

The Musical “Renaissance” of Late Seventeenth Century Ottoman Turkey: Reflections on the Musical Materials of Ali Ufkî Bey (ca. 1610-1675), Hâfiz Post (d. 1694) and the “Marâghî” Repertoire¹

Walter Feldman

Introduction:

*The Musical Documents of Ali Ufkî Bey as Part of the History
of Musical Change and Musical Erosion in the Perso-Turkic
Cultural Sphere*

By the early 17th century the study of the music of the entire Middle Eastern region takes on a rather different character as the Ottoman musical sources become much richer, for the first time, including substantial musical notations. In addition, a portion of the repertoire preserved in the later Turkish oral tradition shows stylistic affinities with this early period and probably reflects aspects of contemporary compositional style. The musical picture, while far from complete, takes on a new specificity. For earlier centuries and other regions of the Middle East, the researcher must be content to study the history of musical theory, with some reference to the social position of music. For the most part, in the music of the Islamate civilization, it is only at this point in time—the early 17th century—that one can begin to wrestle with those musicological issues that are properly termed historical.

The currently available history of Ottoman Turkish music—starting with the early 20th century publications of Rauf Yekta Bey—display an unreconciled mixture of mythos and logos. One of the pillars of the mythic history of Ottoman music is the vocal repertoire attributed to the early 15th century Azerbaijani composer ‘Abd al-Qâdir Marâghî (Abdülkadir Merağî, d. 1435), a repertoire already mentioned by Prince Cantemir in his *History of the Growth and Decay of the Ottoman Empire* (1714/1734-37) as the compositions of “Hoja Musicar,” and in slightly earlier musical anthologies—such as that of Hafiz Post and the anonymous Revan

¹ This chapter, derived from the conference “Writing the History of ‘OttomanMusic’” sponsored by ITÜ and the Orient-Institut Istanbul, November, 2011, is an expanded version of a paper given by the author for the “Works in Progress Seminar” of the Arts and Humanities Faculty of New York University, Abu Dhabi, February, 2011.

1723—attributed to the “*boca*”, i.e. “The Teacher.” A closer examination of both the Ottoman and Safavid musical sources—which will appear later in this paper—may give us some clues as to the cultural and historical conditions within which these compositions, and their attribution to Maraghi, may have arisen.² Thus the compositions of “The Teacher” became part of the mythic history of Ottoman music, which was related to the Frenchman Charles Fonton in the middle of the 18th century, and which still endures in some form in popular pedagogic materials in Republican Turkey. This “history” displays the logic of myth rather than that of history and may be analyzed profitably in those terms. It also acquired new mythic aspects, thereby accounting for a “national” conception of the emergence of an Ottoman Turkish musical style and repertoire. But either in its older pre-national form, or in its newer nationalist guise, this story has little to tell us about what actually may have happened to music and musicians during the formative periods of Ottoman music.

Prior to the creation of the Turkish Republic in 1923, this musical mythic history was a way through which members of Ottoman civilization understood their own past and their role in the world to which they belonged. Their understanding of cultural history was based not on actual musical documents—although these may have existed at times—but rather on a consensus among members of an educated group of musicians who were viewed as authoritative. However, it so happened that the development of an independent Ottoman musical style and repertoire coincided with increased contact between Ottoman Muslim musicians, local or foreign Ottoman Christians, and Western Europeans. Both Latin Westerners and Ottomans belonging to the Eastern Orthodox Church were heirs to separate traditions of musical notation, which placed their understanding of musical history on a far more empirical basis than that of Muslims. By the 17th and especially the 18th century, myth-making was not the only process at work in the formation of an Ottoman musical history—increasingly the field was cluttered with actual notated musical documents as well as new theoretical works, written in Ottoman Turkish, Armeno-Turkish, or Greek. However disturbing this confrontation between myth and documentary history may have been for members of the Ottoman civilization, this very conflict is part of what produced the mentalité of post-17th century Ottomans.

Muslim intellectuals writing in Arabic, Persian or Turkish generally tried to balance an appreciation of the “novelty” of their own age with the broader continuity of the Great Tradition of the civilization to which they belonged, which, in their view, went back to the Persians and Greeks. Moreover the Ottoman cultural myth and modern conceptions of “world history” can in part agree on the position of an Ottoman civilization within a broader “Islamicate” civilization in a

² As early as 1953 Yekta’s follower, Dr. Subhi Ezgi, had voiced doubts about the attribution to Marâghî, preferring a 16th century Ottoman source for most of them. See Feldman 1991:93. For the actual music of Marâghî, see Wright 1994-95.

“Persianate” form, to use Marshal Hodgson’s terminology. In his magisterial work *The Venture of Islam* Hodgson characterizes the essential conservatism of all pre-industrial, agrarianate societies—that is, urban civilizations where wealth was still primarily based on land, in which “the past, was per se, authoritative” (Hodgson 1977:109). Agrarianate civilizations typically underwent alternating periods of growth and decline, with the occasional and usually brief “golden age” or local “renaissance,” followed by a return to a more common cultural standard.³

Among all the arts prevalent under the conditions of agrarianate civilization, music was the most vulnerable. In the absence of widely used musical notation, sophisticated repertoires and performance techniques had to be preserved, transmitted and developed in each and every generation. A single generation of neglect or experience of political or economic turmoil might spell the loss or erosion of generations of development. In certain Asian civilizations where the artistic music of a rather distant past had high cultural status, enjoyed the support of several segments of society, and may have used various forms of notation as an aide memoire, real continuity—even of specific repertoires over several centuries—might have been possible. Certain classical Chinese repertoires are examples of this process⁴. Northern India from the 17th to the early 19th centuries shows a complex interaction of classical texts as well as older and newer musical genres and instruments (Miner 1993). Within a liturgical context considerable continuity of repertoire and style was possible in post-Byzantine civilization, ongoing under Ottoman rule whose rather sparse notation was based on a continuity of oral transmission under the conditions of a centralized method of musical pedagogy in the church.

