

# Part One



# I The Sources

## *List of Sources in Chronological Order*

In this section, the available sources are classified in chronological order. The method of presentation is as follows:

Listed in order are: the name of the library, the index number and the total number of folios or pages. In the case of manuscript fragments, loose folios or pages, only the number of folios or pages which contain secular music are indicated, followed by the specific folios or pages in parentheses, for example: (662r - 683v). Moreover, an approximation of the date of writing is given with the greatest possible accuracy and, where it exists, the title is also given, for example: “Μελπομένη” (*Melpomene*). Dimensions are mentioned only for self-contained codices and not for fragments, loose folios or pages. Finally, the scribe is mentioned and also a very brief description of the contents is offered.<sup>1</sup>

### 15th c.

#### Booklets, fragments and loose folios

1. NLG 2401, 15th c. f. 122v, scribe not recorded<sup>2</sup>. “Persikon”, *Ar yi yi a to go go gor ri gi*.

### 16th c.

#### Loose folios

2. Iviron 1189, 16th c. (1562), ff. 120r–127v, scribe Leontios Koukouzelis the Hieromonk. The oldest notated Greek folk song *Χαίρεσθε, κάμποι, χαίρεσθε*, and a Persian Music Section.
3. Leimonos 259, 16th c. (1572), ff. 184r–185v, scribe Gabriel Hieromonk. Persian *tasnif* of Abdülkadir [Marâghi].
4. Olympiotissis 188<sup>3</sup>, 16th c., ff. 12v-13, scribe not recorded. Poem by Georgios Therianos “Περὶ τοῦ θανάτου ὅταν ἡ ψυχὴ φοβῆτε τὸν ἀποχωρισμὸν τοῦ σώματος”.

---

<sup>1</sup> During the course of this research, an analytical catalogue of all available sources was constructed, which will be published in due course. The catalogue also contains relevant bibliographical references for each source.

<sup>2</sup> According to Politis (1991:396), the manuscript originates possibly from the Holy Monastery of Prodromos, Serres.

5. Megistis Lavras E4, 16th c. (Chatzigiakoumis 1980:151), ff. 244r-245v, scribe not recorded. A piece without a title *dir teroudilli terella*.

### 17th c.

#### Booklets and loose folios

6. Iviron 1054, 17th c. (early), f. 172r, scribe Makarios. The folk song *Αγριοπούλι μερώθου μου*.
7. Xeropotamou 262, 17th c. (early), ff. 211v-212v, scribe not recorded. Three folk songs.
8. Sinai 1327, 17th c. (early), ff. 190r-191r, scribe not recorded. Compositions by Theophanis Karykis and Iosaph the New Koukouzelis.
9. Megistis Lavras E9, 17th c. (1666), ff. 141v-142, scribe Iosiph Hieromonk. Unclassified genre composed by Theophanis Karykis.
10. Iviron 1203, 17th c., ff. 176v-178r & 239v-240v, scribe Athanasios Katepanos. Two compositions of unclassified genre (one by Theophanis Karykis).
11. Iviron 1203b, 17th c., f. α<sup>1</sup>-4v, scribe Athanasios Katepanos. Thirteen folk songs.
12. Ecumenical Patriarchate 6, 17th c. (1680), ff. 111v-112r, scribe Kosmas the Macedonian. Unclassified genre composed by Theophanis Karykis and *Ατζέμικον έρωτικόν* by Kosmas the Macedonian.
13. Iviron 1080, 17th c. (1688) – early 18th c. ff. 94r-94v & 130r-131r, scribe Kosmas the Macedonian. Two compositions of unclassified genre (one by Theophanis Karykis).
14. Gritsanis 8, 17th c. (1698), pp. 323-345, scribe Kyprianos Hieromonk of Iviron. Alphabetic *acrostic* Christmas song *Άναρχος Θεός καταβέβηκε*, “*mourambades*” (*murabbas*), *semâ'is* and other works of unclassified genre.
15. Koutloumousiou 449, 17th c. (1690-1700), ff. 205v-206r, scribe Daniel the Monk. Compositions of unclassified genre by Theophanis Karykis.
16. NLG 897, 17th c., ff. 425v-427r, scribe not recorded. Compositions of unclassified genre by Theophanis Karykis.
17. NLG 941, 17th c., ff. 404r-405v & 411r-412r, scribe not recorded<sup>4</sup>. Compositions of unclassified genre by Theophanis Karykis and *Ατζέμικον έρωτικόν*.
18. NLG - MHS 399<sup>5</sup>, 17th c., scribe not recorded. Compositions of unclassified genre by Theophanis Karykis.

<sup>3</sup> The following is written in the heading of the codex: “Typikon of the ecclesiastical service of the Holy Lavra of our God-bearing father Savas in Jerusalem”.

<sup>4</sup> The codex dates from the 17<sup>th</sup> century and is found in the catalogue of Sakellion (1892:170). On examination of the writing style it is concluded that the codex is the work of two different scribes.

<sup>5</sup> The codex is not numbered.

**18th c.**Codices

19. Griisanis 3, 18th c. (third quarter)<sup>6</sup>, 255 ff., dimensions 23.5 x 17 centimetres, scribe Petros Peloponnesios. Art music of Constantinople (mainly *peşrevs*, *semâ'îs* and *terkîbs*).
20. LKP (dossier) 60, 18th c. (third quarter), 53 ff., dimensions 17 x 11.1 centimetres, scribe Petros Peloponnesios. Art music of Constantinople (mainly *peşrevs*, *semâ'îs* and *terkîbs*).
21. LKP (dossier) 137, 18th c. (third quarter), 40 ff., dimensions 36.6 x 12.4 centimetres, scribe Petros Peloponnesios. Art music of Constantinople (mainly *peşrevs*, *semâ'îs* and *terkîbs*).
22. RAL 927, 18th c. (third quarter), 86 ff., dimensions 15 x 10 centimetres, Art music of Constantinople (Phanariot songs).

Booklets, fragments and loose folios

23. Iviron 949, 18th c. (early), f. 175v, scribe not recorded. *Beste Mezil iste*.
24. Xeropotamou 329, 18th c. (early)<sup>7</sup>, ff. 196v-197r, scribe not recorded. Two works of unclassified genre (probably *bestes*).
25. Iviron 988, 18th c. (1734), ff. 389r-389v, scribe Dimitrios Anagnostis. Composition of unclassified genre by Theophanis Karykis and the *Isaki zade // Dol Tourkjaloum pade* by Balasios the Priest.
26. Great Meteoron 416 (first half 1730 - 1735), f. 56a. Composition of unclassified genre by Theophanis Karykis.
27. Dionysiou 579, 18th c. (1742), ff. 302r-302v, scribe Theodosios of Nafplion. "Atzemikon" *Itzeloum pate, isachiperizantem*.
28. HESG 305, 18th c. (1749), ff. 94r-101v<sup>8</sup>, scribe Kyrillos Marmarinos. Seventy-one *seyirs* of *makams*<sup>9</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> Regarding the dating of the secular music manuscripts of Petros, the following must be noted: It is known that Petros arrived in Constantinople just before 1760. It is reasonable to assume that it took some time for him to connect to the musical circles of the Ottoman court, where he was taught secular music. Therefore, Petros must have written these manuscripts in the period between the middle of the 1760's and his death in 1778.

<sup>7</sup> Usually, the date given by G. T. Stathis (1975) at the beginning of the description of each manuscript is taken into account. Here, the information is drawn from the end notes, and in particular from pp. 188, 189.

<sup>8</sup> These folios concern only the melodies which reveal the structure and movement of each *makam* (*seyir*). The treatise in total occupies ff. 88r-103r.

<sup>9</sup> Popescu-Judetzi – A. Ababi Sirlı (2000), list seventy three. But this is not the only mistake. The numbering in their publication starts from f. 77a instead of the correct 94r.

29. Koutloumousiou 446, 18th c. (1757), ff. 517v-518v & 521r-522r, scribe Theoklitos the Monk. Composition of unclassified genre by Theophanis Karykis and the “Atzemikon” *Isaki zade // Dol Tourkjaloum pade*.
30. Panteleimonos 994, 18th c. (middle), ff. 323v-325v, scribe not recorded. One *semâ’i* and one *beste* by Kyrillos Marmarinos.
31. Timios Prodromos 93, 18th c. (first half), ff. 251r-251v, unknown scribe. *semâ’i* by Kyrillos Marmarinos.
32. Panteleimonos 1012, 18th c. (1768), ff. 241r-242r, scribe Michael Drakos. Composition of unclassified genre by Theophanis Karykis.
33. NLG 2175, 18th c. (1768), ff. 814v-816v & 835r, scribe not recorded. Composition of unclassified genre by Theophanis Karykis and the “beautiful Atzemikon”, *Isaki zade // Dol Tourkjaloum pade*.
34. Agiou Pavlou 132, 18th c. (1774), pp. 814-816, scribe Dimitrios Lotos. “Atzemikon” *Isaki zade // Dol Tourkjaloum pade*.
35. Xeropotamou 330, 18th c. (1781 - 1782), ff. 378r-380r, scribe Dimitrios Lotos. Two works of unclassified genre (one by Theophanis Karykis).
36. Iviron 997, 18th c. (around 1790), ff. 162v-168r, scribe not recorded. Eleven *taksîms* by Petros Peloponnesios.
37. NLG 2225, 18th c. (second half), ff. 119v-120v, scribe not recorded. “Ἐρωτικὸν Μπαλασίου” *Isaki zade // Dol Tourkjaloum pade*.
38. Gennadius 725, 18th (fourth quarter), ff. 73r<sup>10</sup>, 74v, scribe not recorded. Two Phanariot songs.
39. Iviron 1038, 18th c. (late), ff. 662r-666r, 670r-673v & 681r-683v, scribe not recorded. One *beste* and one *peşrev*.
40. LKP 123/270, 18th c., ff. 23v-35r<sup>11</sup>, scribe Kyrillos Marmarinos<sup>12</sup>. Sixty-seven *makam seyirs*.
41. S. Karas 32, 18th c., ff. 161v-169r, scribe Athanasios Iviritis. “Good *murabba*”
42. S. Karas 38, 18th c., ff. 296a-296b, scribe not recorded. A composition of unclassified genre by Theophanis Karykis.
43. LKP 45/195, 18th c. (late), ff. 551v-552r, scribe not recorded. A composition of unclassified genre by Theophanis Karykis.
44. Xeropotamou 305, 18th c. (late 18th - early 19th c.), ff. 310v-315v, scribe Damaskinos Monk Agraforendiniotis. A work of unclassified genre by Theophanis Karykis. Two *bestes* and eleven *taksîms* by Petros Peloponnesios.

<sup>10</sup> The codex bears the scribe’s note on f. 156v: αψξθ’ (1769). It is of mixed content and written by a main scribe and two or three others. It contains notes dated between 1769 and 1791. The aforementioned information, in conjunction with the fact that the two songs are written in the older notation, place its origins in the fourth quarter of the 18<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>11</sup> These folios concern only the melodies which reveal the structure and movement of each *makam (seyir)*. The treatise in total occupies ff. 18v-37r.

<sup>12</sup> On inner cover Br the following note by K. A. Psachos is found: “Autograph of Kyrillos Bishop of Tinos from Marmara. Precious”.

## 19th c.

Codices

45. RAL 925, 18th c. (late 18th or early 19th), 82 ff., dimensions 16 x 11, scribe Nikeforos Kantouniaries. Art music of Constantinople (Phanariot songs as well as others).
46. LKP 19/173, 19th c. (early, circa 1800), 160 ff., dimensions 18 x 12, scribe Petros Byzantios. Art music of Constantinople (Phanariot songs and six *şarkıs*).
47. RAL 784, 19th c. (early, circa 1810 - 1812<sup>13</sup>), 270 ff., dimensions 17 x 11, scribe Nikeforos Kantouniaries. Art music of Constantinople (Phanariot songs).
48. Iaşı 129, 19th c. (1813), dimensions 20,5X15,1 / 12+346+9 pp., scribe Nikeforos Kantouniaries. Art music of Constantinople (predominantly Phanariot songs), Arabic and Gypsy songs as well as others.
49. ELIA<sup>14</sup>, 19th c. (early, likely in 1816), 107 ff., dimensions 19 x 12, scribe Evgenios, further details unknown. Art music of Constantinople (Phanariot songs).
50. Vatopediou 1428, MS “Melpomene”, 19th c. (1818 - 1820<sup>15</sup>), 5 + 417 pp., dimensions 20 x 16, scribe Nikeforos Kantouniaries. Art music of Constantinople (predominantly Phanariot songs), Arabic and Gypsy songs as well as others.
51. Stathis, 19th c. (circa 1820), 47 ff., dimensions 18 x 12, scribe Ioannis Konidares. Art music of Constantinople (Phanariot songs, *şarkıs* and others).
52. Gennadius 231, 19th c. (1820-1830 roughly), 80 ff., dimensions 16.5 x 11.4, scribe not recorded. Art music of Constantinople (predominantly Phanariot songs).
53. LKP 152/292, 19th c. (1827), 400 pp., dimensions 18 x 12, scribe Ioannis Pelopidis. Art music of Constantinople (Phanariot songs, *bestes*, *taksıms* and *şarkıs*).

