

Post-Byzantine Musical Manuscripts as Sources for Oriental Secular Music:¹

The Case of Petros Peloponnesios (1740-1778) and the Music of the Ottoman Court

Kyriakos Kalaitzidis

Secular Music in the Post-Byzantine Manuscript Tradition

From the middle of the 10th century, or, perhaps a little earlier, Byzantine music teachers developed a system of music notation based on neumes (phonetic signs). About 7,300 Byzantine and post-Byzantine musical manuscripts survive today, scattered throughout publicly and privately owned collections in Greece and the rest of the world. This article deals with the phenomenon of the use of this Byzantine system of notation in the writing of secular music, whether of Greek, Persian, Ottoman or Arabic origin (Fig. 1).

Post-Byzantine musical manuscripts constitute a very important written source for the secular music of the Middle East. We find in them a rich quantity of material, over a long period, a multitude of genres comprising, the *echoi* (modes), *makams* and *usûls*, together with the names of composers and other information. This source material covers a time span that ranges from the end of the 14th century to the beginning of the 19th, or circa 1830 when there appeared the first printed collection of secular music.

The amount of the material is impressive: fourteen complete manuscripts, twelve manuscript fragments and many isolated leaves (folios) dispersed in codices of religious music, in all about 4,400 pages containing secular music compositions. There are 53 eponymous composers, Greeks, Turks, Persians, Arabs and Jews, together with many unattributed composers, making a total of 950 complete compositions. The material preserves Greek traditional songs, genres of the Ottoman court music, Phanariot songs and other compositions of an unspecified form. New musical compositions appear together with new versions of works already known.

From the formal point of view, the material offers new elements which enlarge our knowledge concerning structure, terminology and other topics. We can follow

¹ The paper is an abstract of the doctoral thesis written by Kyriakos Kalaitzidis and it was defended at the Musicology Department of Athens University (Kalaitzidis 2012). Due to this there are footnotes and references missing from the text.




Fig. 1: Saint Paul Monastery / Mont Athos 132, fol. 816: [rast beste] Ησακῆϊα ζαντέ // τολπουρκτζελούμ πατέ [Kosmas Makedon], *ēchos plagal 4th*.

tendencies and developments in different periods included in this manuscript, in other words a secular musical tradition extended over a time-span of four centuries.

The scribes (40 in total) are working on codices of Byzantine Chant as well: Protopsaltes and Lampadarii of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, music teachers and cantors, members of the clergy, monks and lay musicians. In the case of well-known personalities, their position lends authority and special value to the works.

Due to the lack of space, we omit reporting on (even if it is a summary) the Greek traditional songs, the Persian musical pieces and the genre of Phanariot Songs, and we focus on the case of Petros Peloponnesios and his relationship with the musical reality of the Ottoman court.

Petros Peloponnesios (1740-1778) is considered one of the leading personalities of ecclesiastical music, with a variety of narrations dealing with his legendary life. He served in high music positions in the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople (Domesticos (1764-1771) and Lampadarios (1771-1778)), whereas recent research has revealed more and more clues which prove that he was a great personality in terms of 18th century secular music in Constantinople, both as performer (*ney* and *tambur*), composer, and scribe of codices. In one example, Petros is identified with Petraki or Tyriaki in the Turkish sources.

He is the author of the first complete collections of secular music², preserving the bulk of the Ottoman instrumental repertoire. He is the first to give, systematically, for each composition, the *makams*, *usûls* and genres, also mentioning many composers by name. It also seems that he was the first to introduce the Phanariot song genre and was responsible for the first collections of such songs.

Petros' manuscripts were written down in the third quarter of 18th century and they are valuable because of their content. The fact that they are written in Petros' hand, a leading music personality, and are mostly related to our subject, an important and experienced writer of codices, increases their importance. The preparation of analytical catalogues and their study offer many significant clues.

More specifically, the codex Gritsanis 3 (Fig. 2) has already attracted the attention of the scientific community without, however, having been studied previously in any detail. It is worth indicating that two works of Petros' recordings have been published from "En Chordais" in the CDs of the series *Great Mediterranean Composers*. These are the *bestenigar peşrev* of Hânende Zacharias and the *terkîbs* in several *echoi (makams)* of Petros in a *peşrev* of Yorgi in a transcription by Thomas Apostolopoulos.