In the Islamicate cultures the sheer physical continuity of urban life did not ensure the survival of a particular urban musical repertoire for long periods, especially the sophisticated repertoires sponsored by the elite classes. Islam brought with it moral/religious factors, which at times could put all sophisticated music at risk if a puritanical school of religious interpretation were to take hold within a particular state. In earlier times, in the Islamic Middle Periods, and especially in the post-Mongol era, artistic music held a position of some prestige over a wide geographical area. For these periods the sources sometimes allow us to view considerable continuity, development and diffusion of particular musical styles and forms. Thus, despite the disruptions of the Mongol conquest, the ensuing Pax Mongolica and its aftermath in the successor states offered very favourable condi-

³ The concepts underlying this paragraph are indebted to Karl Jaspers (1953), *Vom Ursprung und Ziel der Geschichte* (1949, *The Origin and Goal of History*). Marshal Hodgson supplemented these concepts with a much fuller appreciation of the role of Islamicate civilization than appears in the work of Jaspers, to whom the historical role of “Hither Asia” was largely obscure: “This is an intermediate region possessing unique historical fascination—but it is of such a kind as to render simple, clearly discernable analysis in terms of universal history impossible” (Jaspers 1953:74).

⁴ A brief survey of these written sources can be found in Lam 2002.

tions for the development and diffusion of the Islamicate high musical tradition across a broad geographical zone, comprising areas where Persian, Arabic as well as Turkic was used. But, as is well known, puritanical interpretations of religion had grown in popularity since the 17th century in many parts of the Muslim world. In addition, European economic and then political expansion had gradually weakened the elite social classes on which artistic music had depended (Powers 1979). In these latter periods (and perhaps somewhat earlier, in some cases), even states that patronized architecture, painting and poetry may not have approved of, or patronized, artistic music. Certain musical techniques, modalities, and tendencies in microtonal intonation, might well persist for several centuries, but Islamic societies after the 17th century usually lacked the political continuity, socio-cultural stability and cultural consensus required to preserve compositional forms, much less whole repertoires over a period of more than one century.

During the high points of Islamicate civilization, encouragement from the court, from the Sufi orders, and through other inter-regional contacts may have led to both preservation of older “classical” norms and repertoire, in addition to the creation of new items, as well as the expansion of the technical means available, through new developments in modality, rhythm and compositional form.⁵ Under less favorable conditions—which were probably more common—much of the “classical” repertoire and norms would be forgotten or neglected, leaving in their stead some of the less demanding items from the older courtly repertoire together with aspects of the modal and rhythmic systems, song types derived from folklore, and the urban entertainment music associated with alcoholic consumption and erotic dance. The basic forms of male hospitality and social conviviality, plus the customs of entertainment within harems of the wealthy, ensured that these musical practices would always find both practitioners and audiences. Nevertheless, this should not be seen as an absolute dichotomy between “artistic” and “popular” repertoires, in which one would replace the other. In time more sophisticated items might become simplified, and more rudimentary musical forms could take on a degree of musical and poetic sophistication. Even in the same generation, more or less sophisticated, more conservative or more innovative versions of the same musical elements (such as modus and rhythmic cycle) or musical genre might coexist within different strata of the same society. And—as some of the Safavid and Ottoman evidence suggests—small circles of elite musicians and their students might preserve and develop a sophisticated musical style without much official encouragement. The erosion of older repertoire and compositional forms might actually facilitate the development of improvisatory playing, which was less dependent upon prolonged master-pupil relationships for the learning of complex

⁵ Within Ottoman civilization the *Mevlevi* Order of Dervishes became the most stable institution fostering the preservation (and to some extent also the creation) of artistic repertoire, only after the middle of the 17th century, principally in Istanbul and Edirne.

repertoire. Under new social conditions these in turn might form the basis for a new kind of artistic music.⁶

During periods in which patronage for artistic music was functioning smoothly, new composition was at least as important as the transmission of older repertoire. As both John Bailey and I have noted for the musicians of the Timurid Baburnameh, the profession of composer (*musannif*) was recognized as distinct from that of a performer, although both might be combined in a single individual (Feldman 1996:40-44). Elite musical patrons were not uninterested in the preservation of certain musical “landmarks” connecting them with their cultural past, but preservation alone could not outweigh the importance of new compositions. It would appear that only when conditions for new artistic composition were less favourable—as for example in 19th century North Africa or urban Central Asia—that the preservation of a large fixed “classical” repertoire assumed great importance. Correspondingly, within late Ottoman and early Republican Turkey, when new composition in the traditional high prestige genres was in decline, the fixing of a “classical” repertoire assumed critical importance in a more urgent way than it had been conceived in earlier eras.

In 17th century Turkey, within this complex of cultural factors and musical sources, the work of the Polish convert Wojciech Bobowski (Albertus Bobovius)—who became the Ottoman Ali Ufkî Bey (ca. 1610-1675)—occupies a position of great importance. In addition to his notated musical anthology *Mecmû'a-i Saz ü Söz*, which has been the object of study by several Turkish and foreign scholars—including the present writer—the recent publication of a study of the Bobowski materials in the Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris (notably Turc 292) allows us to draw many new conclusions regarding the repertoire’s musical substance (Behar 2008). As a practicing musician, Bobowski documented much of the music played at the Ottoman court, while he also acted as a private music teacher, principally, it seems, for Europeans in Turkey. In that capacity he created musical notations and written materials, which he never organized into a book. Considered as a whole, Bobowski’s writings represent the earliest corpus of notations of Ottoman music.⁷

⁶ This statement is not meant to deny purely musical/aesthetic causes for the development of improvisation, or “performance generation” as I term it elsewhere. For an Ottoman example see the chapter “The Taksim and Modulation” in my 1996 monograph (see below). Nor can the situation described here in late 16th century Turkey and Iran be applied in this form to different societies such as India, for example.