---

<sup>13</sup> It contains songs of Gregorios whom he addresses as Lambadarios. Gregorios served as Lambadarios of the Great Church from the early 1800s until 1819. However, Nikeforos wrote codex Iaşı 129 which appears more methodologically advanced and closer to Vatopediou 1428 in 1813. Hence, it is concluded that the manuscript was written in the period after 1810 and before 1813.

<sup>14</sup> The manuscript does not have an index or listing number.

<sup>15</sup> On the heading, the date 1818 is given, but the information on f. 349 supports the conclusion that its writing was completed in 1820 (Verses of the philosopher Govdelas to his highness master Michael Gregorios Soutsos, composed by the Protopsaltes of Constantinople Gregorios and sent to Iaşı in 1820).

Booklets, fragments, loose folios

54. Gregoriou 23, 19th c. (1800), ff. 187v-189v, scribe not recorded. Heirmos Ismailitikos *An yi pon gerpe epentzi rouzy sobpet*.
55. RAL 653, 19th c. (early), ff. 33r-40r, scribe not recorded. Art music of Constantinople (Phanariot songs).
56. Xeropotamou 299, 19th c. (circa 1810), pp. 534-543, scribe Nikeforos Kantouniaries<sup>16</sup>. A series of eleven *taksims* by Petros Peloponnesios.
57. CAMS, P2, 19th c. (early), 48 pp., scribe not recorded. Art music of Constantinople (Phanariot songs).
58. CAMS, P1, 19th c. (early<sup>17</sup>), 16 pp., scribe Nikeforos Kantouniaries. Art music of Constantinople (Phanariot songs).
59. NLG 2424, 18th c. (early), f. 114r, unknown scribe. One Phanariot song.
60. LKP 2/59a, 19th c. (first quarter), 8 ff., scribe Gregorios Protopsaltes. Art music of Constantinople (*pesrevs*, *semá'ís* and *terkíbs* with relevant commentary).
61. LKP (dossier) 58, 19th c. (first quarter), 8 pp., scribe Gregorios Protopsaltes. Art music of Constantinople (fragment from an instrumental composition with relevant commentary).
62. LKP (dossier) 59, 19th c. (first quarter), 8 pp., scribe Gregorios Protopsaltes. Art music of Constantinople (two *bestes* and one *yürük semá'í*).
63. LKP (dossier) 76, 19th c. (first quarter), 4 pp.; scribe Gregorios Protopsaltes. Art music of Constantinople (Phanariot songs).
64. LKP (dossier) 81, 19th c. (first quarter), 4 ff., scribe Gregorios Protopsaltes. Art music of Constantinople (the *kâr* by Georgios Soutsos).
65. Dochiariou 322, 19th c. (circa 1825), ff. 93r-96v, scribe not recorded (Stathis 1975:366). Art music of Constantinople (eleven Phanariot songs by Gregorios Protopsaltes and one *şarki*).
66. Xenophontos 146, 19th c. (1825), f. 140v, scribe not recorded. One Phanariot song by Gregorios Protopsaltes.
67. NLG - MHS 722, 19th c. (1819), ff. 386v-389r, scribe Chourmouzos Charthophylax. The composition of unclassified genre by Theofanis Karykis, explained.

<sup>16</sup> This conclusion is drawn by G. T. Stathis (1975:150-151), by comparing the writing style of Xeropotamou 299 and Xeropotamou 295, 318 and Vatopediou 1427. Additionally, without further comments he attributes the codex to Nikeforos (Stathis 2001c:616).

<sup>17</sup> J. Plemmenos (1999-2000: 99-100) places authoring around 1815 on the basis of two arguments: a) "Before 1816, Nikeforos was occupied with the writing of ecclesiastical music manuscripts" and b) due to the "coincidence" of Nikeforos and Germanos of Old Patras being in Constantinople at the same time, as evidenced in the verses of two songs. This reasoning however, is proven incorrect since Nikeforos was occupied with secular music even before 1816 as clearly documented by the date of Iaşi 129, being 1813. His two other early manuscripts, RAL 925 and 784 also date from the early 19<sup>th</sup> century.

68. Archdiocese of Cyprus 33, 19th c. (first half), 3 ff., scribe not recorded. Art music of Constantinople (Phanariot songs).
69. LKP (dossier) 73, 19th c. (first half), 16 pp., scribe not recorded. Art music of Constantinople (Phanariot songs).
70. LKP (dossier) 89, 19th c. (first half), 16 pp., scribe not recorded. Art music of Constantinople (Phanariot songs).
71. LKP (dossier) 93, 19th c. (first half), 4 ff., scribe not recorded. Art music of Constantinople (Phanariot songs).
72. LKP (dossier) 117, 19th c. (first half), 16 pp., scribe not recorded. Art music of Constantinople (Phanariot songs).

### *Quantitative Classification by Century*

The above catalogue shows the impressive volume of secular music transcriptions in the manuscript tradition of ecclesiastical music. It is likely that upon completion of the analytical cataloguing of all the, approximately, 7,300 manuscript codices of *psaltic* art, more folios, pages or autonomous codices of secular music will surface.

The available source material is around 2,100 folios or 4,200 pages. The vast majority is found in self-contained collections of secular music, only approximately 10 percent surviving in individual folios or pages of codices containing ecclesiastical music, and as fragments or booklets. Essentially, the secular music sources originate from the post-Byzantine period, with the exception of NLG 2401, which dates from the 15<sup>th</sup> century.

### *Classification by Genre*

The table above offers an overview of the sources on the basis of the chronological order and their grouping into self-contained codices, fragments and individual folios or pages. A different processing and presentation of the material enables an alternative viewpoint, whereby the following groupings are obtained:

#### 1. Folk songs:

Ivion 1054, 172r; Xeropotamou 262, 211v-212v; Ivion 1203b, 176v.

A total of three codices.

#### 2. Mixed content: Folk songs, unclassified genres and possible *bestes*, *taksîms* etc.:

Ivion 1189, 120r-127v; Gritsanis 8, 324-345; Xeropotamou 305, 310v-315v.

A total of three codices.

#### 3. Works of undetermined genre by known composers:

Leimonos 259, 184r-185v; Olympiotissis 188, 12v-13v; Megistis Lavras E9, 141v-142v; Ivion 1203, 176v-178r & 239v-240v; Ecumenical Patriarchate 6, 111v-112r; Ivion 1080, 94r-94v &

130r-1301r; Koutloumousiou 449, 205v-206r; NLG 897, 425v-427r; NLG 941, 404r-405v & 411v-412r; NLG - MHS 399; Iviron 988, 389r-389v; Koutloumousiou 446, 517v-518v & 521r-522r; Panteleimonos 1012, 241r-242r; NLG 2175, ff. 814v-816v & 835r; Agiou Pavlou 132, 814-816; Xeropotamou 330, 378r-380r; NLG 2225, 119v-120v; S. Karas 38, 296a-296b; LKP 45/195, 547v.

A total of nineteen codices.

#### 4. Anonymous works of undetermined genre:

NLG 2401, 122v; Megistis Lavras E4, 244r-245v; Iviron 949, 175v; Xeropotamou 329, 196v-197r; Dionysiou 579, 302r-302v; S. Karas 32, 161v-169r; Gregoriou 23, 187v-1879v.

A total of seven codices.

#### 5. Art music of Constantinople (*peşrevs*, *semâ'îs*, *şarkıs*, *seyirs* etc.):

HESG 305, 94r-101v; Gritsanis 3, 250 ff., LKP (dossier) 60, 53 ff.; LKP (dossier) 137, 40 ff., Panteleimonos 994, 323v-325v; Timios Prodromos 93, 251r-251v; Iviron 997, 162v-168r; Iviron 1038, 662r-666r, 670r-673v & 681r-683v; Xeropotamou 299, 534-543; LKP 169/309, 40 ff., LKP 2/59a, 8 ff.; LKP (dossier) 58, 8 pp.; LKP (dossier) 59, 8 pp.; LKP 123/270, ff. 23v-35r.

A total of fourteen codices.

#### 6. Art music of Constantinople (Phanariot songs):

RAL 927, 86 ff.; RAL 925, 82 ff.; RAL 653, 33r-40r; Gennadius 725, 73r, 74v; ELIA, 107 ff.; RAL 784, 270 ff., Gennadius 231, 80 ff.; CAMS, P2, 48 pp.; CAMS, P1, pp. 16; NLG 2424, 114r; LKP (dossier) 76, 4 pp.; LKP (dossier) 81 4 ff.; Dochiariou 322, 93r-96v; Xenophontos 146, 40v; Archdiocese of Cyprus 33, 3 ff.; LKP (dossier) 73, 16 pp.; LKP (dossier) 89, 16 pp.; LKP (dossier) 93, 4 ff.; LKP (dossier) 117, 16 pp.

A total of nineteen codices.

#### 7. Art music of Constantinople (mixed content: Phanariot songs, *peşrevs*, *semâ'îs*, *şarkıs*, *taksîms* etc.):

LKP 19/173, 160 ff., İaşı 129, 367 pp.; Vatopediou 1428, 422 pp.; Stathis, 47 ff.; LKP 152/292, 400 pp., Dochiariou 322, ff. 93r-96v.

A total of six codices.

### *Commentary – Evaluation of the Sources*

From the study of the total available manuscripts, fragments and individual folios of codices containing secular music, a variety of interesting pieces of information can be ascertained and a series of useful conclusions reached. In the following pages, a brief presentation and evaluation of this material as a source of secular music is offered.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>18</sup> The secular music manuscripts lend themselves also to investigation from perspectives other than musical; particularly, literary. From such research, important conclusions could be drawn in relation to the language, the orthography, the meter and more. That, however,

### *The Oldest Surviving Manuscript Containing Secular Music*

The oldest sample of secular music written in Byzantine notation and also the oldest notated sample of Persian music, survives on **f. 122v** of **NLG 2401** dating from the late 14<sup>th</sup> to the early 15<sup>th</sup> century (see plate 1). It is the “persikon” (Persian) *Ar yi yi yi a to go go gor ri gi* in *echos* IV. Unfortunately, no other indication (genre, *makam*, rhythmic cycle, composer etc.) is mentioned in the heading.

### *The Oldest Transcriptions of Folk Songs*

The following four codices contain the oldest transcriptions of folk songs. They are **Ivion 1189**, ff. 120r-127v; **Ivion 1203b**<sup>19</sup>, f. 176v; **Xeropotamou 262**, ff. 211v-212v and **Ivion 1054**, f. 172r. The content of these four codices has occupied researchers more than any other such source, and owing to this, there are not an insignificant number of studies related to the topic.<sup>20</sup>

The oldest manuscript, Ivion 1189, is dated from 1562 (see plate 2), and the scribe is Leontios Koukouzelis (Stathis 1976). In the eight folios containing secular music one folk song is found, the *Χαίρεσθε κάμποι, χαίρεσθε* (125v-127v), as well as a section of Persian music (120r-125r). The other three codices date from the early to the middle of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, and exhibit great ambiguity as to their content. Xeropotamou 262 contains three songs, two of which are also found in Ivion 1203b. Ivion 1054 contains one song, which also exists in Ivion 1203b. Even though it appears to be the latest of the three, the Ivion 1203b codex is preserved in a particularly poor condition. It was written by Athanasios Katepanos, contains thirteen songs, and essentially, is the first collection of notated folk songs – possibly a part of a larger one that does not exist anymore.<sup>21</sup> The songs are presented simply – with few details. Only the *echos* is stated and in the few instances where more information is given, it is poor:

*Όργανικόν [Instrumental]* (Ivion 1203b, 1r & 2r / Xeropotamou 262, 212r), *ἐτοῦτο ἐποιήθη εἰς τὴν ἄλωσιν τῆς Μπόσνας* [this was created for the conquest of Bosna] (Ivion 1203b, 3r).

*Ἔτερα, τὰ ὅποια λέγονται εἰς εὐθυμίας καὶ χαρὰν* [Other songs, which are sung in times of merriment and joy] (Xeropotamou 262, 211v).

---

exceeds the scope of this work. It can only be hoped that relevant studies will emerge in the future.

<sup>19</sup> Fairly recently, after preservation works, the collection received the label “b” (1203b) to differentiate it from 1203, where, in the binding of which, the folios with the songs were found.

<sup>20</sup> See Introduction, pp. 24-25.

<sup>21</sup> Stilpon Kyriakidis (1978:322) appears indeed certain about this version.

Occasionally performance instructions are given:

Τοῦτο λέγεται εἰς τὸ τέλος τοῦ *Χαίρεσθε* [This one is sung at the end of *Χαίρεσθε*], [*echos*] *plagal IV* (Iviron 1189, 127r).

*Λέγεται καὶ τοῦτο οὕτως* [This one is sung as well, like this] (Xeropotamou 262, 211v).

Finally, with a few exceptions (these being Iviron 1054 and the first folio of Iviron 1203b), at the end of each song the rest of the verses are provided in text only.

### *Two Persian Works from the 16th Century*

As already mentioned, the Iviron 1189 codex discussed above includes a section of Persian music. No identifying details are given and the *echos* indications in four places may reveal four different compositions, or four parts of a self-contained work. The codex **Megistis Lavras E4**, of unspecified scribe, dates from the same century. On ff. 244r-245v a heading-less fragment of a Persian composition survives, without indications of identity or even *echos*. The fragment is dominated by the non-lexical syllables of *terennüm*, while the verses, given as text only at the end, are the same as those existing at the end of the Persian section of Iviron 1189.

