data on the opera see David Z. Kushner, “The Revivals of Bloch’s *Macbeth*,” *Opera Journal* 4, no. 2 (Spring 1971): 9-12; and Frank Kinkaid, “The Other *Macbeth*,” *Opera News* 37, no. 25 (May 1973): 10-11.

⁴ Fleg (1874-1963), whose original name was Flegenheimer, like Bloch, was born in Geneva. He, too, was estranged from his birth-religion of Judaism until the confluence of the Dreyfus affair and his burgeoning interest in Zionism. Bloch had initially established a friendship with Fleg in Geneva in 1901, and renewed the relationship during his time in Paris between 1903-04.

My dear friend...I have read the Bible—I have read fragments about Moses. And an immense sense of pride has been surging within me! My entire being reverberated. It is a revelation. I shall find myself again in this—I could not continue reading, for I was afraid. Yes, Fleg, I was afraid of discovering too much of myself, of feeling everything which had gradually accumulated, glued to me, fall away in one sudden blow; of finding myself naked again, naked within this entire past which lives inside me, of standing erect as a Jew proudly Jewish...and of no longer being able to stand the conditions in which I live...⁵

To some extent, Bloch had come back to his roots. After all, his paternal grandfather, Isaak Joseph Bloch, was a *Baal Tefillah* and a leader of the small Jewish community in Lengnau in the mid-nineteenth century.⁶ But following his Bar Mitzvah, he seems to have had little interest in Jewish religion or culture. While many commentators have cited the reawakening of his heritage, it is instructive to note what became a life-long ambivalence toward his religion. In the same year in which he penned the declaration of assertiveness regarding his Jewishness to Fleg, at the urging of his friend Robert Godet (1866-1950) he bought a large wooden crucifix in an antiquarian shop in Berne, Switzerland.⁷ The latter, who had written favorably about the two movements of the composer's *Symphony in C-sharp minor* that were performed in Basle in 1903, established a decade-long friendship with Bloch. In that same fateful year, 1906, Godet urged Bloch to express his Jewish lineage musically. Thus it was that the

⁵ An extract from Suzanne Bloch, program notes for a performance of the *Sacred Service* at Lincoln Center, New York, on 7 December 1969, p. 2.

⁶ An engraving of the Lengnau cemetery and its wall appears on the cover of the *Ernest Bloch Society Bulletin* 21-22 (1989-90). The same publication (p. 30) contains a photo of the cemetery by Ernest Bloch in which the Hebrew-lettered tombstones are clearly visible.

⁷ Godet, a Swiss journalist and essayist, maintained a personal relationship with Bloch between

friendships with Fleg and Godet converged, but from opposing directions, to create in Bloch a new awareness of his inner self. Bloch had wondered why Godet had been so insistent on the purchase of the Christ statue. Some years later he received in the mail a book Godet had been translating into French, Houston Stewart Chamberlain's *Die Grundlagen des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts* (1899). Stunned by the book's content, in particular the theories regarding Aryan racial superiority and the negative attributes ascribed to Jews, Bloch, feeling as though he were serving as Godet's guinea pig to test Chamberlain's theses, severed all ties with his "friend." The statue, which symbolized for Bloch the suffering of all humanity, remained with him throughout his life.⁸

Bloch's flirtation with this admixture of Christological and Judaic theology and his fomenting a Blochian view of universalism in all matters reached the level of a fixation by the time Bloch had established himself in the United States. He is quoted in an interview with Cesar Saerchinger as saying to a lady who had noted the apparent incongruity of the Christ statue in his New York apartment, "My dear Madam—yes, it is true that I am a Jew. But I should be equally proud to call myself a Christian. For He is to me only the symbol of that Christianity which both Jew and Gentile strive to attain. Who, indeed, will have the temerity to call himself Christian...?"⁹ And yet, on 3 April 1918, Bloch attended services at an old Orthodox synagogue on the Lower East Side of New York in the company of Dr. and Mrs. Judah Magnes. In a letter to his mother, dated 5 April, he reveals his deeply felt impressions of a group of some fifty Hassidim chanting the service in a spartan room with well-worn tables and chairs. He also recalls the dinner

1903-13. Godet's letters to the composer are in the Ernest Bloch Collection in the Library of Congress.