⁷ Concerning Ali Bey’s biography, is sufficient to note that, after being captured—probably by Crimean Tatars in the course of Ottoman/Polish hostilities near his native Lemberg (Lwow)—Bobowski was sold as a slave in Istanbul. Early on in his captivity he converted to Islam, taking the name Ali Ufkî Bey. His musical talent was soon recognized and he became a court musician, playing the *santur*, related to the East European *cimbalom*. Hereafter he signed himself “Santuri Ali Beg.” After some years his knowledge of languages led him into the court service as an interpreter, in which position he became acquainted with many European ambassadors. Altogether he spent nineteen years in the court service. His

The next substantial corpus of Ottoman musical notations were created by the Moldavian Prince Demetrius Cantemir (1673-1723), which is comprised exclusively of instrumental pieces (*peşrevs* and *semâ'îs*).⁸ Whereas Bobowski treated mainly the musical repertoire created within his generation, Cantemir had a broader aim, and so included many *peşrevs* which had been written down roughly fifty years previously by Bobowski, but in the form in which they were played in his time, as he did not have access to Bobowski's collection. Thus, the commonalities of the two collections have tended to obscure the real musical differences separating the period from 1620 to 1700, roughly two generations. While earlier I had attempted to create a stylistic differentiation between the *peşrevs* composed in what I had termed "period 3" (1600–1650) and "period 4" (1650–1690, which could certainly be extended to ca. 1700, when Cantemir wrote his treatise), here I would like to deepen and broaden this idea by introducing material from the Ottoman vocal repertoire and from contemporaneous Iranian musical and historical sources. In the course of this comparison I will attempt to interpret what this stylistic change may mean in creating a periodization of Ottoman music (Feldman 1996:339-391).

The Musical Situation in Ottoman Turkey in the First Half of the Seventeenth Century

The problematic of the present work was articulated as far back as 1992 by Owen Wright in his groundbreaking study of the Hâfiz Post *Mecmû'âsı* and its antecedent musical anthologies (Wright 1992a). After his exhaustive study of four musical anthologies dating from the 15th and 16th centuries, he notes the almost total break in repertoire and genre with the appearance of the *Hâfiz Post Mecmû'âsı* of the later 17th century. It is worth quoting part of his conclusion:

religious and cultural allegiances were complex, and he was probably connected with the Calvino-Turk movement, seeking Ottoman support for Protestant opposition to the Habsburgs. To this end he was entrusted with the translation of the Bible into Turkish, and the publication of the Geneva Psalm hymnal of 1572 into Turkish, with the original music arranged according to Turkish makams (modes). See Judith I. Haug's unpublished paper: "Summounting religious, musical and linguistic frontiers: 'Ali Ufki's translation of the Genevan Psalter (c.1665) as a transcultural achievement" and her published dissertation (Haug 2010). Since then Dr. Haug's work on Bobowski has continued.

⁸ Demetrius Cantemir—in Turkish, Cantemir—(1673-1723) was a major Eastern European intellectual figure. Having spent most of his life in Istanbul, he became Voivode of Moldova for one year (1711) before fleeing to Russia after the failure of Peter the Great's attempted invasion. Around 1700 he wrote his groundbreaking treatise on Ottoman music, to which he appended a collection of 350 *peşrevs* and 50 *semâ'îs* in his own musical notation. His famous *History of the Growth and Decay of the Ottoman Empire* was written while in exile in Russia, but published in English, 1734-37. For his notations, see Wright 1992b, and Feldman 1996. Among the many sources on Cantemir as a musicologist and as part of the history of Eastern Europe, we may note Popescu-Judetiz 1999; Eşanu 2008.

What is at issue, however is not the pre-history of the court-music repertoire, but the problem of its quite sudden disappearance, to which one may add the question of the extent to which, viewed specifically in relation to the emergence of the Ottoman tradition, the musical system through which it was articulated survived it. Despite the undeniable existence of many common elements, the evidence reviewed above indicates that the seventeenth-century Ottoman system differed from its predecessor to the extent that if the two were juxtaposed we would need to speak of musical diglossia, and given the brevity of the time span involved it is difficult to conceive that the idiom of the earlier court-music repertoire could have been relinquished (at the earliest during the third quarter of the sixteenth century) before the initial stages of the evolution of the its successor into a form recognizably Ottoman (the process being completed at the latest during the second quarter of the seventeenth century) (Wright 1992: 285).

Before closing his study, Wright puts forward some brief suggestions related to the “sociological axis” that must have allowed the newer populist Turkish repertoire to have come into existence while the older courtly international “Persianate” repertoire had not yet disappeared:

Here, in the absence, yet again, of appropriate evidence, we can only put forward as a plausible hypothesis that the sixteenth-century court music recorded in the antecedent collections could have been precisely that, a corpus of songs largely in languages other than Turkish enjoying high prestige but only limited diffusion, performed often by professional musicians trained elsewhere and employing a specialized idiom that may not have enjoyed wide currency beyond the confines of the court. Alongside and in a certain sense beneath this one could well imagine the development of an indigenous Ottoman tradition of urban music-making, which would be characterized by its emphasis on Turkish texts avoiding the prominent panegyric strain of court poetry and, since it existed outside the patronage system of the court, would rely very little on the professional performer but depend, rather, on wider participation (*op. cit.*, 285).

In his study Wright based his description of the contours of the early Ottoman repertoire both on the *Hâfiz Post Mecmû’âsı* and on the notations in the somewhat earlier *Mecmû’a-i Saz ü Söz* of Ali Ufkî Bey (ca. 1650). In the past four decades, during which period the notations of Ali Ufkî Bey as well as other Ottoman musical sources have been subjected to increasing scholarly scrutiny, it has become clear that his work is important, not only because it is the earliest substantial corpus of musical notation of Ottoman music, but also because it documents the earliest phases of what was to become a distinct Ottoman musical culture. As I noted earlier, this was a “complex of events which resulted in the creation of new modal structures, a new series of musical genres, a more extensive cyclical performance, a new relationship between composed items and performance generation, a new instrumental ensemble, new social patterns of professionalism and new relations with the non-Ottoman musical world. That is, Ottoman Turkish music properly speaking came into existence” (Feldman 1996:46). But in the light of subsequent research—this statement from 1996 telescopes, as it were, a series of discrete musical processes that had occurred over a period of perhaps 70 to 80 years—most of what it describes was in place only after approximately 1670 or 1680. Ali Ufkî’s musical career lay squarely within an earlier generation in which

this process was far from complete, whereas Prince Cantemir lived in a world in which it was well underway.