### *The Oldest Compositions of Secular Music from Known Composers*

The oldest works of secular music written in Byzantine notation by known composers are preserved in MSS Leimonos 259 and Olympiotissis 188. Both were written during the 16<sup>th</sup> century, MS **Leimonos 259** dating from 1572 (see plate 3). The scribe is Gabriel Hieromonk. On ff. 184r-185v it contains a Persian *tasnîf* by Abdülkadir Marâghî:

Persian *tasnîf* by Abdülkadir, this was written at the command of the great master by Mr. Gerasimos of the monastery of Xanthopoulon, introduction, *echos I*, *Aaaa giarimen Etererou drante Ritina Tillilir nteni utiza*

This piece is of particular interest, firstly because Marâghî is a leading musical personality for both Persians and Turks, and secondly because this is his oldest surviving work which was indeed preserved in notation from that era. Additionally, this particular work does not survive in any other source. From the heading, two other notable pieces of information are extracted: a) The transcription happened at the “command” of the “great master”, that is, either a Byzantine emperor or an Ottoman sultan and b) the first transcriber, was Mr. Gerasimos<sup>22</sup> from the Monastery of Xanthopoulon (first half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century).

<sup>22</sup> For more information on hieromonk Gerasimos see Karagounis 2003:241.

MS **Olympiotissis 188** written in the 16th century by an unspecified scribe contains the oldest composition of post-Byzantine secular music by a known composer on ff. 12v-13v. It is a work of educational content by Georgios Therianos from Chania with the initial verse *Κόσμε ἔχε γειά κ' ἀφήνοσε κ' ἀποχωρίζομέ σε*. The composition is in *echos* plagal I and is provided also with the explanatory subtitle “On death, when the soul fears the separation of the body” (“Περὶ τοῦ θανάτου ὅταν ἡ ψυχὴ φοβῆτε τὸν ἀποχωρισμὸν τοῦ σώματος”).<sup>23</sup>

#### *Two More Compositions by Known Composers in a 17th Century Manuscript*

MS **Sinai 1327**, dating from the early 17th century, contains a work by Theophanis Karykis (ff. 190r - 190v), and one by Ioasaph the New Koukouzelis (ff. 190v-191r).<sup>24</sup> The two works have approximately the same length, that is, one and a half pages of music score, and are found only in this specific manuscript. Any indications of *makam* and *usûl* are absent. If the composer references are valid, the first one is the only work of Karykis with verses in the Persian or Ottoman languages and the second is the only evidence of Ioasaph's occupation with secular music.

#### *The First Collection of Art Music*

The codex **Gritsanis 8** (see plate 5) was written by hieromonk Kyprianos Iviritis in 1698. On pp. 323-345 it contains a section of secular music, which is labelled with the phrase “And here begin some songs and *murabba's*”. The collection contains the important alphabetic *acrostic* song on the birth of Christ *Ἀναρχος Θεὸς καταβέβηκε* and a series of compositions of art music. Chronologically, it is the second oldest collection of secular music and the first containing art music. In the song headings only the *echos* is provided and not the *makam* or the *usûl*. For the first time, however, a definition of the genre is found in the terms *murabba'* (“μουρεμπάς”) and *semâ'î* (“σουμαΐ”). There are also the adjectives *secular non-Greek* (“ἔθνικὸν βαρβαρικόν”), *non-Greek* (“βαρβαρικόν”), and *Islamic* (“μουσουλμάνικον”).

#### *Twenty-eight Manuscripts with Content of the Same Genre*

In this section, a group of manuscripts with common characteristics that allow their classification and study as a group is examined. These manuscripts are

<sup>23</sup> Information about the existence of this specific work is due to professor G. T. Stathis.

<sup>24</sup> For an analytical presentation of the manuscript see D. K. Balageorgos, F. N. Kritikou, *The Byzantine Music Manuscripts – Sinai, Κατάλογος περιγραφικὸς τῶν χειρογράφων κωδίκων βυζαντινῆς μουσικῆς τῶν ἀποκειμένων στὴν βιβλιοθήκη τῆς Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς τοῦ Ὁρους Σινᾶ*, Athens, vol. 1, 2008, p. 589-592.

twenty-seven in number and they contain works of ecclesiastical music, with the exception of a few folios of secular music. They are grouped here separately from other manuscripts because:

1. They contain some folios with secular music, typically one to two, and are not thus self-contained collections of secular music.
2. They date from the middle of the 17th through to the late 18th century, at which time another category of manuscript appears, like the collections of art music of Constantinople by Petros Peloponnesios, and the collections of Phanariot songs.
3. The transcriptions do not concern folk songs but compositions of art music, which are provided either with composer names or anonymously, and without any inscription pertaining to their specific genre, *makam* or rhythmic cycle.
4. At a first glance of the available analytical catalogues of the above manuscripts, it is observed that these secular melodies are often written in *Kratemataria*, or in sections of *kratemata* inside *Anthologies*, *Papadikes* and *Mathemataria*.

The above manuscripts can possibly be divided into two groups. The first, and larger of the two, contains twenty-two manuscripts, and essentially includes three compositions. The manuscripts in chronological order are as follows:

Megistis Lavras E9, Iviron 1203, Ecumenical Patriarchate 6, Iviron 1080, Koutloumousiou 449, NLG 897, NLG 941, NLG - MHS 399, Xeropotamou 329, Iviron 988, Great Meteoron 416, Dionysiou 579, Koutloumousiou 446, Panteleimonos 1012, NLG 2175, Agiou Pavlou 132, Xeropotamou 330, NLG 2225, S. Karas 38, Xeropotamou 305, LKP 45/195, NLG - MHS 722.

What follows is a list of the three compositions and the sources within which they are found:

1. [Composition of undetermined genre] *Anene... Doustum yelela... janim del del del er be tanni tanni... rinetine zulfé...* Theophanis Karykis, *echos plagal I*.

Megistis Lavras E9, 141v / Iviron 1203, 176v / Ecumenical Patriarchate 6, 111v / Iviron 1080, 94r / Koutloumousiou 449, 205v / NLG 897, 425v / NLG 941, 404r / NLG - MHS 399 / Iviron 988, 366v / Great Meteoron 416, f. 56a / Koutloumousiou 446, 517v / Panteleimonos 1012, 241r / NLG 2175, 814v / Xeropotamou 330, 378r / Xeropotamou 305, 310v / LKP 45/195, 551v / NLG - MHS 722, 386v (see figure 4).

2. [Rast *beste*] *Isaki zade // Dol Tourkjaloum pade Kosmas the Macedonian*<sup>25</sup>, *echos plagal IV*.

Ecumenical Patriarchate 6, 112r / NLG 941, 411r / Xeropotamou 329, 197r / Iviron 988, 389r / Dionysiou 579, 232r / Koutloumousiou 446, 521r / NLG 2175, 835r / Agiou Pavlou 132, 814 / Xeropotamou 330, 379r / NLG 2225, 119v / S. Karas 38 / Xeropotamou 305, 311r. (See figure 11)

---

<sup>25</sup> For the authorship of the composition see the chapter titled “Catalogue of Secular Compositions”, p. 81, fn. 22.

3. *Ei ki mpertos titan bha me ain oki tariiii, echos varys.*

Iviron 1080, 130r / Iviron 1203, 239v / Xeropotamou 329,196v<sup>26</sup>.

A first simple observation is that these compositions are often copied from codex to codex. In a few of the codices, two or three compositions co-exist, while in some others only one of the compositions is found. Up to now, thirteen manuscripts have been identified containing the composition of Karykis and twelve with that of Kosmas. These works are characterised by the scribes as *persikon* (“πέρσικον”), *atzemikon* (“ἀτζέμικον”), *nai* (“νάι”), *ethnikon* (“ἔθνικόν”), meaning secular, etc. That is, they continue the naming practice commonly used in the genre of *kratemata*. However, even though the scribes transcribe or copy these types of pieces, they do not appear adequately familiar with this kind of music. This is deduced by the fact that they are unable, as indeed were the older scribes, to recognise and determine a specific genre of secular music. They do not indicate the constituent parts, that is, the genre’s inherent sections. They only list the *echos* according to the rules of ecclesiastical music but not the *makam* or *usûl*. These elements, which determine the identity of a work, are stated for the first time clearly and in full by Petros Peloponnesios.

The second group consists of the manuscripts of **Iviron 949**, **Panteleimonos 994**, **Timios Prodromos 93**, **Iviron 1038**, **Gregoriou 23**, and **S. Karas 32**. These six manuscripts are examined separately because they cannot be fully included in the main group. Chronologically, they are distant from each other, since the first of them dates from the late 17th century, and the fourth, from the 1800s. They exhibit some of the general characteristics of the main group, but there are also some differences. The transcriptions here also concern art music compositions, with the difference that in some of them a specific recognisable genre (*beste*, *semâ’î* etc.) is mentioned. The main difference, however, is that each of these works are found in only one codex. They are not found in other manuscripts of ecclesiastical music either because they were not copied, or if they were copied, they did not survive to our day.

Specifically, on f. 175v of **Iviron 949**, the *beste* genre is clearly indicated for possibly the first time: “*Beste Mezil iste*”<sup>27</sup>. Absent are any indications of *makam* and *usûl* and only the *echos* is given. The piece occupies half of the 30.4 x 29.4 centimetre page, but the transcription seems complete and although there is no written indication, its two constituent parts are easily discernible. And, at the end of the first part, one more verse is given as text only.

The codex **Panteleimonos 994** presents a *semâ’î* and a *beste* of Kyrillos Marmarinos (ff. 323v-325v). As a matter of fact, they are the first works of art music

<sup>26</sup> This particular piece is also preserved in codex Iviron 1189 as part of a broader section of Persian music.

<sup>27</sup> After extensive research, the composition is here attributed to Kemânî Yorgi. For more information see the chapters “Catalogue of Secular Compositions” and “Composers”.

of Constantinople, in Byzantine sources, attributed to their composer – a music teacher in the field of the *psaltic* art. In the heading, the name of the composer, the *makam* and the *echos* are mentioned. Moreover, the genre is given, though incomplete, as *semâ'î*, without clarification as to whether it is an *ağır semâ'î* or a *yürük semâ'î*:

This is the work of Mr. Kyrillos former bishop of Tinos, which is called *semâ'î*, in Turkish *hüseynî*, music and words of the Persians, *echos* I.

The same *semâ'î* is also preserved on ff. 251r-251v of MS Timios **Prodromos 93**, without, however, giving the name of the composer.

Unfortunately the full composition contained in the codex **S. Karas 32** was not available and for that reason the information pertaining to it is currently incomplete. The codex contains a composition of secular music without title, *usûl* or *makam*, which starts from f. 296b. The scribe, Athanasios Iviritis, gives only the indication “This is a good *murabba'*, *echos* plagal IV”.

The codex **Gregoriou 23** contains a work titled “*Heirmos Ismailitikos An gi pan ngerpe epentzi rouzy, echos I*” (ff. 187v-189v). Either it is a copy from another older manuscript or the scribe is isolated from the reality of their time, being unable to distinguish, firstly, the genre and also of course, the *makam* and the *usûl*.

Lastly, the codex **Iviron 1038**, in which the works appear to be written in three sections, is examined. The first and the second sections (ff. 662r-666r & 670r-673v) are in the main body of the codex but they exhibit differences in the writing style. In the second, the characters are of bigger size than the first and they occupy fewer lines on the paper. The third section (ff. 681r-683v) is written in an additional booklet bound with the rest of the manuscript, the writing style of which is quite different. We have therefore a manuscript with three small sections of secular music written by at least two or three hands. The main body of the codex dates from the early 18th century while the added booklet from later in the same century. The content of the three sections is as follows:

662r *Echos* I *Yeyeli yeyela*

663r Arabic beste, *echos plagal* I, *Segringoulingoulou*

664r *Echos* I, Bagipakerpe, until f. 666r

670r Beste named Nai, *echos* IV, *Ormatipichereitzcha*

670v *Echos* I, *Tzismimistontou*

671r [*Echos*] I, *Tzakpoutempchoupen*

671v [*Echos*] I, *Saliniskairisechives*

672r Another... difficult of mine, [*echos*] I, *Yar kimin canesi*

672v [*Echos*] I, *Yar Efendim pedeteriya*

673r [*Echos*] I, *Yar byzifeta*, until f. 673v

681r Named Isach Sakili, also known as *karapataki*, written by Mr. Ioannis Protopsaltes at the exhortation of the Most Holy Metropolitan of Heracleia Mr. Gerasimos, copied

from the autograph of Mr. Ioannis Protopsaltes himself. The *makam* is considered *hicâz* by the Persians and [echos] plagal II by us. *eterelelele*

*Mülazime teterela*

682r *Orta hâne teterela*

682v *Mülazime teterela*

683r *Son hâne teterela*

683v Again the same, then *mülazime*

The study of this manuscript yields a number of very interesting findings:

1. The genres of *beste* and *peşrev* are mentioned.
2. The national names “Arabic” and “Persian” are used. However, in both cases Ottoman origin is implied. The poetic text of the *beste* is given in Ottoman, and not in Arabic or Persian. The name of *makam hicâz* is indeed etymologically of Persian (or Arabic) origin, however it is certain that the scribe (or the scribes) of this particular manuscript were made aware of this from their cultural osmosis with the Ottoman Turks, and not with the Arabs or the Persians.<sup>28</sup>
3. “*Beste* named *naî*” indicates that the favoured term, *nai*, for the definition of *kratema* is used. Perhaps the genre of *beste* is still confused with the *kratemata*.
4. On f. 672r the phrase “Another... difficult of mine” is found. Therefore, we can assume that it is a composition of the scribe.
5. The f. 681r, where the *peşrev* of Ioannis Protopsaltes is prefaced, is of particular interest. The genre (*peşrev*) is given together with the corresponding *echos* and *makam*. According to a custom of the time, the *peşrev* has a name, and is called *Isach Sakili* or *karapataki*. The story behind the composition is given, that is, that it was written by Mr. Ioannis Protopsaltes at the exhortation of the Most Holy Metropolitan of Heracleia, Mr. Gerasimos, and witnesses the existence of an earlier codex, an autograph of Ioannis, from where this one was copied.
6. The inherent structure of the same piece is also presented, consisting of the following parts: *mülazime* / 682r *orta hâne* / 682v *mülazime* / 683r *son hâne* / 683v again the same, then *mülazime*.