⁸ The Bloch family donated the Christ statue to the organ studio of the Juilliard School of Music in 1971. See Suzanne Bloch, "Bloch and His Crucifix," *Ernest Bloch Society Bulletin* (1971): 1-2.

that followed at the *rebbe's* house, and the warmth and sincerity of the relatives who visited on that memorable Sabbath. Bloch's letter is instructive, too; in it he informs his mother that the service was for the "last days of Easter,"¹⁰ and that he remembered his Hebrew name, "Yitzrock (sic) ben Meier."¹¹

At the close of this letter, the composer expresses his joy at experiencing a vital part of his roots and the hope "to go often, to submerge myself there, if they are willing to accept me. It is another world, which can help me to support the one in which we have to live every day."¹² As was so many times the case thereafter, the exuberance of the moment was just that, a fleeting fancy upon which he did not act.

From the Cleveland Institute of Music, where he served as Director (1920-25), he wrote to Fleg (30 May 1923) about his desire to compose a symbolical Mass, a continuation of his symphony, *Israel*, which would include Gregorian themes, Lutheran chorales, and motifs from his "Jewish Cycle." He expanded these thoughts in a letter to Ada Clement two years later:

The last movement conceived in 1914 and of which I have sketches, was meant to signify "next year in Jerusalem" but in a symbolic sense. The triumph of TRUTH and JUSTICE and PEACE ON EARTH. At the end the Bass would come in front of the stage and proclaim a CREDO embodying my own idea of Judaism, of
Humanity:

⁹ Cesar Saerchinger, "America, the Land of Promise and Fulfillment for One of Switzerland's Most Gifted Sons," *Musical America* 28 (7 September 1918): 5-6.

¹⁰ The complete letter, translated from the French by Charles C. Cushing, then President of the Ernest Bloch Society, appears in the *Ernest Bloch Society Bulletin* 7 (1984): 2. It should be mentioned here that Cushing mistranslated the French word for Passover, *pâque*, as Easter, the French spelling of which is *Pâques*.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² *Ibid.*

“Here ENDS Israel...but here begins the realization of its ideals which are those of all Humanity, according to the great prophets!”—proclaiming the Unity of Humanity, and a chorus would end with a hymn of Peace and Love.

...This MASS, which would bring my excommunication from among the Jews, the Protestants, the Catholics, would be a tremendous thing. The text of the Mass contains the whole philosophy of Life. The KYRIE would embody all the sufferings of Man since the beginnings of the world. The struggles in the darkness, the appeals to God “Why hast thou forsaken me?” (...)

Then I could realize my whole philosophy of life and thought.

Shall I ever be able to do it? I do not know. I am despairing!—*Voilà l’histoire d’ISRAEL*.¹³

When Bloch returned to Europe, after five years as Director of the San Francisco Conservatory of Music, his first—and most serious—creative effort was the composition of the *Avodath Hakodesh*. It was this vehicle that forced him to confront his deepest feelings about religion in general and Judaism in particular. An intimate Hebrew expression, *Abodah*, written for the prodigy, Yehudi Menuhin, who gave it its world premiere on 5 December 1928 in San Francisco’s Exposition Auditorium, was a miniature prelude, perhaps, to the gigantic challenge that he now faced as a composer and as a Jew.

As Bloch settled down in Roveredo-Capriasca in the small Italianate canton of Ticino, his first task was to undertake a study of the Hebrew language, a tongue that he barely recalled from his Bar Mitzvah preparation. Because Cantor Reuben Rinder, who

¹³ Quoted in Suzanne Bloch, “The MASS Bloch Never Wrote,” *Ernest Bloch Society Bulletin* (1972): 1.

was to have helped him in this task, was indisposed owing to an accident, he was forced to accept this challenge as a personal one.¹⁴ As the *Sacred Service* was intended for the Reform Temple Emanu-El in San Francisco, the text draws from the Davidic *Psalms*, *Deuteronomy*, *Exodus*, *Isaiah*, and *Proverbs*. The composer's fervor is expressed in a letter to Ada Clements and Lillian Hodghead:

It far surpasses a Jewish Service now. It has become a cosmic poem, a glorification of the Laws of the Universe...I intend, besides the *Service*, to write a great orchestral choral work with it...I do not care any more what people will say...I do not wish it for the Jews—who will probably fight it...not for the critics, not for the “Tradition”! It has become a private affair between God and me.¹⁵

These words illustrate the hyperbolic flights that Bloch sometimes took when in the throes of high optimism or creative energy. They also reveal, yet again, the zigzag approach he had always taken toward religion. In the *Sacred Service* the only music that derives explicitly from the Jewish service is the *Tzur Yisroel*. It is of more than passing interest to observe the artist's references to Christian, specifically Roman Catholic, musical and religious traditions when attempting to proffer analogies to the Jewish service. In his letter to Cantor Rinder (26 November 1930),¹⁶ he points out that he sees *Hakodosh boruch hu* (The Lord be praised) as “a kind of Jewish *Magnificat*.” He elaborates on this theme by stating that, although the *Service*'s opening motif is herein

¹⁴ Reuben Rinder was cantor at Temple Emanu-El in San Francisco during the time Bloch was associated with the San Francisco Conservatory of Music.