It would be a mistake to view this new “Ottomanism” as the outcome of a long cultural evolution, whereby a medieval “international” musical style was replaced by a newly self-confident “national” school, to use a Western European cultural paradigm. There is no evidence to show that the Ottomans viewed their musical situation in this way, and quite a lot of evidence suggests the opposite. As Wright argues above, the new “national” style was the result of the partial collapse of an earlier, more sophisticated musical style that was indeed “international” (i.e. Persianate of the Eastern Islamic culture). Evidently local musicians were forced to search for local musical sources to combine with the remnants of the earlier international art music in order to create a new musical style and repertoire. For Wright in 1992 it was a moot point whether this musical change was brought about primarily by the collapse of the earlier court repertoire, or by a cultural shift that rendered it somehow culturally irrelevant. The temporal proximity of the two styles suggested to him that a major cultural shift had occurred, which brought the more populist “Turkish” repertoire to the fore, even while the older international repertoire was still recalled to some extent. It now appears—at least to the present writer—that the *Mecmû’â-i Saz ü Söz* and the *Hâfız Post Mecmû’âsı* actually document two fairly distinct phases in this musical shift. In the former the populist element has come to the fore, with the courtly style more evident in the instrumental *peşrev* than in the vocal repertoire, while the latter documents the beginning of the new “courtly” vocal repertoire. Once this second process had begun in the second half of the 17th century, a period of artistic “progress” and development did indeed commence and continued with little interruption well into the middle of the 19th century—a period of a full two hundred years.

The main focus of the present paper is to synthesize the results of research on Ottoman musical sources since the early 1990s, so as to highlight the gradual nature of this process, a development which now seems to have only begun to gather momentum in the last third of the 17th century, that is, after Ali Ufkî Bey’s lifetime. In the light of the current state of our knowledge, Ali Ufkî/Bobowski’s notations appear to document a transitional stage between the decline of earlier, international musical norms, and the creation of the mature Ottoman musical style and repertoire, between roughly 1670 and 1800. While, as I noted as early as 1996 (and more clearly in later publications), there were significant structural differences between the music created in the earlier and in the later half of this later period, there was no real break or lack of continuity. The basic technical and broader aesthetic features of the music of the second half were clearly built on those of the first half of this period. That is, although the period from 1670 to 1800 witnessed the most rapid technical development in the entire history of Ottoman music—certainly surpassing the 19th century in that regard—these developments were never rejections of earlier musical practice. They were rather incremental developments

of the principles evident in the earlier repertoire and its theory. Looking at the beginning and end of the broad era from 1670 to 1800, the changes appear to be prodigious, but they probably would not have seemed that way to participants experiencing these musical developments. At no point in this later period do we see the radical break in musical conceptualization that underlies the theory of Prince Cantemir, and all theorists that went before him.

Cantemir, writing in the early 18th century—but in Latin for a Western readership—stated clearly that the middle of the 17th century represented not continuity, but a significant break and the start of a local “renaissance” for Ottoman music. In his *History of the Growth and Decay of the Ottoman Empire*, Cantemir wrote the following about music during the reign of Sultan Mehmed IV (1648-1687), in Tindal’s charming English translation: “The art of musick almost forgot, not only revived, but was rendered more perfect by Osman Efendi, a noble Constantinopolitan” (Cantemir 1734, I. 15-52). Cantemir himself had studied with Osman’s student Buhurîzâde Mustafa İtrî—whom he quotes in his book of theory—but Cantemir was a *tanbur* player, not a vocalist, and in his *History*, among his teachers he noted only instrumentalists: Koca Angeli, Eyyubi Mehmed Çelebi, Tanbûrî Çelebi (“Chelebico”), Kemânî Ahmed and Neyzen Ali Hoca. And as we shall see below, the instrumental repertoire did not undergo the same degree of generic change as the vocal repertoire had; there seems little chance that it had been “almost forgot.” Cantemir mentions five of Osman’s eminent students: Hâfız Kômür, Buhurcuoğlu (İtrî), Memiş Ağa, Küçük Müezzîn and Tesbîhçi Emir. Hâfız Post (d. 1694) was yet another major student of Osman’s. Cantemir himself was among the second generation of Osman’s students (through İtrî), and he mentions two of his own students—Taşcıoğlu Mehmed and Bardakçı Mehmed Çelebi—thus tracing the direct influence of Koca Osman through three further generations of musicians, a period of an entire century. Behar also notes the important fact that Es’ad Efendi fails to mention these master-student relationships which were so crucial in transmitting the “classical” musical techniques and repertoire, whereas the few remarks by the outsider/insider Cantemir are much more revealing (Behar 2010:126).

Earlier, Evliya Çelebi in his *Seyahatname* had placed “Hânende Kasımpaşalı Koca Osman Çelebi” as the first in his list of eminent singers (*bânende*): “he was a perfect master, a venerable imam, who resembled an angel in the heavens.”⁹ This “Osman Efendi” or “Koca Osman” (“Osman the Elder”) is one of the earliest Ottoman composers to appear in the 17th and early 18th century Ottoman sources. Osman was the teacher of Hâfız Post (1630-1694), who included several of his compositions in his famous anthology (*mecmû’â*). The biographical dictionary of Es’ad Efendi (ca.1725)—who was contemporary with Prince Cantemir—lavishes the highest praise upon Osman, calling him “the saint of the *tarikât* (Sufi order) of

⁹ Evliya Çelebi *Seyahatnamesi*, I (1996:302), quoted in Behar 2010:125.

mastery and the guide in the valley of connoisseurship, he was the master (*üstad*) of most of the masters of Rum.” He also notes his specialization in composing the most serious compositional forms (the *murabba’*, *kâr* and *nakiş*) as well as the *şarkı*, and mentions his “over 200 compositions” (Behar 2010:263). Es’ad Efendi’s entrance for him is among the longest in his book, and begins:

Osman Efendi. His birthplace and residence were both in the Kasım Paşa neighborhood (of Istanbul), and he was known as “Koca Osman.” He was one of the masters of music who became famous around the year 1030 (1620). He came from the *müteferrika* group of the *askeri* class... (Mekteb no. 10, p. 401).