### *The First Transcriptions of Makam Seyirs*

The manuscript HESG 305, dated 1749, is an autograph of Kyrillos Marmarinos. On ff. 94r-101v it contains seventy-one *echoi* or *makam seyirs* as they are called in the Ottoman:

Clarifying which and how many *echoi* each *makam* comprises, and what is its progression from beginning to the end.

<sup>28</sup> For more information see chapter four “Composers: Works with Names of Ethnic or Religious Origin”.

Even though these theoretical issues do not fall within the scope of this work, this manuscript is of interest since the notated musical descriptions of the *makams* by Kyrillos, are the oldest transcriptions of *seyir* in Ottoman music.<sup>29</sup> The section in which the *echoi* are presented, consists of seventy-one paragraphs. Every paragraph starts with the name of the *makam* and continues with a textual description:

Rast, beginning from its own *perde* and via the *geveşt perde* descends to ‘*aşirân*, and then ascending it goes via *rehâvî, rast, düğâh, segâh*...

Subsequently followed by one or two lines of notated score showing the basic progression of the *makam*:

A copy of Kyrillos’s work is included in LKP 123/270, which dates from the 18th century (see figure 12). On ff. 23v-35r, sixty-seven *makam seyirs* are presented, that is four less than HESG 305.<sup>30</sup>

#### *Four Autograph Codices of Petros Peloponnesios*

They are LKP (dossier) 60, which has 53 folios, LKP (dossier) 137, with 40 folios, Gritsanis 3, with 255 folios, and RAL 927, with 86 folios. They were written in the third quarter of the 18th century, and they are significant because of their content. The first three contain art music of Constantinople, mainly *pesrevs*, *semâ’îs* and *terkîbs*, and the fourth contains Phanariot songs. They are the earliest codices with a purely secular musical content,<sup>31</sup> constituting the beginnings of the rich output of other such codices, seen in the following decades. Coupled with the fact that they were written by Petros Peloponnesios – leading composer of ecclesiastical music, superb *exegetes*, active musician in both ecclesiastical as well as secular music, and most importantly in regard to the topic at hand, notable and experienced codex writer – their significance is magnified. Their analytical cataloguing and study brings to the surface a wealth of extremely important details. Extensive mention will be made of these codices not only because of their significance but also because there has not been any other relevant publication devoted to their investigation.

In particular, codex **Gritsanis 3**, has already attracted the interest of academic circles. The information contained in the two catalogues compiled of the manuscripts in the Gritsanis library (Adamis 1966-67:313-365, Papagiannopoulos

<sup>29</sup> Popescu-Judetș – A. Ababi Sirlî 2000:18. On the *seyir* and the specific transcriptions see below pp. 221-222.

<sup>30</sup> According to the catalogue of Gertsman (1996), Kyrillos’s theoretical treatise as well as some Phanariot songs are included in MS St. Petersburg 127. Gertsman dates this codex in the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, thus it was outside the scope of this work.

<sup>31</sup> With the exception of one *Kalophonic Heirmos* in Gritsanis 3 and a few folios with fragments of ecclesiastical music in LKP (dossier) 137.

1937), is unclear. In his article “Πέτρος Λαμπαδάριος ὁ ἀπὸ Λακεδαιμόνοϛ”, G. T. Stathis (1983:117-118) presents some initial indications of the existence of secular music in this particular codex, which is attributed to Petros. Finally, two pieces from Petros’s transcriptions have been recorded by “En Chordais” in the albums of the series *Great Mediterranean Composers*. They are *bestenigâr peşrev* by Hânende Zacharias<sup>32</sup> and the *terkîbs* in various *echoi* of Petros Peloponnesios<sup>33</sup> from the *exegesis* of T. K. Apostolopoulos.

The codex is most important for the study of secular music for many reasons. Firstly, its size (255 folios) and its dimensions (23.5 x 17 centimetres) allow the preservation of a great number of pieces (around two-hundred works of art music) revealing both the breadth of the repertoire mastered by Petros and also his deep knowledge of that music. Secondly, its content spans a very wide time frame, from the 15th century at least, if not earlier, until the time the codex was written, which is the third quarter of the 18th century, enabling researchers to trace the past through the surety of written sources. Thirdly, it preserves works of known great composers as well as many other anonymous pieces, significantly widening the repertoire of the art music of Constantinople. And finally, it is of special interest to the study of musical form and of music theory, due to the wealth of information contained within it.

Nevertheless, the manuscript is characterised by a great untidiness of both the writing style, and the organisation of the repertoire. An extensive and repeating sequence of different writing styles is traced throughout. A number of works are written with particular care, using two colours, in calligraphic script, with easily readable characters, elegant initials, clear information and indications pertaining to musical form, composer, *makam*, *usûl*, *echos*, *martyria* etc. (See plate 6)

Other works, on the other hand, are particularly badly written and hard to read, in a single colour, and with incomplete headings and many smudges. (See plate 8)

The organisation of the content does not follow some logical order, either by *echos* – *makam*, or by composer. Additionally, it was not possible to discern some sort of macro-form, such as the *fasil*.

Of the compositions contained in the codex, some are presented with the name of their composer; the majority however, are presented anonymously. During the research and writing of this book, a few pieces were identified and consequently attributed to their composers. The earliest composers identified in the codex are:

Abdülkadir Marâghî (1353 - 1453), Mehmet Ağa [Kul] (- 1580?), Hasan Can (1490 - 1567), Gazi Gıray Han II (1554 - 1607 and Seyf el-Mısırî (16th c.).

<sup>32</sup> Track No. 2, “En Chordais”, Zakharia Khanendeh.

<sup>33</sup> Track No. 5, “En Chordais”, Petros Peloponnesios.

Followed in chronological order by:

Hacı Kasım ( - 1600 ?), Emir-i Hac ( - 1600? or second half of the 16th c.), Ağa Mu'min (17th c.?), Ali Beğ (17th c.?), Rıza Ağa ( - 1650?), Solakzâde Mıskalî Mehmed Hemdemî Çelebi ( - 1658), Murad Ağa [Şeştârî], (1610 - 1673), Şerîf ( ? - 1680), Küçük Hatib ( - 1700?), Reftâr Kalfa ( - 1700?), İtrî (Buhûrîzâde Mustafa Efendi and/or Çelebi) (1638? - 1712), Dimitri Cantemir (1673 - 1723), Kasım [Mehmed] ( - 1730?), Abdurrahmân Bâhir Efendi [Arabzâde] (1680 - 1746), Es'ad Efendi [Şeyhülislâm Mehmed, Ebû-İshâk-zâde] (1685 - 1753), Hânende Zacharias (18th c.), Hızır Ağa (? - 1760), Tanburi Haham Musi (Moshe) (? - 1770?), Kemânî Yorgi (early - middle 18th c.), Ahmet Ağa [Musâhib Seyyid, Vardakosta] (1728? - 1794).

In addition to the above twenty-five composers which proved possible to identify<sup>34</sup>, Petros transcribes works from at least nine others including: Pappas, Ousta Yiesefin, Ismail Tzaous, Antonis (Antoninin), Atriznin (or Arizouni) Tamburi, Peligratzoglou, Tamburi Hacı Omer Aga, Tziohatzoglou, Hocanmasinin. The fact that these composers are not known from other direct or indirect sources, but are explicitly and clearly mentioned by Petros, presents opportunities for further research into the personalities that contributed to the development of this important musical heritage. Moreover, a great part of the repertoire consists of anonymous works, many of which may be by Petros himself.

With regard to the genres, the vast majority of pieces in the codices are instrumental compositions, like *peşrevs* and *semâ'îs*. Vocal compositions are limited to a few fragments of Phanariot songs in the first and last folios of the codex (1v-3r, 7r, 254r-255r), and to about ten other works, such as *kârs*, *bestes*, *yürük semâ'îs* and others of so far undetermined form<sup>35</sup>. It is worth noting that none of the vocal compositions mentions the name of the poet – lyricist.

The manuscript **LKP (dossier) 60**<sup>36</sup> is also quite poorly written, but readable. Only black ink is used, with the exception of ff. 36r-37r, where the scribe appears to make some small corrections with red ink. It is attributed to Petros by comparing its writing style with Gritsanis 3, and the rest of his surviving autographs. In this manuscript as well, Petros does not follow a method of organising the content with the criterion of *echos* or *makam*, or the composer. However, in the titles he provides performance instructions as well as quite satisfactory information about the *makams* and *usûls* such as:

<sup>34</sup> On the issues concerning the identification of composers, see more in the relevant chapter, pp. 135-136.

<sup>35</sup> The codex also contains one piece of ecclesiastical music, the *Kalophonic Heirmos* of Hânende Zacharias *Ὄρανός πολύφωτος* in *echos varys* (6v).

<sup>36</sup> The manuscript, as well as LKP (dossier) 137, is described analytically in the catalogue created and prepared for publication by G. T. Stathis with the title “Τὰ χειρόγραφα βυζαντινῆς μουσικῆς – Τὸ Ἀρχεῖο Γρηγορίου Πρωτοψάλτου τῆς Βιβλιοθήκης Κωνσταντίνου Ψάχου”.

- 11r *Peşrev makam karcığâr, diyyek* from *rast teterela terelela*  
 the *mülazime* from *segâb teterela terelela*  
 2nd *terkîb* from *segâb teterela terelela*  
 3rd *terkîb* from *rast teterela terelela*  
 4th *terkîb* from *segâb teterela terelela*  
*orta hâne* from *segâb teterela terelela*  
 11v the *son [hâne]* from *nevâ teterela terelela*

Despite its relatively small size, the manuscript is of special interest because it contains significant and rare types of compositions, many of which have unusual names and are not found in other manuscripts, for example:

- 1r The *küll-i külliyât hüseyinî usûl aksak*  
 15r *Sabâ değışme*, the *son hâne hafîf* from *dügâb*  
 18r *Beyâtî devrikebîr*, starts from *nevâ* and *beyâtî*, called *bebram*  
 39v *Hüseyinî şükûfezâr, nazîrent, diyyek* from *dügâb*  
 47r The *büyük nevâ çember* from *nevâ* (see figure 9)

Extensive reference to these compositions will be made below. Moreover, quite an impression is made by the existence of a piece titled “hindilerin” (“χινητηλερίν”), which reveals its Indian origin<sup>37</sup>. The composers named in the manuscript are:

Behrâm Ağa [Nefiri] (- 1560?), Rıza Ağa (- 1650?), Muzaffer (Sâatçî Mustafa Efendi) (- 1710?) and Hasan Ağa [Benli, Tanbûrî, Musâhib-i Şehriyârî] (1607 - 1662).

Finally, here as well, more works are presented anonymously, and of course many of them are possibly the compositions of Petros himself.

The manuscript **LKP (dossier) 137**, is, in its entirety, particularly poorly written and untidy. The writing is in a single colour and is very careless. Its content consists of secular music transcriptions though some fragments or whole ecclesiastical pieces can be found scattered in various folios. Most works are vocal; probably *bestes*. Absent here as well, is any logical and consistent classification by either *echos* – *makam*, by composer or by genre. Basic indications (*makam*, *echos*, composer, *usûl*) are generally omitted as are the analytical details appearing in Grîtsanis 3 and in LKP (dossier) 60. The pieces start with a simple mention of the *makam*.

Very few details can be extracted about the composers and nothing about the poets of the vocal works. References are made to Tanbûrî Haham Musî (Moshe) (? - 1770?) and Emir-i Hac (- 1600? or second half of the 16th century). Again here, most works are anonymous and many of them are possibly by Petros himself.

It is worth noting that the content of these three manuscripts is not identical, neither does it overlap. No work present in one codex can be found in the other two, hence each manuscript is complementary to the others. Despite the irregu-

<sup>37</sup> See p. 156 for more.

larity that characterises them from the point of view of outer appearance as well as content, it is reasonable to view these three manuscripts as one very important source. Petros produced around three hundred and fifty autographed folios, preserving a large part of the repertoire of the art music of Constantinople. In contrast with MS Gritsanis 3, which appears to have started with loftier aims as a work of transcription, MSS LKP (dossier) 60 & 137 have the appearance of music notebooks. This is easily discerned both by the comparison of the dimensions of each manuscript (23.5 x 17 centimetres for Gritsanis 3, 17 x 11.1 centimetres for LKP (dossier) 60, and 36.6 x 12.4 centimetres for LKP (dossier) 137), and the great attention given to appearance, as well as the care taken, which to a great degree defines Gritsanis 3. This detail however, does not diminish the importance of the other two manuscripts.