¹⁵ Quoted in Suzanne Bloch and Irene Heskes, *Ernest Bloch: Creative Spirit* (New York: Jewish Music Council of the National Jewish Welfare Board, 1976), 74.

¹⁶ The letter is in the Cantor Reuben R. Rinder Collection in the Western Jewish History Center in Berkeley, California.

employed, there is a relationship to the Gregorian *Magnificat* “most probably originating in the Synagogue in Jerusalem and which I will restore to Us!”¹⁷

Later in the same letter he refers to the *Kaddish* as the *Doxology*. While the texts of both center on the praise of God, the context is dramatically dissimilar. The Jewish prayer for the deceased is surely not commensurate, for example, with the Protestant (“Praise God from Whom all blessings flow”) or the Catholic (“*Gloria in excelsis*,” the greater doxology, or “*Gloria patri*,” the lesser doxology), liturgical practices in which the term doxology is applied. With respect to the final two stanzas of the closing hymn, *Adon Olam* (Lord of All), the composer tells the Cantor that “this is our Christianity, the God near man, and not in need of taking a human shape, of being crucified.”¹⁸

The explanation of the text rendered to Rinder is quite different from the one he offered to his audience at a lecture he gave at the San Francisco Conservatory of Music on 16 September 1933.¹⁹ On that occasion, before a general audience, he spoke about the *Adon Olam* as follows: “...Then the Christianity comes in, God becoming more in the shape of man—He is my God, my Living Liberator.”²⁰ Albert Weisser construed this statement²¹ as affirmation that Bloch often made confusing and paradoxical statements about his religious convictions. It appears to this writer that the composer provided Cantor Rinder with the kind of Jewish perspective that he knew Rinder would welcome; yet, to the general populace, he felt impelled to inject a Christological influence.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ The lecture, which was recorded by a stenographer, is in the library of the San Francisco Conservatory of Music; it is printed in its entirety in Robert Strassburg, *Ernest Bloch, Voice in the Wilderness* (Los Angeles: The Trident Shop, California State University, 1977), 136-42.

²⁰ Ibid., 142.

²¹ Albert Weisser, “Jewish Music in Twentieth-Century United States: Four Representative Figures” (Doctor of Sacred Music diss., The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1980), 57.

Bloch's naiveté regarding Judaism is matched by an equal naiveté regarding the world's political realities in 1934. In New York for the American premiere of the *Sacred Service*, he gave an interview to *The New York Times* in which he opined:

...The phenomenon of Germany is bigger than the treatment of the Jews...A movement as profound as the Lutheran Reformation is taking place. I greatly respect Hitler's sincerity. He believes wholly and disinterestedly in what he is doing. He is a fanatic, if you will, on fire with his cause, but certainly not an opportunist making political capital. But to label him and his movement merely as anti-Jewish is inaccurate; the movement goes much further back; its Jewish aspect is discernible in H. S. Chamberlain's Genesis of the Nineteenth Century...²²

Bloch seems oblivious to the fact that only a year previous to these comments the Nazi regime had passed laws enabling them to oust Jews from positions in government and cultural institutions.²³ Either he suppressed knowledge of such events or he was, for whatever reasons, unaware of them.

As Bloch's words paint him as ambivalent and ambiguous about his Judaism, many commentators, composers, and performing musicians seemed bent on pinning a Jewish label on him, although the means by which they did this vary in intent and in the degree to which they ascribe Bloch's faith in Judaism. Ernest Newman, for example, who saw the intended universality in the *Sacred Service*, nevertheless observes a conflict between the musician's heart and mind. This apparent paradox is seen in the settings of the *Shema*, wherein the augmented fourth (A-D-sharp) concludes the text, "O hear, Israel,

²² "Bloch, Composer, Here to Conduct," *The New York Times* (27 March 1934), p. 24.

²³ See Lucy S. Davidowicz, *The Jewish Presence: Essays in Identity and History* (New York:

Our God, our creator, our God is One.” Newman hears the tritone as a question rather than as a statement of conviction, but he seems not to hear the note of resolution, E. This type of accentuation and resolution appears in too many compositions by this composer to be regarded as signifying, as Newman would have it in this instance, that Bloch, “in his heart of hearts, had little belief in his own words of faith and hope.”²⁴ These words, of course, are not Bloch’s, and the admitted questioning of faith can easily be found, not in the intervallic choices in certain passages, but in the artist’s *own* words.