An early manuscript of the same text specifies that Osman’s fame had already begun in the time of “Sultan Murad Han,” that is Murad IV (1623-1640).¹⁰ This illustrates that Osman Efendi was an influential musician some twenty years before the accession to the throne of Sultan Mehmed IV, as mentioned by Cantemir, thus making him contemporary with the period in which Ali Ufkî was a court musician for Sultan Murad. Koca Osman—evidently a “noble” member of the military bureaucracy—was part of the first generation of Turkish composers whose works are remembered in the later Turkish oral tradition, along with his contemporaries Ama Kadri and Sütcüade İsa, and his students Buhurcioğlu (Buhurîzâde) İtrî, Hâfız Kömür, Küçük Müezzîn and Hâfız Post. We know from Evliya Çelebi that Murad IV was an active patron of music, but Koca Osman was not a court musician. His influence seems to have passed largely through his students, who were more involved with courtly patronage. Koca Osman is represented rather more substantially in the anonymous *mecmû’â* Revan 1723, and in the most prominent positions. For example the “*fasl-i uşşak*” begins not with *kâr*s by “the hoca”, i.e. Marâghî—as is usual in this mecmua as well as in the *Hâfız Post mecmû’ası*—but with three pieces by Koca Osman: *kâr uşşakname*, *hafif*, *nakiş*, *zarb-ı feñh* and *nakiş türki-zarb*, two of them not incidentally in the heaviest of the *usûls* and with Persian texts.

The evidence of the Hâfız Post anthology, Revan 1723 and *Atrab ül-asâr* of Es’ad Efendi suggest that the last third of the 17th century represented a stylistic break with the past. Wright describes the repertoire documented by Hâfız Post:

Assuming that those included by Es’ad Efendi provide a representative cross-section of the composers in HP [Hâfız Post] the emphasis is, therefore, very much on Istanbul as the major cultural centre, and on a repertoire which is predominantly an assemblage of what had been produced within one or at most two generations, for apart from the particular categories of the Persian language *kâr* and *nakiş*, generally attributed to legendary composers and evidently considered to be the representatives of an ancient tradition, the great bulk of material will have been produced by composers active in the third quarter of the century, with only a relatively few pieces surviving from composers of the preceding generation, such as Koca ‘Osman, Hâfız Post’s own teacher (Wright 1992: 203).

¹⁰ Istanbul Universitesi Nadir Eserler Kütüphanesi, Türkçe Yazmalar 6204. See Behar 2010:262.

Es’ad Efendi, perhaps trying to present as balanced a picture as he could, is considerably more generous to Koca Osman and his students, but the contrast in musical creativity between the first half of the 17th century and its third quarter is striking: the reigns of Sultans Ahmet I, Murad IV and Ibrahim (comprising the years 1603-1648) can boast only nine well known composers, whereas the reign of Mehmet IV alone (1648-1687) has 59 (Behar 2010:138)! This was the period when the great compositional and teaching activity of Koca Osman (as well as that of Sütçüzade ‘Isa and Ama Kadri) bore fruit, along with that of several other native and imported musicians of note. Es’ad Efendi wrote his *tezkiye* almost 25 years after Cantemir’s defection from Turkey—neither mentions the other—but they must have shared rather similar views of the relative musical significance of the first as opposed to the second half of the 17th century.¹¹

Cantemir based his judgments of Ottoman musical history upon his teachers and informants’ views such as Tanburi Angelos, Tanburi Eyyubi Mehmed Çelebi, Kemani Ahmed, Kemani [Neyzen] Ali Hoca, Buhurîzâde Mustafa Itî, and Çömlekçîzade Receb, who were the authoritative sources of his time. For the Turkish musicians of the later 17th century, the crisis through which their music had passed less than a century earlier, and the heroic efforts made by certain musicians one or two generations before them, were still part of living memory. It is highly significant that Cantemir’s teachers did not relate to him only the mythic view of the history of music—going from Pythagoras (*Fisagor*), through Ibn Sina to ‘Abd al-Qâdir Marâghî, Gulam Shadi and the court of Hüseyin Bayqara—but also communicated the specific local history, which centered on the early to mid-17th century as its crucial phase.

In Cantemir’s little phrase “the art of musick, almost forgot,” lies an unwritten history of musical decline and erosion that master musicians like Tanburi Angelos or Kemani Ahmed must have indicated to their young Moldavian student either through actual examples or via knowing silences. Perhaps due to the fact that they and their princely pupil were all of Orthodox Christian origin (Kemani Ahmed was a Greek convert to Islam), they may have been more willing to explain to him what they knew of the actual history of music in Istanbul, and not only the Islamic/Ottoman mythic history. Nevertheless, although Es’ad Efendi does not express himself as categorically as Cantemir—in his *tezkiye* the *‘ilmül-mûsîkî* is never “forgot”—yet the *Şeyhülislâm* and the Moldavian prince are in substantial agreement about the musical history of the preceding century.

By the middle of the 18th century the more conservative Ottoman view reasserted itself, as we can see in the book by Charles Fonton (1751). For Fonton’s Turkish informants, the continuity of Ottoman music from medieval Persian

¹¹ Behar 2010, chapter V—“Eskiler’ ve ‘Yeniler’ Meselesi: Osmanlı/Türk Musikisinin Öz-bilinci” (The Ancients and the Moderns: the Self-Definition of Ottoman Turkish Music), treats some of these issues, including Cantemir’s reference to Koca Osman and the question of Ottoman pseudographia.

practice is the dominant theme and the early 17th century does not signify anything special or unique. Evidently, having undergone the crisis of the later 16th century, Turkish musicians living in the 18th century, after a new repertoire and performance practice had come into a secure existence, and music was rather well supported, had no desire to dwell on the problems of the past. It is also possible, of course that Fonton's Ottoman informants (whom he does not name) did not choose to share this kind of problematic local history with an outsider.