In these three manuscripts Petros transcribes the repertoire generally heard in the Ottoman court, revealing, in parallel, his deep knowledge of that tradition. Petros transcribed what he heard, what he was taught and what he composed and sang or played on *ney* and *tanbur*. He transcribed his own works, the works of his contemporaries, but also of those much earlier than him, as preserved by the oral tradition of the Ottoman court. In conclusion, it can be supported with certainty that these three manuscripts created by Petros, constitute a precious source for the study of the art music of Constantinople. Together with the collections of Bobowski and Cantemir, they are the most important sources of the repertoire of the Ottoman court, from the 15th until the middle of the 18th century.

The fourth autograph of Petros containing secular music, is **RAL 927**. It is the earliest manuscript containing the genre of “Phanariot songs”<sup>38</sup>, and its content became the basis of a series of later music collections, some of which copied it to a great extent<sup>39</sup>. It is a notebook<sup>40</sup> of unusual length and dimensions, with writ-

<sup>38</sup> Plemmenos (2005-2006) attributes the manuscript to Petros, a view which the author of this work is in agreement with. As mentioned above, fragments of Phanariot songs are found in the first and last folios of Gritsanis 3 (1v-3r, 7r, 254r-255r), but it is not known which codex precedes the other. In any case, the content of this particular manuscript contains Phanariot songs exclusively, hence it can be considered essentially the first. On the genre of Phanariot songs see more in the chapter “Genres of Secular Music” pp. 245-255.

<sup>39</sup> Plemmenos (1998:16-17) notes that its content was copied in manuscripts RAL 653, ELIA, CAMS P1 & P2 and Vatopediou 1428. To those, LKP 19/173 and Iași 129, can be added, which obviously Plemmenos was not aware of. In the same article, J. Plemmenos supports that RAL 784 contains exactly the same songs as RAL 927, but that claim is incorrect. Most of Petros’s songs found in RAL 927 do not exist in RAL 784, neither in RAL 925. Nikeforos, seemed to have based his writing of Vatopediou 1428 and of Iași 129 on RAL 927, since many songs are found in both manuscripts. During the writing of RAL 784 and of RAL 925, he was probably unaware of the collection, or he didn’t use it. By comparing the content of Vatopediou 1428, with other manuscripts containing Phanariot songs, it is concluded that Nikeforos must have copied many songs from the anthology of Petros Peloponnesios (RAL 927) and from the anthology of Petros Byzantios (LKP 19/173). For example:

ing resembling a draft more than a finished manuscript, however, still discernable and legible. An inconsistency is observed here as well with regard to the organisation of the content as initially the layout of the songs does not follow any classification method<sup>41</sup> (see plate 10).

However, from f. 14r onwards, Petros generally follows a method of grouping the songs by *makam*, according to their base note, and their natural sequence on the Turkish scale. That is, he begins with *yegâh*, then lists all *hüseynî-‘aşîrân* together, all *irak*, all *rast* together and so on. Moreover, the *usûls* are given either with quantitative signs such as *ó 2*, *ó 2 ó i*, or with names such as *sofyan*, *semâ’î*, etc. In general, the above reveals that Petros was rather undecided as to which method to follow in the organisation of his material and the manner of its presentation or, most significantly, the pieces were draft transcriptions to be organised and presented in final codices, which he eventually did not produce.

---

*Άλλο δὲν εἶν’ νὰ συγγίξη, τόσον καὶ νὰ μ’ ἀφανίξη*, Petros Peloponnesios, *echos plagal II* heptaphonic, *şelmâz*, *sofyan*, RAL 927, 61r / LKP 19/173, 116r / Iaşi 129, 213 / Vatopediou 1428, 218.

*Ἀμὴν ἀπὸ τὰ χέρια σου κι ἀπ’ τὰ πικρά σου λόγια*, Petros Peloponnesios, *echos IV*, *isfabân*, *semâ’î*, RAL 927, 54r / LKP 19/173, 95r / Iaşi 129, 141 / Vatopediou 1428, 127.

*Ἐπῆρα τὴν ἀπόφρασιν πλέον ἀπ’ τὸ πουλί μου*, Petros Peloponnesios, *echos IV*, *beyâtî*, *semâ’î*, RAL 927, 57r / LKP 19/173, 87r / Iaşi 129, 114 / Vatopediou 1428, 105.

*Μὲ πόθον ὑπερβολικόν*, Petros Peloponnesios, *echos plagal I*, *sabâ*, *sofyan*, RAL 927, 29r / LKP 19/173, 40r / Iaşi 129, 169 / Vatopediou 1428, 174.

*Μὲ τὸ νὰ εἶναι ἀφευκτος σχεδόν*, Petros Byzantios, *echos varies* diatonic, *evîç-bûselik*, *ó 2 ó i*, LKP 19/173, 136r / Iaşi 129, 52 / Vatopediou 1428, 30.

*Ἐνὸς ρόδου θεωρία*, Unspecified composer, *echos plagal II*, *hicâz*, *sofyan*, RAL 927, 12v / LKP 19/173, 64r / ELIA, 81r / Iaşi 129, 202 / Vatopediou 1428, 206.

An examination of the above songs shows that the notation is similar.

<sup>40</sup> Its dimensions are 10 centimeters wide and 15 centimeters high, and it is bound at the top end of the page. That is, the pages do not turn right to left, instead they turn from top to bottom. On f. 86v the following noteworthy annotation is written by a different hand: “for that *metzmai* [*mecmu’â*], he [Petros Byzantios] gave the son of the late protopsaltes of the Great and Holy Church of Christ a woollen overcoat from Vienna in the year 1808 in Iaşi, which the departed had been given from the earlier departed Mr. Petros the Peloponnesian, since the above mentioned protopsaltes is the more recent Petros Byzantios who became a pupil of the former lambadarios Petros Peloponnesios, for everyone’s information, he has special songs”.

Generally, such anthologies were usually called “Μιζμαγιές” (Mizmagies), a corrupted version of the Arabic word *mecmu’â*, meaning, a collection of the poetic texts of vocal compositions. Of course, apart from the music manuscripts, where complete Phanariot songs are preserved, there are also many anthologies of poetry where only the text is given, without musical notation. A basic bibliography on the topic is given in the chapter “Genres of Secular Music”.

<sup>41</sup> On the first folio (6r) text only verses are found without a title. After that, the model followed is “one page to one song” where only the music is given (7r) or the music followed by text only verses (6v, 7v). This is followed by songs where the verses are given only as text (ff. 8r-10r, 11r), while on f. 10v a song is inserted with both text and music. From then on, each song is given with its notated melody and also with all its preceding verses in text only, except for ff. 24r, 31v, 32r, 37, 48r, 57v where only the music is given.

Additionally, no composer names are mentioned in the manuscript. Nevertheless, for many of the songs it can be argued with certainty that they were compositions of Petros himself, since they are clearly attributed to him in other codices.<sup>42</sup> Finally, some pieces are listed anonymously in other sources as well, therefore it cannot be excluded that they are indeed the works of unknown composers.

### *The Autograph Collection of Petros Byzantios*

The manuscript **LKP 19/173**, dating from the late 18th to the early 19th century, is an autograph codex of Petros Byzantios (see figure 13). It has 160 folios containing art music of Constantinople, being mainly Phanariot songs. The first mention of the manuscript as well as its authorship is found in the *Φόρμιγξ* journal in the article of K. Psachos (1911), “Πέτρος ὁ Βυζάντιος Πρωτοψάλτης τῆς Μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας καὶ τὰ σωζόμενα αὐτοῦ χειρόγραφα”. The *makam*, the *echos* with its *martyria* and the *usûl*, with quantitative signs such as ὁ 2, ὁ 2 ὁ I, are found in the heading of every song. The genre is only mentioned for *şarkis* and for *nakis ağır semâ’î*. The name of the composer is not given for any of the pieces. However, it contains eight songs by Petros Byzantios himself, ninety-seven songs by Petros Peloponnesios, three by Iakovos Protopsaltes, one by Ioannis Protopsaltes, one by Athanasios Dimitriadou, while for forty-three songs the composer is unspecified, as is the case for the six songs existing in Turkish. The content of the manuscript is quite influenced by RAL 927<sup>43</sup> and presents similarities, in regard to the order of the songs, to the manuscripts of ELIA, CAMS P2 and Vatopediou 1428<sup>44</sup>. Additionally, the codex has many blank pages, ninety in total, all of them verso. Perhaps Petros left them blank to add the verses later, something that eventuated at a later time by a different scribe.

Four sections can be clearly discerned in the codex:

a) ff. 1r - 119r, b) ff. 120r - 149v, c) ff. 150r - 158v & d) ff. 159r - 160v. In the first section and only there, Petros follows an organisational method for the rep-

<sup>42</sup> For more information see the catalogue of works of Petros, in the chapter titled “Catalogue of Secular Compositions”, pp. 89-98 where references to all available sources are listed for each song individually.

<sup>43</sup> It should be noted that there are songs by Petros Peloponnesios, which are not found in RAL 927. Thus, it can be concluded that the scribe did not simply copy the manuscript but either used another, or many other manuscripts, as a basis for this one, or that he transcribed some melodies from memory. With regards to Vatopediou 1428, mention must be made of the song *Όλα τὰ πράγματα καιρόν, πῶς ἔχουν εἶναι φανερόν* (Petros Peloponnesios, *echos* plagal II, *hūmayîn*, *sofyan*) which is written twice in LKP 19/173 and twice in ELIA. The two versions have small differences between them, but these differences are reproduced as follows:

1<sup>st</sup> version: LKP 19/173 f. 76r & ELIA f. 39r,

2<sup>nd</sup> version: LKP 19/173 f. 74r & ELIA f. 40r.

<sup>44</sup> See below.

ertoire reminiscent of the corresponding method of RAL 927, but with greater consistency. In the second section, he seems to have missed some songs which he later lists unordered and without an organisational method. In the third section, five *şarkıs* and one *nakış ağır semâ'î* are found, while in the fourth, four more Phanariot songs exist, one of which is incomplete. The codex is also missing initials, which appear to have been left out during its initial authoring.

*Four Codices and One Fragment of Secular Music by Nikeforos Kantouniaries*

The codices RAL 925, RAL 784, Iaşi 129, Vatopediou 1428, the fragment CAMS P1, and pp. 534-543 of the codex Xeropotamou 299, are all by Nikeforos Kantouniaries. The four codices contain mainly Phanariot songs, as well as other vocal genres, *şarkıs*, *bestes*, *ağır semâ'î*, *yürük semâ'î*, Gypsy and Arabic songs, and many more. The CAMS fragment exclusively contains Phanariot songs. The folios of the Xeropotamou codex contain a series of eleven *taksıms* by Petros Peloponnesios. The secular music manuscripts of Nikeforos have been studied by J. Plemmenos in a number of his articles<sup>45</sup>; while in particular for Vatopediou 1428, a relevant article has been published by G. T. Stathis<sup>46</sup>, who was the first to bring this most important codex to light.

Codex **RAL 925** is the earliest secular music manuscript of Nikeforos Kantouniaries. It has 82 folios and exhibits a relative untidiness with regard to its content and its general appearance. The songs are listed in a rough order and in some cases text only verses are interspersed without notation. The headings mention the names of *makams* but not *usûls*. In addition, the songs are listed anonymously except for those attributed to Iakovos Protopsaltes (Yiakoumakis Lambadarios)<sup>47</sup>. Two songs have descriptions pertaining to geographical regions, one of them bearing the description *Wallachian* (“Βλάχικον”) and the other, *Frankish* (“Φράγγικον”). Moreover, in contrast to MSS RAL 784, Vatopediou 1428 and CAMS P1, the codex does not contain any songs of Nikeforos himself, a fact that leads to the conclusion that he had not yet begun composing verses. In general the collection bears the characteristics of a first attempt, which shows Nikeforos’s immaturity as a collector of songs and unfamiliarity of secular music in general. This as well as the rest of the palaeographical observations, support that this is the earliest one of his four codices of secular music.

Codex **RAL 784** appears to be the second earliest manuscript containing secular music by Nikeforos Kantouniaries (see plate 14). It has 270 folios and contains around two hundred songs. Its general appearance clearly indicates that more

<sup>45</sup> See relevant reference in the Introduction, p. 25.

<sup>46</sup> See relevant reference in the Introduction, p. 24, fn. 33.