The codex is very significant for many reasons, due to: a) its size (250 folios) and dimensions (23×5×17), allowing the recording of a great number of pieces

² Gritsanis Library 3, K. A. Psachos Music Library Collection, Gregorios Protopsaltes Archive folder 2 / sub-folder 60 & folder 6/ sub-folder 137 and Romanian Academy Library 927.




Fig. 2: Gritsani 3, fol. 198v: [Petros Peloponnesios *terkîls* in several *makams* in *hicaz nev kislât pesrev* of Tzortzi, (*ēchos plagal 2nd*), *fahle*].

(approximately 200 works of art music), thereby revealing the range of the repertoire that Petros had and also his deep knowledge of this music; b) Its content covers a great chronological span, from the 15th century at least, maybe earlier, until the period in which the code was written, specifically in the third quarter of the 18th century, allowing researchers to delve into the past through the means of written sources; c) It preserves works of known and unknown composers and also many other anonymous works, broadening significantly the repertoire of the music of the Ottoman court; d) In addition, it is of special interest for the study of the morphology and the theory of music, due to the richness of the information it contains.

From the compositions that are included in the codex, some are mentioned using the name of the composer, while many others are anonymous. During our survey, many of them were identified and as a result they were attributed to their composers, a small contribution to the further documentation and delineation of the personality and the work of the composers of Oriental music. These included:

‘Abd al-Qâdir Marâghî (1353-1453), Mehmet Ağa [Kul] (d.1580?), Hasan Can (1490-1567), Gazi Gıray Han II (1554-1607 and Seyf el-Mısırî (16th c.), Hacı Kasım (d.1600?), Emir-i Hac (d.1600? or second half of the 16th c.), Ağa Mu’mîn (17th c.), Ali Beğ (17th c.), Rıza Ağa (d.1650?), Solakzâde Miskâlî Mehmed Hemdemî Çelebi (d. 1658), Murad Ağa [Şeştârî], (1610-1673), Şerîf (d.1680), Küçük Hatib (d.1700?), Reftâr Kalfa (d.1700?), İtrî (Buhûrîzâde Mustafa Efendi and/or Çelebi) (1638?-1712), Dimitri Cantemir (1673-1723), Kasım [Mehmed] (d.1730?), Abdurrahmân Bâhir Efendi [Arabzâde] (1680-1746), Es’ad Efendi [Şeyhülislâm Mehmed, Ebû-İshâk-zâde] (1685-1753), Hânende Zacharias (18th c.), Hızır Ağa (d.1760), Tanburi Haham Musi (Moshe) (d.1770?), Kemânî Yorgi (early-mid 18th c.), Ahmet Ağa [Musâhib Seyyid, Vardakosta] (1728?-1794).

Apart from the above-mentioned twenty six composers who were identified, Petros records the works of at least nine more composers, still unidentified from other sources, including:

Papas, Usta Yesefin, İsmail Caus, Antoninin, Tanburi Atrizin (or Arizouni), Peli-gracoğlu, Tanburi Hacı Omer Ağa, Ciohacoğlu, Hocanmasisin.

The fact that these composers are not known from other direct and indirect sources, but they are clearly referred by Petros, provides a research perspective that suggests that the study of these personalities linked to the development of a deep music heritage will continue. Besides this, a large amount of the repertoire is constituted of anonymous works, many of which may be by Petros himself.

As for the genres, the content of the manuscript consists mostly of instrumental compositions, *peşrev* and *semâ’îs*, confirming the turn towards instrumental music during the 17th century. Vocal compositions are limited to a few fragments of Phanariot songs in the first and the last leaves of the codex (1v-3r, 7r, 254r-255r) and in approximately ten eponymous and anonymous works, that is to say *kârs*, *bestes*, *yürük semâ’îs* and others of an still indefinite form.

The manuscripts, Psachos (folder) 60 and Psachos (folder) 137, come from the archive of Gregorios Protopsaltes and they have not been studied or introduced to music or musicological society. Regarding Psachos (folder) 60, despite its relatively small size it is of special interest because it contains special and rare types of compositions, many of which have unusual names and which do not appear in other manuscripts and also offers performing information (Fig. 3).