To conclude, it would appear that factors were at work during the 16th century that prevented the entire musical system of the previous era to be preserved and transmitted. Thus, the earlier 17th century represented a period of both decline and innovation. It is this conclusion that must be the starting point for any evaluation of the significance of the musical materials documented by Ali Ufkî Bey.

Stylistic Change

Starting with the last third of the 17th century through to the middle of the 19th century, Ottoman Turkish music presents a picture of steady development, although the chronology of these developments is as yet unclear. They may be summarized as follows:

- 1) decrease in overall tempo, allowing for longer and more intricately ornamented melodies.
- 2) growing sophistication of the system of rhythmic cycles and their increasingly complex relationship to the melodic line.
- 3) development of the modal system, with increasing emphasis on subsidiary modal entities and compound modes.
- 4) increasing use of modulation, both in compositions and in improvisations (*taksîm*).
- 5) differentiation between related modal entities through the development of increasingly specific melodic progressions (*seyir*).
- 6) finer distinctions in intonation, leading to a larger number of named and accepted pitches.
- 7) rather sharp distinction between musical genres admitted within the courtly *fasıl* cycle and other forms of music.
- 8) development of a fixed order for the performance of items within a concert (*fasıl meclisi*).
- 9) specific instrumentation for the courtly repertoire.

Of these nine major elements that characterized Ottoman music from the later 17th century until the mid-19th century, how many of them can be seen in the repertoire and other musical sources of the first half of the 17th century as preserved in the contemporaneous notations of Ali Ufkî? The most evident are nos. 2, 4, 5 (to some degree) and 9.

No. 2: While the vocal repertoire is overwhelmingly in the simpler folkloric rhythms *semâ'î* (6/8), *düyek* (8/8) as well as some in *haffîf* (16/4) and *evfer* (9/4), the instrumental *peşrev* does feature many longer *usûls*, especially *sakîl* (48/4) and *darb-i fetih* (88/4). This suggests greater continuity in the *peşrev* than in the courtly vocal repertoire.

No. 4: One area of continuity with the later practice is in the *taksim* improvisation, which is already mentioned in the poetry of the first half of the 17th century, in Evliya Çelebi and then extensively in Cantemir. While for Cantemir modulation was a basic feature of high level *taksim* playing, there is relatively little use of modulation in the *peşrev* and *semâ'î* repertoire that he documented, and even less in that of Ali Ufkî Bey.

No. 5: *seyir* (melodic progression). While distinctions between related *makams* (e.g. *muhayyer* and *hüseynî*) are often not as clear as in the repertoire from the late 17th century and beyond, some of the *murabba*'s and most of the *peşrevs* display an awareness of *seyir*, although often in a rudimentary form. The *seyir* aspect comes out more clearly in comparison with the folkloric repertoire of *türkü* and *varsâgî*, where it is largely absent.

No. 9: instrumentation. The *ney* and *tanbur* do have a significant role in performance, although they still share a place with the *ud*, *şeshane*, *çeng*, and the somewhat enigmatic *şestâr*. It does seem clear that all of these latter instruments are on their way out, and indeed none of them will be played at court by the end of the 17th century (Feldman1996:110-176). This radical change in instrumentation was not based primarily upon technical improvements (although those did occur as well). Rather it points to equally radical changes in musical style.

Cantemir's earlier 18th century generation was something of a pivot-facing both back to the 17th century and anticipating the mid-18th century. The increasing stability of musical life at the court allowed the earlier 17th century instrumental repertoire to be remembered for as much as two generations or more, so that Cantemir was able to document somewhat variant versions of much of the instrumental repertoire that had been played and then notated by Ali Ufkî Bey. As Wright observes, the vocal repertoire collected some years earlier by Hâfiz Post in his anthology contains less of the early 17th century repertoire, and concentrates more on the author's own generation. It seems unlikely that Hâfiz Post, who was a student of Osman Efendi, and born 43 years earlier than Cantemir, lacked access to more of his teacher's compositions as well as those of the latter's contemporaries. Evidently they interested him less than pieces by his own contemporaries. *Mecmû'â* Revan 1723 does include more compositions by Koca Osman and other early to mid 17th century composers, such as 'Ama Kadri, Sütçüzade 'İsa, and the Iranian Aqa Momin (Agha Mumin). Cantemir's inclusion of a relatively large instrumental repertoire from the mid- and even the early 17th century can probably be explained by his scholarly approach, which dictated that he record as much early repertoire as he could. This attitude is also suggested by his table of

contents, which includes the names of *peşrevs* that he had heard about, but whose actual melodies he was unable to learn from any living musician. This fact suggests that—unlike Hâfız Post—Cantemir was not simply collecting pieces that he liked, but rather, like a true scholar, he was attempting to document the entire known instrumental repertoire. Cantemir’s own compositions—which have been analyzed at some length by Wright, Popescu-Judetza and myself, among others—show little affinity with the *peşrevs* of the early to mid-17th century. Rather they point to momentous changes that were already underway in Cantemir’s time and would emerge with greater clarity in the following generation.¹²

Looking back at the repertoire of the early 17th century—as noted by Ali Ufkî Bey and partly by Prince Cantemir—we can say that it lacks almost every musical element that gives the later tradition of Ottoman music its characteristic aesthetic. For repertoire, the instrumental *peşrev* and *semâ’î-i sazende* were already in use, as well as rudimentary forms of the vocal *murabba’* and *semâ’î*, alongside a number of folkloric forms, such as *varsâği* and *türkü*, which would be removed from the sphere of courtly music by the end of the century. There is a range of development within the songs named *türkü*, which is the largest folkloric genre in the collection. While most are created within the simple *usûl* patterns of *semâ’î* in 6/8 or alternations of 7/8 and 14/8, others create a 9/8 pattern by adding 3/8 to the *semâ’î usûl*, yet others are binary.¹³ It would appear that some of the *türkü*s on religious themes or connected with warfare were created by semi-professional *aşiks* or *ozans*, and are thus somewhat more sophisticated.¹⁴

Among the features of artistic music found in the *murabba’* repertoire is the use of a fairly wide number of *makams*, the occasional use of longer *usûls*—such as *sakil* and *çenber*—and the presence of a *miyan* (“middle”) section in both *murabba’* and *semâ’î*, which are often lacking in the folkloric *türkü* (although sometimes present in the *varsâği*). Quite common in the *murabba’*s are the popular *usûls* *düyek* and *sofyan*, while most in the *Mecmû’a-i Saz ü Söz* or the Paris MS are notated without specific mention of their *usûls*. A count of the length of the *murabba’* melodies often suggest the *usûl hafif* (16/4), but often the phrasing could just have well be considered *düyek* (8/8). The absence of a named *usûl* suggests that in this repertoire the difference between the “popular” *düyek* and the “courtly” *hafif* was minimal in practice.