<sup>47</sup> Nikeforos also mentions the names of Kemâni Yorgi, Mustafa Ağa and Sultan Mahmud, but he does not provide notated works of theirs, just text only verses.

care was taken with it in comparison to RAL 925. Kantouniaries here attempts to follow a classification method, grouping the *makams* on the basis of the *octoechos*, however, some inconsistencies are observed.<sup>48</sup> In addition, apart from the *makam* and the *echos*, he lists the *usûl* as well. He lists the names of the composers, including for his own songs. At the end of each song the verses are listed as text only. In many songs, he seems to ignore the composer or he is just not sure:

- 109r Unspecified composer; *segâb makam*, [echos] IV *legetos*, *usûl* ó 2, *Ἡ ἀβέβαιος κινεῖται, τύχη πάντα καὶ μμεῖται*. In “Melpomene” he attributes it to Petros Byzantios;  
 127r Petros Byzantios; *türkî bicâz makam*, [echos] *plagal* II, *usûl* ó 2 ó i. In “Melpomene” he lists it as of unspecified composer.  
 132r Unspecified composer; *nihavent makam*, *echos* *plagal* IV, *usûl* ó 2, *Τί φοβερὰ καὶ σκοτεινὴ καὶ τῶν κακῶν νύκτα κοινή*. In “Melpomene” he attributes it to Petros Peloponnesios.  
 134v *Hicâz makam*, [echos] *plagal* II, *usûl* ó 2 2 ó i, *Τὰ θέληγτρα ποὺ ἔχεις ἀγάπη μ’ φυσικά*. In this manuscript he does not mention any composer, in “Melpomene” he mentions Petros Peloponnesios.

Codex **Vatopediou 1428** is the largest and most complete collection of Phanariot songs, even though its content is not limited to this genre (see plate 15). In its 422 pages it contains about 250 songs and encompasses nearly the whole compositional output of Phanariot songs. In the beginning of the codex, Kantouniaries adds the following description, which deserves to be commented upon:

*Melpomene, namely the book containing semâ'is, şarkis and bestes previously scattered here and there and subsequently collected by Nikeforos Kantouniaries of Chios, archdeacon of the Patriarchal throne of Antioch and teacher at the common music school of Iaşi, in the holy, reverend and famous, due to the holy icon of the most holy Theotokos, the most miraculous one, monastery called Golia, during the abbotsip of his most holiness saint bishop of Irinoupolis, Mr. Gregorios, the Ephesian. 1818 in the month of November. Archdeacon of Antioch, Nikeforos.*

Nikeforos titled the collection *Melpomene* (“*Μελπομένη*”), which is the name of the muse of poetry in Greek Mythology. He must have written it over the period between 1818 and 1820. The year 1818 is explicitly found in the heading, but the information on p. 349, seen below, leads to the conclusion that its writing was completed by 1820 at the earliest (Stathis 2001c:618).

*Verses of the philosopher Govdelas for his highness master Michael Gregorios Soutsos, composed by the already protopsaltes of Constantinople Gregorios and sent to Iaşi doubly, 1820*

<sup>48</sup> For example, the pieces extend to around two rounds of the *octoechos*. It is possible that Nikeforos decided to include more songs at some point, and continued the transcription in that way.

The two-year period seems long for an experienced scribe such as Nikeforos. A few weeks or even days would be adequate. It is reasonable to question why Nikeforos delayed completing the manuscript for so long. An attempt to answer this question is made below.

The codex, which is preserved in very good condition, has a seemingly appearance and is written with particular care. At the beginning of each *echos*, the scribe decorated the top part of the page with a floral design, and each song with elegant initials. Apart from the attention to the aesthetic of the manuscript which is obvious at first glance, the organisation of the material is discerned to be clearly much more methodical in comparison to Nikeforos older manuscripts. Another difference of this manuscript, compared to Nikeforos's other manuscripts, is that his writing style in the plain text verses is much improved. Nikeforos organises the layout of the repertoire on the basis of the *octoechos*. Within each *echos*, he lists the songs, grouping them initially by *makam* and then by composer. It is essentially the earliest manuscript in the Byzantine sources whose content is organised in such a way. Finally, in between *echos* groups, Nikeforos leaves a few blank pages, obviously to have the ability to make necessary additions of songs, without disturbing the order of the eight *echoi*.

The phrase “*scattered here and there and subsequently collected*” states that, according to Nikeforos, the (mainly Phanariot) song material, was scattered, unordered and unclassified. It appears that Kantouniaries knew of other, older manuscripts containing secular music pieces, which he took into account for the compilation of *Melpomene*. The scattered material was collected by the laborious effort of Nikeforos himself. Indeed, many of the songs of the collection were notated by him. The word “*etonisthi*” (“*ἐτονίσθη*”) or “*tonisma*” (“*τόνισμα*”)<sup>49</sup> meaning notated or transcribed, appears often in the titles of the songs. See examples below:

- 38 *Şarki*. Letters and music by the famous *chanopaziate* royal dervish Ismael the *mousaipis*. Transcribed (*Etonisthi*) by Nikeforos archdeacon, *makam 'uşşak*, *echos I*, *usûl sofyân Çbintzriale çhalim diyer gün ei ledivach*
- 85 *Aravikon* transcription (*tonisma*) of Nikeforos archdeacon as he heard it. *Makam çâr-gâb*, *echos III*, *usûl ó 2*, *Baydâ biş-ša'ri-l-abyad*

Nikeforos systematically uses that particular terminology for the lesser-known pieces (Arabic, *Tausanika*, Gypsy, Italian, French etc.) in order to state those specific pieces are his own transcriptions. These terms are contrasted with the terms “*melos*” (“*μέλος*” meaning melody), as well as “*melourgithentes*” (“*μελουργηθέντες*”) and “*emelourgithi*” (“*ἐμελουργήθη*”), meaning “*melody created by*”, which are generally used in the headings of Phanariot songs. It would seem, that he wants thus to make his mark on, and highlight his contribution to, the transcription of

<sup>49</sup> For more on the term *tonisma* (τόνισμα) and the manner in which it is used in the psaltic art see chapter “Historical Overview”, pp. 67-68.

the secular repertoire. Therefore, the use of these terms implies, that for the construction of the collection, he copied many Phanariot songs from other manuscript collections, he organised the content of his collection (as described above) based on his own methodology, he added his own songs to verses again of his own or by others, and enriched the whole collection with many other songs and transcriptions of melodies, making it an exemplary secular music collection. A supporting piece of evidence confirming this is his own testimony, as reliable codex scribe, that two of the songs of the collection were transcribed by Gregorios Protopsaltes:

337 *Şarkı* by Hânende Ahmet A ğ a Saraili. Transcribed by Gregorios Lambadarios in the new system, *makam nîkrîz*, *echos* plagal IV, *usûl* ó 2, *Ach cihan payin*

334 By Yiangos Aĝa of Siphnos. Transcription of the Lambadarios. *Makam nîkrîz*, *echos* plagal IV, *usûl* ó 2, *Mê tâς ζωηράς ἀκτίνας τῶν ὠραίων σου ματιῶν*

All works bear complete titles that adhere to the same logic: name of composer and poet where it exists, followed by *makam* name and initial *martyria* of *echos*. The rhythmic cycle, that is the *usûl*, is given either with its name or with the symbols used by the Greek music teachers. All pieces start from the beginning of the page and, except in very few cases, all song verses are given in plain text. Given all of the above, each song is presented in its completeness. In the last pages of the codex a table of contents is found, listing the songs in alphabetical order based on the initial verse and accompanied by the number of the page on which they are written.

The composers referenced in the manuscript are: Petros Peloponnesios, Petros Byzantios, Iakovos Protopsaltes, Gregorios Protopsaltes, Nikeforos Kantouniaries, Archon Postelnikos Georgios Soutsos, Ismail Dede Efendi, Ioannis Protopsaltes, Athanasios Dimitriadis, Manuel Protopsaltes, mouzikantes Skouloumbris Chios, Yiangos Aĝa of Sifnos and Ahmet Aĝa [Musâhib Seyyid, Vardakosta]. Additionally, in song headings he mentions the names of the following poets: Athanasios Christopoulos<sup>50</sup>, Germanos bishop of Old Patras, Alexandros Sophianos, Dimitrakis Mourouzis, Iakovos Protopsaltes<sup>51</sup>, Archon Postelnikos Georgios Soutsos, Beyzade Yiangos Karatzas, Ismail Dede Efendi, Petros Peloponnesios, Nikeforos Kantouniaries, Archon Megalos Komisos Theodorakis Negris, archdeacon Kyrillos, Tzelepis Yiakovakis Roizos, Antonios Photinos (Doctor), Nikolakis son of Souloutziaris Eliaskos, Alekos Balasidis, Selim III<sup>52</sup> and Govdelas the Philosopher.

<sup>50</sup> Some of the songs are clearly attributed by Nikeforos to Christopoulos, while in others he simply gives the name of the anthology of poetry from where they originate “ἐκ τῶν λυρικῶν” or “ἐκ τῶν βακχικῶν” which are also works by Christopoulos.

<sup>51</sup> Apart from his own songs, verses of his are also found in songs by others, e.g. on p. 3. Verses by Iakovos Protopsaltes Byzantios. Music by Petros Peloponnesios Lambadarios *makam hüseyinî*, *echos* I, *usûl* ó 2, *Τὸ ὠραῖον πρόσωπόν σου σχηματίζει οὐρανόν*.

<sup>52</sup> Selim III wrote the verses in Turkish. According to Nikeforos they were translated into Greek and music was composed to them “by some unknown composer”, or according to the scribe of LKP 152/292, 14, by Gregorios Protopsaltes.

Such references aid in the attribution of songs to composers, when the same songs appear in other manuscripts where the composer is not mentioned. Of course, there are many anonymous songs here as well. Anonymity however is explicitly stated, a fact that ascertains that the scribe has not forgotten or missed the name, but that the piece is indeed by an unknown composer. Hence, in the general catalogue of works, many of the songs were identified and attributed to composers owing to the explicit descriptions of Nikeforos.

The genres contained in the codex are given by the scribe himself at the beginning of the codex: “Melpomene, namely book containing *semâ’îs*, *şarkıs* and *bestes...*”. Included in the above, is also the genre of Phanariot songs, which is not explicitly stated by the scribe. Phanariot songs are the majority in number, while *şarkıs*, *bestes*, *ağır semâ’îs*, *yürük semâ’îs* and *kârs* are very few. Moreover, most of these are presented again with Greek verses, therefore they can also be classified as “Phanariot songs”. Completely absent are transcriptions of instrumental compositions such as *peşrev*, *saz semâ’î* or *taksım*. There are Arabic songs – a rare occurrence for the 19th century, and, totally unexpectedly, there are also Italian, French, Gypsy and “Taousianika” songs. Finally, the codex includes other noteworthy transcriptions such as three Islamic hymns<sup>53</sup>, calls of travelling salesmen<sup>54</sup>, as well as the melody of the Laosynaktis’s call to church<sup>55</sup>.

In the genre of Phanariot songs, Nikeforos does not intersperse performance rubrics, because he obviously does not deem them necessary. The form of Phanariot songs was adequately clear and known. For the more complex genres he indicates only the change between parts: *beyti*, *nakarar*, *miyân*, *nağme* and others. Finally, the collection contains many distichs without music notation, that is, in plain text.

As previously mentioned, the writing of the codex took place over a period of at least two years, raising the question of what may have delayed the completion of the codex to this extent. One explanation is that perhaps the delay was due to the fact that the scribe’s aim was to compile a collection as complete as possible in terms of content and aesthetic. It seems Nikeforos regarded “*Melpomene*”, which was his last manuscript relative to his others containing secular music, as the culmination of his whole effort to transcribe and preserve the secular music of his environment, and as a serious monumental work of collecting and transcribing a great part of the repertoire of his time, including his own personal compositional output. His personal aesthetic criteria obviously played a significant role in the creation of the collection. However, compared to his earlier collections, there is an evident qualitative difference. This difference is due to his accumulated experience and maturity as a musician and codex scribe. Nikeforos

<sup>53</sup> See pp. 10, 213, 284 of the MS and on p. 115 of this book, in the analytical catalogue of works.

<sup>54</sup> See p. 64, 187 of the MS and on p. 117 of this book, in the analytical catalogue of works.

<sup>55</sup> See p. 187 of the MS and on p. 117 of this book, in the analytical catalogue of works.

appears determined and sure about the aim and the significance of this particular work; he seems to be conscious of the fact that he leaves behind an ark of secular music. This can indeed be witnessed by the few lines in the codex's heading. Hence, for the implementation of such an ambitious plan, the quality of the final result, rather than the time it took to complete it, was of particular importance. Indeed, for the sake of completeness, he left many blank pages at the end of each *echos*, in order to append songs that he missed or that he learnt later on. He also built the table of contents at the end of the codex and chose a codex of large dimension and multiple pages, for the writing of his collection.

The codex **Iași 129** presents great similarity to that of Vatopediou 1429, in regard to the method of organisation of the content and the transcribed songs, as well as its general appearance. It has 367 pages and mentions 1813 as the year of writing, that is, five to six years earlier than “*Melpomene*”, where the method of presentation of the works is clearly improved. Elegant initials can also be seen here in the beginning of each song. Additionally, each song occupies one page. After the notated music, the rest of the song verses are written in plain text. The order of works is to a great extent the same in both codices, even though the headings in Vatopediou 1428 are more comprehensive and more complete.

In this manuscript, four songs of Nikeforos, which do not exist in any other manuscript, are found. They are copied as is, in the analytical catalogue:

- 147 ex /// transcription by Nikeforos archdeacon. *makam segâb*, [*echos* IV] *legetos*,  
*usûl* ó 2 ó i, *Δέν τήν πονεῖς τή νιότη μου*  
 Of the gypsies. Transcription by Nikeforos, *makam arabân beyâtî*, [*echos*] IV soft chromatic (*phthora*) , *usûl* ó 2, *Ikidetour gilirali*  
 Plain text verses 2nd, 3rd, 4th, *nakarar*, the same in Greek Greek “*Έλα ζουρνά μ’, έλα να σε πῶ*”
- 315 *Απονεῖ ή κάθε γλωσσα*, music by Nikeforos, *makam mâbûr*, *echos* plagal IV  
*frangikon*
- 182 *Exomeritikon*, transcription by Nikeforos. *makam hisar* , *echos* plagal I,  
*Άν κι αυτό τό 'καμε βλέπεις*

The above few observations are listed here due to the manuscript's great similarity with Vatopediou 1428. In this codex, it appears that Nikeforos is moving towards consolidating the organisational method of a secular music collection.