- 1r The *küll-i külliât hüseyinî, usûl akşak*
 15r *Saba değışme, the ser hane hafif, from dugâh*
 18r *Beyâtî devri kebîr, beginning from neva and beyâtî, his name is mebram*
 39v *Hüseyinî şükûfezâr, nazîre, düyek from dugâh*
 47r The *büyük nevâ çenber, from nevâ*

The manuscript Psachos (folder) 137 is generally badly written and untidy regarding the structure of its content. Most of the pieces that are recorded are vocal, and they may be *bestes*. The majority of the works are anonymous, and of course many of them are probably the compositions of Petros himself. The other composers mentioned are: Behrâm Ağa [Nefirî] (d. 1560?), Rıza Ağa (d.1650?), Muzaffer (Sâatçî Mustafa Efendi) (d. 1710?) and Hasan Ağa [Benli, Tanbûrî, Musâhib-i Şehriyârî] (1607-1662).

It is notable that the content of these three manuscripts is not identical nor does it overlap. No composition that exists in one code exists in the other two, therefore every manuscript is complementary to the other two. Despite their dissimilarity in terms of their appearance and content, it is fair and logical for the three manuscripts to be treated as a very important source of approximately three hundred and fifty manuscript folios which constitutes a large part of the classical music of Petros' time.

In these three manuscripts Petros records the repertoire that in general is heard at the Ottoman court, exposing at the same time his deep knowledge of this tradition. Petros recorded what he had heard, what he was taught, and what he composed and sang or performed on his *ney* or with his *tanbur*. He recorded his own works, his contemporaries' works and also some of those much earlier than him, as preserved by the oral tradition of the Ottoman court. In conclusion, we can certainly say that these three manuscripts of Petros form a valuable source for the study of Ottoman music. Together with the collections of Bobowski and Cantemir, they are the most important sources of the repertoire of Ottoman court music, from the 15th until the third quarter of the 18th century.

In general, in post-Byzantine musical manuscripts there are preserved in Byzantine notation 144 *peşrevs*, 45 instrumental *semâ'îs*, 12 *taksîms*, 71 *seyirs*, 9 *kârs*, 38 *bestes*, 27 *semâ'îs* and 36 *şarkıs*.

Except for two *peşrevs* that Gregorios Protopsaltes records in Psachos Library 2/59a and one of Ioannis Protopsaltes from the unknown writer of Iviron 1038, all others come from the Petros Peloponnisios Gritsanis 3 and Psachos (folder) 60




Fig. 3: Psachos (folder) 60, 1r: *Küll-i külliyât* [peşrev] [anonymous].

mss. In the first we find in total one hundred and twenty works of art music, whereas in Psachos (folder) 60 there are (approximately) twenty four. They all date from the mid-16th century to the mid-18th century. Of course the anonymous and unidentified pieces are difficult to date accurately. The eponymous and/or identified *peşrevs* come from the 16th (11 *peşrevs*), 17th (25) and 18th centuries respectively (26). Regarding the 18th century, due to the fact that there are no *peşrevs* preserved in other written sources, these 26 written *peşrevs* are of genuine significance for the study of this specific genre. Some of these compositions are also found in the collections of Bobowski and Demetrius Cantemir, including:

Seif miseyn naziresi, makam arak, tonyek, Gritsanis 3, 61v → *Irak nazire-i seyfü'l-misri, diyyek*, Cantemir, f. 103-104, work 194.

Asik huseini, tonyek, Gritsanis 3, 148r → *Aşık hüseyinî diyyek*, Cantemir, f. 46-47, work 84.

Muhayer doneyek kioutsonk Ali Pei, Gritsanis 3, 154v → *Pişrev-i 'Ali Beğ, der maḳâm-ı muhayyer, uşûleş diyyek*, Bobowski, 70-1.

Neva [peşrev] [Persian], [echos plagal II], feri mouhames, LKP (dossier) 60, 25v. → *Nevâ 'acemler fer'-i muḥammes*, f. 37, work 68.

Gioulistan pentziougiah [peşrev] [Persian], [echos plagal IV tetraphonic], doneyek, Gritsanis 3, 146v. → *Pencgâh gülistân diyyek*, Cantemir, f. 17-18, work 27.