The numerous instrumental *peşrevs* in the *Mecmû’a-i Saz ü Söz*, on the other hand, are usually created in the longer *usûls* and they show a much longer and more developed formal structure than anything in the vocal repertoire. In searching for a possible explanation for the still “courtly” nature of the *peşrev*, as opposed to the partly “populist” character of the vocal repertoire, one probable

¹² See Feldman 1996:408-441, “Transmission of the Ottoman Peşrev Repertoire”.

¹³ A handy collection of the folklore of the former is Uludemir 1992.

¹⁴ See Gültekin Oransay’s unpublished study of the religious repertoire of the *Mecmû’a-i Saz ü Söz*: *Ali Ufkî ve Türk Dini Musikisi*. Ankara, İlahiyat Fakültesi, 1972 (Y. 16566).

source was the continued function of the *peşrev* within the official *mehter* ensemble, used both for military and for ceremonial functions. For example Evliya Çelebi mentions a specific *peşrev* in the long *usûl sakîl* (48/4) by the contemporary court composer Solakzade in a public mehter performance before Sultan Murad IV (Özergin 1972:6050). It would seem that both the tradition of the Ottoman military and the ceremonials of the Ottoman rulers, viziers and military governors (pasha) insisted on the preservation and new creation of a “courtly” instrumental repertoire and not the adoption of quasi-folkloric forms related to dance music, which was the main function for instrumental music among the people (although the more popular *semâ’î* form was also used within the *mehter*).

In addition we should not overlook the fact that most of the *peşrevs* in the *Mecmû’â* are by named composers, while many *murabba’s* are anonymous; this in itself would suggest that the *murabba’* was closer to popular taste than the *peşrev*. It appears that the structural differences between items bearing a “courtly” or a “folkloric” name are not nearly as great as these differences would become later. Wright has noted: “The differences between *semâ’î*, *murabba’* and *türkü* as recorded by Ali Ufkî lie less in features of musical form or melodic style than in textual conventions...” (Wright 1992:160). But this judgment may in fact be overly schematic, for we may note several stylistic differences between *murabba’* and the purely folkloric genres. These differences relate to overall scope, extension of the melodic line beyond basic *usûl* boundaries, and what I have termed “*seyir-consciousness*,” i.e. demonstrating an awareness of modal/melodic progression. Many of the items named *türkü* and *varsâğı* appear to be truly folkloric, sometimes echoing modern Anatolian Turkish folksongs, or more minimal and evidently archaic styles.

Let us compare briefly two *murabba’s* and one *ilâbî* as written down by Ali Ufkî in the same *makam*. The first *murabba’* (from the Paris MS) is in the shortest *usûl-sofyan* (“*sufiyane*”), and the second (from the London MS) in *sakîl*, one of the longer *usûls*.

Saklı Mecmua

V MURABBA' NEVA USÛLEŞ SÛFİYANE

148a

Mes ta ne ol dum aş kın e lin den yar ba na bir ça
re yar ba na bir ça re-----

Music Example no.1: *Murabba' neva usûleş sufiyane*, Paris MS 148a (Behar 2008:230).

The lyric of this *murabba'*, while incomplete, places it squarely within the *aşık* (folk bardic) style, neither a courtly *gazel* nor a folkloric *türkü*: “*Mestane oldum aşkın elinden/yar bana bir çare yar bana bir çare*” (I have become drunk from love, o beloved give me a cure, o beloved give me a cure!). While the *usûl* is given as *sufiyane* (4/4), the melodic line extends for 16/4, much as in *usûl hafif*. The *zemin* section (first two lines) demonstrates a use of the *seyir* of *nevâ* as found in many other vocal and instrumental items in Ali Ufki as well as Cantemir. The melody clearly focuses on the note *nevâ* (d), but with significant movement below as far as the sub-tonic *rast* (G), before resolving on *dügâb* (A). The *miyan* section changes its modal emphasis by stressing *hüseynî* (e) and the flattened sixth degree (*acem*/f), before resolving on A. While still rudimentary by the standards of the 18th century and later, this melody is not to be confused with any of the *türkü*s in the collection. It also differs somewhat from the *ilâbî*s in that its rhythm is more “*usûl*-like” and not suitable for dancing, whereas Ali Ufki’s *ilâbî*s create simpler rhythmic groupings which are more reminiscent of *usûl sofyan* as it is used in the *zîkr* ceremony. As an example we may take the following *ilâbî* (evidently in *makam nevâ*) from the Paris MS (Music Example no. 2).

Notalar ve Güfteler

XIII İLAHİ

251b

Bi ze biz den o lan----- ya ki-----
 nü ka rib Ko ma gur bet----- e lin----- de bi-----
 zi a zib ke re min den vi sa----- lin ey-----
 le na sib

Music Example no. 2: *İlahî*, Paris MS 251b (Behar 2008:233).

The *murabba'* in *makam nevâ*, *usûl sakîl* on page 111-12 of the London MS (Music example no. 3), described as *beste-i nevâi*, is one of Ali Ufkî's few *murabba'*s in a long *usûl* and by a named composer. Not surprisingly, it is more complex than most of his other *murabba'* melodies, and may be taken as occupying a middle stage between the dominant semi-folkloric or *aşık* style *murabba'* and the later 17th century *murabba' beste*.