**CAMS P1:** This fragment dates from the early 19th century<sup>56</sup> and has 16 pages. The songs contained within it are generally also found in the rest of Nikeforos's

<sup>56</sup> Plemmenos (1999-2000:99-100) places authoring around 1815 on the basis of two arguments, a) “Before 1816, Nikeforos was occupied with the writing of ecclesiastical music manuscripts” and b) due to the “coincidence” of Nikeforos and Germanos of Old Patras in Constantinople at the same time, as seen in the verses of two songs. This reasoning is proved wrong since Nikeforos was occupied with secular music even before 1816 as is clearly documented by the date of Iași 129, being 1813 .

manuscripts. The following two songs are an exception however, preserved only in this particular fragment:

*Ἔρωτος ὄλη ἢ δόξα ιδιώματα*, [unspecified composer], *echos* varies heptaphonic, *ενίς, σοφῆς*, CAMS P1, 12.

*Μέσα σὲ πέλαγος βαθύ*, [unspecified composer], *echos* plagal II, *hicâz*, CAMS P1, 16.

To those, the following must be added:

*Μετὰ ἀσπλαχνίας ἄκρας καὶ μεγάλης ἀπονιᾶς*, Nikeforos Kantouniaries, *echos* I pentaphonic, *acet*, verses by Germanos of Old Patras, CAMS P1, 2.

which is also found in Vatopediou 1428, but composed in a different *makam*:

*Μετὰ ἀσπλαχνίας ἄκρας καὶ μεγάλης ἀπονιᾶς*, Nikeforos Kantouniaries, *echos* plagal IV, *mâbûr, frengi*, verses by Germanos of Old Patras, Vatopediou 1428, 317.

From these few pages, any organisation of the content based on *makams* cannot be discerned. Indeed, Nikeforos gives one notated song, immediately followed by another, then another, and so on, without listing the plain text verses, resulting in each page having up to three songs. In the headings he mentions *makams*, and *usûls*, and the initials are calligraphic. Some songs mention the composers: Georgios Soutsos, Iakovos Protopsaltes and Nikeforos himself; and Yiangos Karatzas and Soutsos are mentioned as poets. For the rest of the songs, Nikeforos does not add the indication “anonymous” or something similar, as he commonly gives in other manuscripts.

Concluding this section on Nikeforos’s manuscripts, it must be noted again, that he himself often highlights his contribution to the transcription of secular music by using the terms “tonisma” (“τόνισμα”) and “etonisthi” (“ἐτονίσθη”), meaning “transcribed by”, in song headings. Nikeforos was rather “ostracized” by the *psaltic* and ecclesiastical circles. It is worth noting that his own songs survive only in his autographed codices. Other, later manuscript collections do not contain any songs by Nikeforos<sup>57</sup>.

### *Three Codices with the Eleven Taksîms of Petros Peloponnesios*

Eleven transcribed *taksîms* by Petros Peloponnesios are preserved in three codices dating from the late 18th to the early 19th century. Specifically, the codices are: Iviron 997, Xeropotamou 305 and Xeropotamou 299. They contain the oldest *taksîm* transcriptions in Byzantine notation and they are either compositions of Petros himself or transcriptions made initially by Petros and later copied by other scribes. They are a series of eleven *taksîms* in eight *echoi*, one for each *echos*,

<sup>57</sup> The only exception being the song *Ἥλιος λαμπρὸς νῦν φαίνει* in manuscript RAL 2238, 13r.

except two in *echos* III, two in *echos varys* and two in *echos plagal* IV, which bear the heading:

“Proemia, that is *taksîms* in Turkish, pieces composed by Mr. Petros Peloponnesios”<sup>58</sup>

The oldest codex containing the *taksîms* of Petros is **Ivion 997** (ff. 162v-168r) dating from the 18th century. **Xeropotamou 305** (ff. 310v-315v) follows, written by Damaskinos Agraforendiniotis, dating from the end of the 18th to the beginning of the 19th century. The *taksîms* are found immediately before the series of *kalophonic beirmoi* that conclude the codex. The *Persikon* of Karykis and one *beste* precedes them. Lastly, is **Xeropotamou 299** (pp. 534-543), which was written around 1810 by Nikeforos Kantouniaries<sup>59</sup>.

*One Manuscript and a Few Folios with Phanariot Songs  
from the Late 18th – Early 19th century*

The oldest codex containing a few individual folios with Phanariot songs is **Gennadius 725**<sup>60</sup>. It dates from the fourth quarter of the 18th century and on ff. 73r and 74v it contains two Phanariot songs. In addition, it must be noted that this is the only manuscript that does not belong to the corpus of manuscripts of ecclesiastical music. It presents heterogeneous content with plain text verses, recipes, financial accounts etc. Codex **RAL 653** originates from the same period. On ff. 33r-40r it contains Phanariot songs, which present examples of classification by *echoi* and *makams*. The rest of the codex's content is plain text verses and pieces of ecclesiastical music. It ought to be noted that it is the first manuscript to present Phanariot songs attributed to their composers. A little later, in the early 19th century (possibly in 1816), the manuscript **ELIA**, which has 107 folios, was written. Its scribe is Evgenios, of whom no other details are known. It also contains Phanariot songs. It presents very few traces of an attempt at organising the inherently untidy content.<sup>61</sup>

<sup>58</sup> (Translator's note: A *proem* (pl. *proemia*) is an introductory musical phrase or short piece.) In all three codices, the *taksîm* section is presented with the exact same title.

<sup>59</sup> Stathis 1976:73-81, 150-151) identifies the unnamed scribe as Nikeforos by comparing the writing style of Xeropotamou 299 with that of Xeropotamou 295, 318 and Vatopediou 1427. A reasonable question though arises as to why Nikeforos, having written at least five codices with secular music, did not include the eleven *taksîms* of Petros in some of those collections instead of including them as part of an Anthology of ecclesiastical music. Moreover, the *taksîms* do not mention *makam* names, only their *echos* is mentioned. Focused future research may provide answers to these questions.

<sup>60</sup> The codex bears the note by the scribe on f. 156v: αψξθ' [1769]. It is of mixed content and written by one main scribe and two or three others. It contains other notes dating from between 1769 and 1791. The above in conjunction with the fact that the two songs are written in the *Old Notation* lead to the assumption that the codex dates from the fourth quarter of the 18<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>61</sup> It appears to be somehow related to codices RAL 927 and LKP 19/173.

*Five Autograph Fragments of Gregorios Protopsaltes and Four Kanonia of the Echoi*

Also examined here, are manuscripts either written by Gregorios's students according to his own teachings, or containing many of his songs.

Five autograph fragments by Gregorios with secular musical content<sup>62</sup> survive in the archive of Gregorios Protopsaltes of the LKP of the University of Athens. They are LKP 2/59a, 8 folios; LKP (dossier) 58, 8 pages; LKP (dossier) 59, 8 pages; LKP (dossier) 76, 4 pages and LKP (dossier) 81, 4 folios. Apart from these, the so-called *kanonia* of the *echoi*, which will be discussed below, also exist in his archive. These secular music transcriptions are essentially the first in the *New Method* of music notation.

Of particular interest is the fragment **LKP 2/59a**. It has 8 folios and its content consists of two *peşrevs* and two *semâ'îs*.<sup>63</sup> Its significance is due to the fact that Gregorios does not stop at providing the exact transcription of each melody and some brief performance details, but he introduces every composition with an analytical commentary, focusing on issues of musical form and theory. Moreover, related comments are often interspersed even within the composition, between its parts.<sup>64</sup> As previously mentioned, the addition of performance instructions is not an unknown phenomenon in secular music manuscripts. Some indicative manuscripts, which must be noted, include Gritsanis 3 and Vatopediou 1428, which are full of phrases such as,

Then the *terkîb*, then the second *terkîb* of *mûlazime*, and then the *zeyl*

or codex Vatopediou 1428 that contains an analytical presentation of some *usûls*.<sup>65</sup> Gregorios, however, goes even further. Unfortunately, the complete manuscript does not survive in order to offer a richer wealth of information about the art music of Constantinople, and of course a more complete picture of the method followed by Gregorios. However, even from these few folios it can be easily surmised that Gregorios had designed a new way of transcription and preservation of secular music, transmitting the pieces of secular music, *exegised* and analysed, to the later generations, not just in the *New Method*, but with all the necessary information for their proper performance. From that point of view,

<sup>62</sup> Apart from their existence in Gregorios's archive, the fact that they are his autographs is also evidenced by the writing style and the characteristic decorative drawing.

<sup>63</sup> 1r *Peşrev* called *beyâtî* composed by Isak. *Beyâtî*, starting from the *echos* IV...

3r *Semâ'î* called arabân *beyâtîsi* composed by Tatari via *gümüüsü gerdan* which is played at every *beyâtî* starting from *dügâb*, that is from *echos* plagal I, *terelele*

4r *Peşrev* muhayyer Koutpounaes, *usûl devr-i kebîr, zarp[ey]n*, bu *peşrev*..., plagal first heptaphonic [*echos*] *erelelele*  
*Gkine gioukari kigkimpî terelele*

7r *Semâ'î muhayyer sînbiüle*, [*echos*] plagal I heptaphonic, *erelelele*

<sup>64</sup> See pp. 202-203 & 269-271 for more.

<sup>65</sup> See chapter "Echoi and Makams – Rhythmic Cycles and Usûls", p. 283-284.

the folios of this fragment comprise a very interesting example of innovative work; a model collection of secular music. The composers mentioned in the codex are Gazi Giray Han II (1554 - 1607), Osman Dede [Kutb-ı Nâyî Şeyh] (1652; - 1730) and Tanbûrî Isak Fresco-Romano (1745 -1814).

Related to LKP 2/59a is also fragment **LKP (dossier) 58**<sup>66</sup>, the two folios of which contain an incomplete piece, probably a *peşrev*, without a heading:

- 1 Again the same  
Another *terkîb* of *son hâne lelelele*  
*mülazime lelelele*
- 2 The first time in the *nana teslim* to take it one more time, one more time and the second time it does *evîç* to take the *orta hâne* like this *lelelelelelia*
- 3 The second time it finishes like this because the *son hâne* starts from the *irak lelelelele*

Here as well, Gregorios gives some information, though of limited extent. The fact, however, that the fragment contains but one composition, and that this composition does not start from the beginning, firstly, does not allow the formation of a clear picture of the presentation method, and secondly, leads to the speculation that Gregorios may have provided more analytical information and commentary also in this manuscript.

Two more autograph fragments of Gregorios are: LKP (dossier) 76 and LKP (dossier) 81 which contain four pages, and four folios with Phanariot songs, respectively. The **LKP (dossier) 76** contains five songs by Gregorios which also bear the indication “*ἡμέτερον*”, in English, “mine” (see plate 16). The *makam* and corresponding *echos*, and the *usûl* are given in all songs. MS **LKP (dossier) 81** contains only one composition by Georgios Soutsos in *makam bestenigâr* – *echos varys* that, as Gregorios notes, is called *kâr*, according to secular musicians. Of interest is the phrase at the heading of the piece: “Composed by me, Gregorios Lambadarios, according to the teachings of him”, that is, of Soutsos. The exact same information is found in another four manuscripts originating from the circle of Gregorios’s students: Stathis, 27r, Gennadius 231, 51v, LKP 152/292, 122 and Archdiocese of Cyprus 33.<sup>67</sup>

Prior to the examination of these manuscripts, it is worth examining another group of Gregorios’s autographs, the “*kanonia*” of the *echoi*.<sup>68</sup> Initially the group

<sup>66</sup> The different dimensions of the examined fragments exclude the possibility that they originate from the same codex.

<sup>67</sup> The same phrase exists in MS RAL 2238, although pertaining to a different composition of Soutsos:

1r Tragic verses composed by the most noble Archon Postelnikos Mr. Georgios Soutsos, words and music, notated by Mr. Gregorios Protopsaltes, *makam, usûl sofyan, me deanti auton* [*echos*] plagal I Pa (*triphonic* with *kliton*), *Τί μεγάλη συμφορά, τί ημέρα, τί εἰδήσεις*

<sup>68</sup> The manuscripts in which the *kanonia* of the *echoi* are preserved have not been included in the table of the available sources, since they do not contain music scores. Here, they are

included MSS LKP (dossier) 135 and LKP (dossier) 136. In the course of this research however it was discovered that NLG / MHS 726 must also be an autograph of Gregorios. In that manuscript, apart from the obvious similarity of writing style, the same word for word phrases are observed within the descriptions of *echoi* and *makams*. Panteleimonos 1250 seems to be a copy of NLG / MHS 726, but by the hand of a different scribe, and is also nearly a word for word copy, with respect to the descriptions.