Houseini [peşrev] [Indian], [echos plagal I], devri revan, LKP (dossier) 60, 52r. → *Hüseyinî dev-i revân hindliler*, Cantemir, f. 93, work 172.

[Rast] gioul tevri pesrefi [unspecified composer], echos plagal IV, devr-i kebîr, Gritsanis 3, 231v. → *Rast gül devr'i devr-i kebîr*, Cantemir, f. 67, work 122.

Houseini gamzekiar naziresi pesrefi [unspecified composer], [echos plagal I], doneyek, Gritsanis 3, 246v. → *Hüseyinî nazire-i gamzekâr diyyek*, Cantemir, f. 170-171, work 314.

Houseini soukoufezar naziresi [peşrev] [unspecified composer], [echos plagal I], doneyek, LKP (dossier) 60, 39v. → *Hüseyinî nazire-i şükûfezâr diyyek*, Cantemir, f. 50, work 90.

Hitzaz tourna, [peşrev] [unspecified composer], [echos plagal II], sakîl, LKP (dossier) 60, 22v. → *'Uzzal turna sakîl*, Cantemir, f. 176-177, work 324.

Segâh [roubban peşrev] [unspecified composer], [echos IV legetos], doneyek, Gritsanis 3, 60v. → *Segâh rûbban diyyek*, Cantemir, f. 97-98, work 182.

Beyiati [peşrev] [Behrâm Ağa (Nefiri)], [echos IV], devr-i kebîr LKP (dossier) 60, 18r. → *Pisrev-i bebram nefiri*, Bobowski f. 69-1.

Neva bougionuk [peşrev] [unspecified composer], [echos IV], doneyek, LKP (dossier) 60, 26r. → *Büyük nevâ diyyek*, Cantemir, f. 38-39, work 70.

Rast mourasa pesrefi [unspecified composer], [echos plagal IV], doneyek, Gritsanis 3, 218v & Gritsanis 3, 220v. → *Rast muraşş'a diyyek*, Cantemir, f. 113, work 214.

Neva bougionuk [peşrev] [unspecified composer], [echos IV], tsemler, LKP (dossier) 60, 47r. → *Büyük neva çenber*, Cantemir, ff. 102-103, work 191.

Some also have in their headings characteristic names:

Ασίκ [*Aşık*] (Lover), Gritsani 3, 150r.

Γαίζεκιάρ [*Gamze-kâr*] (Arrogant look), Gritsani 3, 251v.

Γελινκτζίκ [*Gelincik*] (Little bride), Psachos (folder) 60, 32v.

Γιουλιστάν [*Gülistan*] (Garden of roses), Gritsani 3, 148v.

Γκιούλ τέβρι [*Gül Devri*] (The era of roses), Gritsani 3, 235v.

Κιαννάτ [*Kaynat*] (Existence), Gritsani 3, 252v & Psachos (folder) 60, 38r.

Κιοχ παρέ [*Küh-päre*] (Mountain), Gritsani 3, 23v.

Μπουγιούκ [*Buyuk*] (Great), Psachos (folder) 60, 26r & 47r.

Ρουχπάν [*Rouhpan*] (The monks), Gritsani 3, 60v.

Σαλιντζάκ [*Salıncak*] (Swing), Psachos (folder) 60, 45r.

Σοϊλού [*Soylu*] (Majestic), Gritsani 3, 238v.

Σουκιουφεζάρ [*Şüküfezâr*] (Garden in blossom), Psachos (folder) 60, 39v & 27v / Gritsani 3, 112v.

Σουλεϊϊάνναϊε [*Süleymân-Nâme*], Gritsani 3, 173v.

Σούτχου σαχάρ [*Subh-i Sahar*] (Dawn), Gritsani 3, 189v.

Τουρνά [*Turna*] (Gray heron), Psachos (folder) 60, 22v.

Χαπχάπ [*Haphap*], Gritsani 3, 105r.

Some of them are also already known from other sources. Additionally, Petros does not limit himself to the recording of the parts, but he also gives performance instructions using the music terminology of his time.