Paul Rosenfeld, a one-time champion of Bloch’s music, found the *Sacred Service* “appallingly tame, resembling a work one might have expected of an English Victorian.”²⁵ He skewers this “cosmic poem” as lacking religious conviction, but he takes a different path from Newman in arriving at this opinion. Rosenfeld cites as his proof for this assertion Bloch’s quotation of the Reader’s words prior to the Mourner’s *Kaddish* in *The Union Prayerbook for Jewish Worship*—“in the fullness of time we shall know why we are tried, and why our love brings us sorrow as well as happiness.”²⁶ The critic erroneously speaks of these words as “the little sermon interpolated by the composer,”²⁷ yet another example of attributing to Bloch something *he* did not say. It is quite possible, however, that he (Bloch) was thinking of this text on a personal level when he asked that it be sung “with an expression of despair.”²⁸

Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1977), 37-38.

²⁴ Suzanne Bloch and Irene Heskes, *Ernest Bloch: Creative Spirit*, 18. Newman’s review, quoted here, was written for *The Sunday Times* (3 April 1938).

²⁵ Paul Rosenfeld, “Bloch and His *Sacred Service*,” *Discoveries of a Music Critic* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1936; reprint, New York: Vienna House, 1972), 167.

²⁶ For one of the several citations of this text in its religious setting, see *The Union Prayerbook for Jewish Worship* (New York: The Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1961), 151.

²⁷ Paul Rosenfeld, “Bloch and His *Sacred Service*.”

²⁸ Ernest Bloch, *Avodath Hakodesh* (New York: Broude Brothers, Ltd., 1972), 133-34.

Lazare Saminsky agreed with Bloch that race was an important and influential factor in determining cultural identity, but that when it is used, as it was by the likes of Richard Wagner and H. S. Chamberlain, to malign others it has exceeded its usefulness as a tool of understanding. With regard to the *Sacred Service*, Saminsky takes a circuitous route to identify it as being essentially a Jewish expression. He concludes that because the six-note Gregorian motif on which it is based had its basis in Jewish biblical chant, the *Service* has evolved from its original roots. Finding that the concert hall is too theatrical a setting for the work, he comments: “The synagogue will subdue the over-exuberant and the superficial quasi-tribal climaxes, will lend dignity and pathos of quality to the rendition... Then the full value of this important work will benefit Judaism, the Synagogue and our everyday cultural life.”²⁹

Kurt List also finds the *Sacred Service* “a rather unique and unmistakably a Jewish work.”³⁰ He concludes that, contrary to Bloch’s intentions, he (Bloch) has, rather, “created such a uniquely separatist and Jewish world that it becomes radically unassimilable for the Western world.”³¹ When Bloch was asked by Samuel Laderman, a leader of the Jewish community in Chicago and a major figure in the Bloch festival held in that city between 28 November – 3 December 1950, for his reaction to List’s article, the composer commented caustically, “...the best Jews were burned and tortured by Hitler, while some of the worst escaped and now poisoned America!”³² While the Lists of the world were, apparently, assimilated into mainstream America, others, such as Bloch, were caught in the dilemma of ambivalence and ambiguity.

²⁹ Lazare Saminsky, *Music in the Ghetto and the Bible* (New York: Bloch Publishing Co., 1934), 180.

³⁰ Kurt List, “Ernest Bloch’s *Sacred Service*,” *Commentary* 10, no. 6 (December 1950): 589.

³¹ *Ibid.*

Leonard Bernstein, in his recording of the *Sacred Service*,³³ makes significant alterations in the score, the result of which was to bring Bloch's universal approach to religion back to its Jewish moorings. The sections designated "spoken voice," recitative-like passages with clearly marked pitches and rhythms, are instead recited as ordinary speech by Rabbi Judah Cahn; as this decision led to a shortening of the time normally required to recite the *Alenu*, much of the music is heard without voice/text (rehearsal numbers 67-72). When the rabbi resumes with the text immediately preceding the *Kaddish*, i.e. "And now ere we part..." he again recites the text in ordinary speech patterns, not, as Bloch would have it, in a recitative style. At this point, Bloch inserts the *Tsur Yisroel*. In concert hall performances, the *Kaddish* is not said. But, as the score indicates, in a temple setting, the rabbi (minister) could say *Kaddish*, in Hebrew, at this juncture, while the cantor and chorus are rendering *Tsur Yisroel*.