All four manuscripts contain tables of the scales of the *echoi* (similar to those found in Chrysanthos's theory book) and commentary for each *echos* and *makam* correspondence. The comparative layout of *echoi* and *makams* and the relevant calligraphic tables constructed in the *kanonia* of the *echoi* by Gregorios, in conjunction with the analytical presentation and the commentary on the *peşrevs* and the *semâ's* of fragment LKP 2/59a, show his broader aim, and his intention for a systematic approach and presentation of "secular music".

Another category of manuscripts is examined together with Gregorios's autographs. Some of them were compiled by his students "according to his teachings". The rest, predominantly contain his own compositions. The earliest one (circa 1820) is the MS of the Stathis library whose scribe is Ioannis Konidaris. It has 47 folios and contains Phanariot songs mainly by Gregorios Protopsaltes<sup>69</sup>, as well as some *şarkıs*. It is the oldest surviving complete secular music manuscript in the *New Method*. Information provided in the song headings includes: the composer, the *echos* or some brief commentary. However, paradoxically, there is no reference to *makam* or *usûl*.

Belonging to the same group is Gennadius 231 (ff. 80), written by an unknown scribe in the first decades of the 19th century. It contains many songs that are attributed to Gregorios, or are identified as his own even though he is not mentioned as the composer. The headings present an inconsistency in regard to the information given. In general, *echos* and *makam* are given for each song, in some cases the *usûl* is given as well, while the name of the composer is given even more rarely. Many songs are given without a heading and with only the initial *martyria* of the *echos*.

Eleven songs of Gregorios and one *şarkı* are contained in the few folios of Dochiariou 322. The manuscript is dated from around 1826 and the scribe, according to G. T. Stathis, is a student of Gregorios. Finally, one song of Gregorios is contained in each of the codices Xenophontos 146, NLG 2424 and Archdiocese of Cyprus 33.

---

presented synoptically as they are directly related to the overall work of Gregorios in the sphere of secular music.

<sup>69</sup> In the heading found on f. 2r Gregorios is referred to as teacher: *book containing some secular melodies, some of which composed by the teacher Gregorios and others as they were found, transcribed in the present style under the care of Ioannis Konidaris who also transcribed some of them from scratch.*

The fragment **CAMS, P2** dating from the beginnings of the 19th century, has 48 pages and contains Phanariot songs. It seems to form part of a codex and its content is related to that of codex RAL 927. Some songs, however, exist only in this fragment and/or in codex Vatopediou 1428.

This fragment's unique particularity, is that it does not provide plain text verses, and the songs appear in notation one after the other in sequence. And so, most pages contain three songs; some of them even containing four. From page 46 onwards however, this pattern changes and plain text verses begin to appear. Perhaps the scribe changed his mind about the completeness of the transcriptions of the songs. The fragment's content is organised according to the *octoechos* with a fair amount of consistency; within each *echos* group the related *makams* are also given. In the majority of songs the *usûl* is given, usually in the manner of 02 etc., and more rarely, the *usûls* are given with their complete names. Finally, the *makam* is usually given, while the *echos* is surmised by the initial *martyria*. The majority of compositions are attributed to Petros Peloponnesios, or are clearly defined as "un-specified". It also contains one song by Petros Byzantios and two by Gregorios Protosaltes.

**LKP 152/292** is the last codex examined. On the first page the following information is given clearly:

Songs of various genres transcribed according to the new found method by the Constantinopolitan most-musical teacher and inventor of the New System, collected and written by myself, Ioannis Pelopidis of Epirus, reviewed by my teacher Mr. Panagiotis Pelopidis Peloponnesios, Trieste, 1827.

Its appearance is quite reminiscent of the first printed books of ecclesiastical music. The mention of Trieste raises questions. It seems unlikely that the codex could be written so far from the centre of activity of this music. It is a reasonable assumption that the manuscript was pre-destined for publication and the city of Trieste was given as the place of publication, and not the place of writing.

In general, the content is quite different to that of other manuscripts. It includes, of course, certain songs of Gregorios, Petros Peloponnesios, Iakovos, Gregorios Soutsos, Spyridon Laphaphanas, Anthimos Archdeacon, Kleomenis Athinis, as well as other Phanariot songs, one composition of Hânende Zacharias and one by Abdülhalim Ağa (1720? - 1802). The bulk however, concerns the compositions of the scribe Ioannis Pelopidis and his teacher and probably relative, Panagiotis Pelopidis. Some errors are seen in the presentation of songs in the codex. For instance, some of them are mistakenly attributed to Gregorios instead of Petros Peloponnesios and Iakovos Protosaltes. The order of songs is not based on some method according to *echos* or *makam*. In the heading of each song, the *makam*, the *usûl*, the tempo and the *echos* is given. Finally, part of the manuscript seems to have been copied from MS Stathis. For example, apart from the many Phanariot songs which are also found in other manuscripts, three of

the songs, as well as four compositions from the repertoire of the Ottoman court, exist only in LKP 152/292 and the Stathis MS:

*Ἄχ ἂν ποτὲ φορὰ καταφέρῃ*, [*unspecified composer*], *echos* plagal I phthorikos, *baba tâbir*: Stathis, 9r / LKP 152/292, 64.

*Ἐαρ εἶσαι μὲ τὰ ἄνθη*, [*unspecified composer*], *echos* plagal II: Stathis, 47r / LKP 152/292, 59.

*Ποῦ ἴναι τὸ ἔσκη κ' ἢ χαρὰ ποῦ εἶχα ἕγὼ ἄλλῃ φορὰ*, [*unspecified composer*], *echos* varies diatonic heptaphonic: Stathis, 14r / LKP 152/292, 65.

*Hicâz Beste Ab olmada dirlele roupoute gamze* [Abdülhalim Ağa], *echos* plagal II, [*hafif*], [verses Fitnat Hanım]: Stathis, 30v / LKP 152/292, 159.

[*Hicâz Beste*] *Hey cisme-i abu bizrin* [*unspecified composer*], *echos* plagal II: Stathis, 33r / LKP 152/292, 164.

[*Uşşak*] *Semâ'î Eirele gül rugikinev* [*unspecified composer*], [*echos* I]: Stathis, 37r / LKP 152/292, 172.

[*Hizzâm şarkı*] *Ey gönce-i payimel* [*unspecified composer*], *echos* IV: Stathis, 41r / LKP 152/292, 193.

### *Notation in Related Music Traditions*

Of special interest for a more complete coverage of the topic, despite the fact that the nature of this work is prohibitive of this task, is the general overview of the musical civilisations of the Eastern Mediterranean, the products of which have been preserved in the manuscript tradition of ecclesiastical music. Knowledge of some fundamental details is necessary in order to interpret, comment upon and analyse the transcribed melodies of non-Greek musical civilisations. Further to this, the available written sources concerning the traditions of the East, before the universal establishment of the use of staff notation, must be taken into account, since they are often referred to, especially in regard to the repertoire of the art music of Constantinople. In this way, the contribution of this book to the study of the musical civilisations of the Eastern Mediterranean will be better understood. Therefore the following points are very briefly outlined:

With the exception of the Greeks and the Armenians<sup>70</sup>, the rest of the peoples of the region had not developed a system of music notation until the middle to late 19th century, when almost concurrently, Arabs, Persians and Turks adopted

<sup>70</sup> Armenians had a the “Khaz” notation for church music since the 9th c. (see for example: Aram Kerovpuyan & Altuğ Yılmaz: *Klasik Osmanlı Müziği ve Ermeniler*, Istanbul: Surp Pirgîç Ermeni Hastanesi Vakfı 2010, p. 56ff), and much later – in the 19th c. – a reformed version was used extensively also for Ottoman sufi and court music, the Hamparsum Notası (see for example: Ralf Martin Jäger: *Türkische Kunstmusik und ihre handschriftlichen Quellen aus dem 19. Jahrhundert*, Eisenach: Karl Dietrich Wagner 1996).

staff notation as a notational system, inventing, in parallel, additional modulation signs in order to represent the intervallic variety of Eastern music.<sup>71</sup> Until then, the common collections were limited to the listing of verses with the addition of some information in their heading, often giving the *makam* and the rhythmic cycle and more rarely the composer's name<sup>72</sup>. The few collections where notation appears along with the poetic text can be divided into two categories:

- 1) Music scores using numerical or alphabetic notation
- 2) Music scores using staff notation

The first category, is dominated by the work of Dimitri Cantemir *Kitābu 'İlmi 'l-Mūsikī 'alā vecih'l-Hurūfāt, Mūsikīyi Harferle Tesbīt ve İcrā İlminin Kitabı*. [The Book of Music Science According to the Alphabetic Notation]<sup>73</sup> which he wrote circa 1700. In the same period, Osman Dede wrote his collection in a different alphabetic system, which can be found in a private collection in Turkey today (Feldman 1996:33), while a little later the music collection titled *Tabrīriye* appears, also in alphabetic notation by his grandson, Abdülbâkî Nâsir Dede (Feldman 1996:95). Around 1750 the *Mevlevi* Dervish Nâyî Ali Mustafa Kevserî created, in essence, a copy of the work of Cantemir written in the same alphabetic system<sup>74</sup>, and in 1815, Hamparsum Limonciyan transcribes his own music collection<sup>75</sup>, which is housed in the central archives of the Turkish Radio in Ankara and is inaccessible to researchers. The works above are mainly concerned with the musical environment of Constantinople, because according to M. Guettat the alphabetic notational systems which were found in Arabic and Persian Metropolitan centres in the past centuries “are not exactly systems of writing, but rather a mechanical way

<sup>71</sup> This topic has been studied by many renowned scholars. See for example Wright 1994, 1995; M. Guettat 2005; Feldman 1996:28-36; Shiloah 1979; Popescu-Judetz 1996; Özalp 1969:92-95.

<sup>72</sup> The most complete study of these collections is O. Wright 1992.

<sup>73</sup> Istanbul Universitesi Kutuphanesi, Turkiyat Enstitusu, No 2768; transcriptions into staff notation and translation to Romanian: Popescu-Judetz 1973; transcriptions into staff notation and translation to English: O. Wright 1992; transcriptions into staff notation and translation to Turkish: Tura 2001. Many references to the music collection of Cantemir, as well as transcriptions into staff notation, are given by W. Feldman (1996). It is a reasonable question why Cantemir, having been educated by Greek teachers in Iași and later in the Patriarchal Academy of Constantinople, did not transcribe the songs of his collection in the widely distributed Byzantine notation which he most likely knew, but he used an alphabetic system of his own invention. It is possible that this move was a “predecessor” of other innovative attempts concerning mainly ecclesiastical music (see Agapios Paliermos, Georgios Lesvios and others). Indeed, W. Feldman (1996:33) aptly writes that “(Cantemir) failed to mention his musicological work, claiming to be the first to invent musical notation among the Turks (Cantemir 1734:151)”.

<sup>74</sup> Feldman 1996:33 and E. Popescu - Judetz, *XVIII Yüzyıl Musiki Yazmalarından Kevserî Mecmuası*, Istanbul 1998.

<sup>75</sup> See Ralf Martin Jäger op. cit. and Ralf Martin Jäger: *Katalog der hamparsum-notast-Manuskripte im Archiv des Konservatoriums der Universität Istanbul*, Eisenach: Karl Dietrich Wagner 1996.

of referencing the notes of the scale” (Guettat 2005:316), that is, a type of tablature.

The music scores in staff notation are mainly transcriptions by Europeans, often travellers, who record musical pieces sporadically<sup>76</sup> in between various annotations and accounts, or within the framework of a music treatise. The collection of Ali Ufkî Bobowski *Mecmû'a-i Saz ü Söz*, dating from around 1650, stands out for its age as well as for its volume, and contains three-hundred and fifty instrumental and vocal works.<sup>77</sup>

These sources have preserved significant works of Eastern music and alongside the aural tradition comprise a part of the repertoire, which is performed today in Turkish classical music circles. It must be noted however that these systems of notation, that of alphabetic, numerical and staff, have a basic characteristic in common: they are not “written traditions” with a continuity and evolution, but isolated and fragmented efforts which are not connected to the musical practice of their times, nor to each other. In order to record or preserve the pieces, musicians either devised alphabetic or numerical systems of notation, (an effort which did not produce any followers), or they used the Western staff notation. However, the composition, the performance and the teaching of this music rested exclusively upon the aural tradition, which in the Ottoman court had a particular name: “*meşk*” (lesson, exercise, music lesson)<sup>78</sup>. This is also the primary differentiating factor when comparing these notational systems with the written tradition of secular music, which developed in the bosom of ecclesiastical music, where a continuity and an evolution in notation can be easily observed.

<sup>76</sup> For more see B. Aksoy, *Avrupalı Gezginlerin Gözüyle Osmanlılarda Musiki* (second edition enhanced), Istanbul 2003, where on pp. 380-424 photographic samples of these transcriptions are provided, as well as W. Feldman 1996: 34-36.

<sup>77</sup> British Museum, Sloane 3114 and Bibliothèque Nationale (Turc) 292. The collection has been published as follows (Ali Ufkî 2000, Cevher 2003). For biographical information about Bobowski, see the chapter titled “Composers”, pp. 139f.

<sup>78</sup> See *RedHouse Turce-İngilizce Sözlük*, (13<sup>th</sup> ed.), Istanbul 1993. On the topic of oral tuition in the Ottoman court see more in C. Behar, *Aşk Olmayınca Meşk Olmaz*, YPY, Istanbul 1998.