Gritsani 3:

42v *Segâlb makam, usûl muhammes, echos IV legetos. Ser hâne, orta hâne, terkîb, ser hâne and mülazime, Son hâne usûl sofyan. 2nd terkîb, 3rd terkîb. Then ser hâne mülazime.*

218v *Peşrev murasa, makam rast, usûl düyek. mülazime, 2nd terkîb, 3rd terkîb, orta hâne, 2nd terkîb, 3rd, 4th, then the last terkîb of the mülazime and later from the beginning of the mülazime until the end, then the son hân[e], Son hâne, 2nd terkîb, 3rd terkîb, of the orta hâne, then the last terkîb of the mülazime and immediately following mülazime from the beginning and it then finishes.*

and Psachos (folder) 60:

6v The *irak darbeyn*, from *irak*, *mülazime* from *dügâlb*, 2nd *terkîb* from *nevâ*, 2nd *terkîb* from *irak*, the *orta hâne* from *nevâ*, 2nd *terkîb* from *mubayyer*, the *mülazime* from the beginning, the *son hâne* from *rast* (and indications, *bûselik, sabâ*).

47r The *büyük nevâ çenber*, from *nevâ*, *mülazime* from *hüseynî*, 2nd *terkîb* from *segâlb*, *orta hâne* from *nevâ*, *mülazime*, the *son* from *nevâ* with *nihavent, beyâtî*.

Similar descriptions, some more summarized or more detailed, accompany the recording of almost all the *peşrevs*. These signs are valuable and their use and utili-

zation does not fit within the limits of this paper. In general they allow: a) A clear understanding of the morphological structure of each work, supplying at the same time the requirements for an accurate performance; b) The realization of the structure of every composition in parts and the comparative study with other available sources of that time, thus enriching our knowledge of *peşrev* structure; c) The descriptions also allow the drawing of more general conclusions about the structure and layout of the basic music genres at the time of Petros, regardless if there are works in the collection dating from much earlier. At the same time, given the fact that Petros recorded not only the parts of the *peşrev*, but also the performance instructions that he was most likely instructed, they offer a serious indication of the way this music was taught.

Moreover, it emphasizes the special structural parts in the *peşrev* like *zeyl*, *tolap* and very often the term *terkîb*, either by the meaning of modal entity, or the meaning of the structural part in *peşrev*. Rarely is the term *teslîm* also found with its old meaning, of course.

Additionally, the *değişme* phenomenon is pointed out and the special types of *peşrev nazire*, *kulli kolliyat*, *karabatak* and *murassa*.

Staying on the instrumental compositions, in our sources there are approximately forty five *semâ'îs* in thirty one different *makams* recorded. This number, in conjunction with the written *peşrevs*, reveals their importance and their position in the music scene of the Ottoman court. Nineteen of them are given eponymously or we have just identified their composer, while twenty six of them remain unidentified, with two of them having the indication of "old". Apart from the two *semâ'îs* that Gregorios Protopsaltes records in Psachos 2/59^a, all the rest are saved by the hand of Petros Peloponnesios in the manuscripts Gritsani 3 and Psachos (folder) 60.

Another interesting aspect that we owe to Petros is the oldest notated *taksims*. They are found in the codices Ivron 997, Xeropotamou 305 and Xeropotamou 299. They are not saved in any autograph code of Petros, but in the codes of other writers, who, however, refer to him as the composer. This is a series of twelve *taksims* in the eight *echoi* of Byzantine music: one in each *echoi* except for two in 2nd *echoi*, two in 3rd, two on *varys* and two on *plagal* 4th.

The lack of space does not allow us to expand on the details sketched above. For example, we can also glean interesting information concerning the use of *makams* in the period, as well as ascertaining the equivalence between Byzantine *echoi-makams* and the function of the rhythmical cycles (*usûls*) in the process of composition. A critical appreciation of their relation should be worked out, or else, to establish the fact that Petros was the first writer that gave clarity to the *usûls* of every composition (Fig. 4).

I believe that these diverse and open issues are relevant to everyone devoted to the study of a great common musical heritage. This includes repertoire, morphology, theory of music, *makams* and *usûls*, as well as the study and analysis of the




Fig. 4: Gritsani 3, 109v: *Segđb pešrev* Dimitri Cantemir, *ēchos 1st*, *berefšan*.

reasons and causes that influenced the writers of this impressive work, the perceptions of the writers, the sociocultural context, and so on.

Given our laborious work over all these years, I do hope it offers a safe tool of study. However, the magnitude of the source material and the completion of its research requires the collective work of many people.