Suzanne Bloch was derisive in her comments on Bernstein's tampering with the score:

...a few months after my father's death, Leonard Bernstein chose to ignore the music written so carefully for this part, giving the explanation that the sung version written by Bloch would overshadow the "marvelous orchestral part," and was "too theatrical." This was recorded; I was told that my disapproval would have been disregarded as the soloist [Robert Merrill] would have refused to sing the very difficult part. At the time I had not the "guts" to make a scene, which I

³² Bloch's letter to Laderman, dated 30 December 1950, is located in the Ernest Bloch Papers, Hargrett Rare Books and Manuscript Library, University of Georgia.

³³ Columbia Masterworks ML 5621 (1961). The performance, remastered, is available on compact disc—Sony Classical SM2K 47533 (1992).

now regret. This “Lenny” interpretation set a tradition by which the work is now regularly desecrated.³⁴

Quite apart from the substitution of spoken words for the called for recitative-style, Bernstein’s inclusion of the *Kaddish* in both his public and recorded version of the work³⁵ restored to it a Jewish imprint, an idea clearly at odds with the intentions of both the composer and his daughter. It is important to note, however, that Bloch was again equivocal with regard to the Jewish vs. universal message for, in the synagogue, he is parochial while on the public stage he moved toward a message he hoped would be acceptable to all people.

Herbert Fromm provides the most imaginative effort to paint Bloch as a Jewish composer. To do so, he imbues the composer with a knowledge of Judaism that stretches the imagination. In what he calls “an imaginary discourse preceding the playing of Ernest Bloch’s *Sacred Service*,”³⁶ Fromm relates the opening motif to the tetragrammaton, the four unvoiced Hebrew letters, YHWH, which represent the unspeakable (because of its sacredness) name of God. The seeming discrepancy between these four letters and the six notes of Bloch’s motif is explained by the composer’s opting for the transliteration of the Hebrew spelling, YAHWEH. In order to account for the fact that the third and sixth letters are the same in transliteration, while in Bloch’s motif the second and fifth notes are identical, Fromm refers to the Third of the Ten Commandments, “Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh

³⁴ Suzanne Bloch, “Portland’s *Avodath Hakodesh*,” *Ernest Bloch Society Bulletin* 18-19 (1986-87): 27-28.

³⁵ Bernstein performed the *Sacred Service* on 8 April 1960 with the New York Philharmonic.

³⁶ Herbert Fromm, “What is Jewish Music?” *On Jewish Music* (United States of America: Herbert Fromm, 1978), 5.

His name in vain.”³⁷ As traditional Jews go out of their way to avoid any possibility of violating this commandment, even to spelling God as G-d when using English, Fromm, in a massive leap of faith, adduces that Bloch’s altering of the six-note motif is the result of his wish to honor the Third Commandment!

It was only appropriate, when the composer was ill in a Portland hospital, that he had a visitor who well understood the man’s turn of mind. Jacob Avshalomov, conductor and musical director of the Portland Youth Philharmonic, reports on a touching scene:

I had two scores under my arm, his own work [*Suite symphonique*] and the *Pange Lingua* mass by Josquin. I told him, “People are doubtless bringing you flowers, but I have something even more beautiful.” Within minutes we were singing the two-part “*Pleni sunt coeli*” in our cracked composers’ voices, regardless of the nuisance it might be to neighboring patients, oblivious to any incongruity of two Jews singing an ancient Catholic mass in a Protestant hospital—just because we loved the music.³⁸

To be or not to be—a Jew: that was *the* question with which Bloch wrestled his entire life. His wish to transcend Judaism and enter a type of universalism was received in a paradoxical manner. His music, even where it is most Jewish, speaks to Jew and non-Jew alike. Bloch, the man, however, is symbolized by the six-pointed Star of David (with the initials EB enclosed therein) that graces the cover of many of his works, including

³⁷ Idem, “The Tetragrammaton in Music,” *On Jewish Music* (United States of America: Herbert Fromm, 1978), 47.

³⁸ Jacob Avshalomov, “Ernest Bloch Through His Music,” *The Spiritual and Artistic Odyssey of Ernest Bloch* (Charleston, SC: Piccolo Spoleto, 1980), 32.

those without Jewish implications, that were published by G. Schirmer. He was, he is, and he will be, a Jew despite himself.

Example 1 *Scherzo fantasque*, 1948, The Star of David, with Ernest Bloch encased therein is a reminder of Bloch as a "Jewish composer."