As a harbinger of the later *beste* style we may note the appearance of word repetitions in the *miyan* section (beginning in line 4), and the extension of the melody to twice the length of the *zemin*, comprising one full cycle of *sakîl* in 48/4. The lyric of the *miyan* utilizes similar topoi as ex. No. 1, the *nevâ murabba'* in *sufiyane*, but its syntax is clearly courtly: “*Mest iken yare dila gâflet idersin yoksa*” (While drunk, oh heart, have you ignored the beloved?).

A comparison of the vocal repertoire recorded by Ali Ufkî with that in the anthology of Hâfiz Post created roughly 30-40 years later (as well as Revan 1723), reveals significant differences. In Hâfiz Post the largest genre is the “unnamed” one, which Owen Wright and myself have understood to be the *murabba'* or *murabba' beste*. The fact that it was gradually termed the *murabba' beste* or simply *beste* (the composition) indicates its central position. Cantemir terms it the *beste*, while his contemporary Es'ad Efendi retains the earlier *murabba'*. However, both by the

MSS s.111-2

MURABBA'
 Uşûleş Şakıl
 Der Maķâm-ı Mezbûr
 Beste-i Nevâi

Di le ğam di de ye fik ri
 A ba şan per te vi hur şı

ru ħı dil ber düş di yâr
 di mü nev ver düş di hur

yâr ru ħı dil ber düş di
 şı di mü nev ver düş di

Mest i ken yâ re di lâ ğaf

let i der sin yok sa ey

ğaf let i der sin yâr yok sa

'Arz ı hâl ey le me ğe yâ

re ne yer ler düş di yâr

yâ re ne yer ler düş di

evidence in the *Hâfiz Post Mecmû’âsı*, *Mecmû’â* Revan no. 1723, and in the detailed description of Cantemir, we can see that the *beste* cannot be accounted as the identical genre as the *murabba’* of the first half of the 17th century for the following reasons:

1) It employed a variety of both long and short *usûls*—among the former *sakîl* (48/4), *remel* (28/4), *çenber* (24/4), *mubammes* (32/4), *hafif* (16/4), as well as *zincir* (*çifte düyek+fabte+çenber+devr-i kebîr+bereşân*) and among the latter *devr-i revan* (14/8), *evfer* (9/4) and *düyek* (8/8/);

2) It could be composed both with or without a lengthy section of syllables termed *terennümat*, but always with a modulating *miyan* section. The use of *terennümat* furnishes an important link with the earlier courtly compositional form *kâr* as well as with the *naqsb*, both of which had developed these wordless sections as a virtual hallmark of the courtly vocal compositional style;

3) It employed texts taken from *gazels* by the major Ottoman poets, usually of the same or the previous century such as Nabi, Vecdi, Neşati, Naili, or Şehri, and never had the popular/*aşık* character of the *murabba’* texts in Ali Ufkî.

While we cannot be entirely certain of this, it is probable that the seriousness of the texts plus the length of the *usûls* suggested the use of the slower tempos that Cantemir indicates was a characteristic of some of the *peşrevs* of his own time. Cantemir states this rather explicitly in his first chapter (on musical notation), while explaining his use of varying “meters” to notate melodies of different speeds and melodic density: “The reason for this is that in some *terkîbs* [sections] the meter of the *usûl* is taken very slowly (*abeste abeste alınur*)...” He also specifies *terkîbs* which are composed according to a “slow moving” (*ağır hareketli*) *usûl* (Feldman 1996:333/Cantemir 1700:I:15). Indeed in later Ottoman Turkish the idiom *abeste beste* emerged, meaning “slow as a beste.” In another work of his (on the “Muhammadan” religion) Cantemir describes the intricacy of the relation of *usûl* and melody in the Turkish “songs.” While in this work (which is not generally concerned with reference to musical technicalities) he does not specify the names of vocal genres, rather his reference is to “twenty-four kinds of meter—which are called *usûls*”—can only indicate the *beste*, for no other vocal genre employed such a wide variety of *usûls*:

There are twenty-four kinds of meters (which are called *usûls*) by which the pace of time is measured. Henceforth, there is great difficulty in singing correctly the songs on an instrument because every author strives to compose songs at his pleasure with the meter and rhythms he likes, and because they are so intricate, those who do not know the meter cannot play the songs at all, even though they were to hear that song a thousand times (Popescu-Judetzy, 1981:103).

He goes on to explain that it is for this reason that the Turks do not employ musical notation “which are of extensive yet easy usage among Europeans”, because: “solely the unique person who masters the *usûl* would be able to sing without error unless he were to hear it from the author or his teacher.” Yet fifty years earlier Ali

Ufki Bey felt little diffidence in writing the *murabba'* tunes in Western staff notation, and indeed there is no insurmountable difficulty in fitting the melodies to the *usûls* and to the texts as we find them in the *Mecmû'â-i Saz ü Söz* or the Paris MS. The difference, I would suggest, is in the nature of the relationship of *usûl*, tempo and melody as they had developed together over the fifty odd years separating these two East European Ottoman musicians. In other words, most of what Ali Ufki was writing down was the semi-folkloric/*aşık murabba'*, while what Cantemir had in mind was the more technically developed courtly *beste*. This was the musical form abundantly documented by Hâfiz Post and by the anonymous compiler of *Mecmû'â Revan* 1723, and it was this form that it was composed by Buhurîzâde Mustafa Itrî and other composers of his time. Cantemir's mention of the "intricate" relationship between melody and *usûl* strongly suggests that even in his time a somewhat melismatic performance technique existed, one of whose hallmarks in the repertoire documented later on was the repetition of syllables of the poetic text in a pre-composed manner, set in specific places within the *usûl*.

Next is the genre termed *semâ'î*, which according to the conventions of the concert suite called *fasıl*—as described by Cantemir—had to succeed the *murabba'*. The most sophisticated and difficult vocal form of the music of the 16th century, the *kâr*, occurs rather rarely.¹⁵ Likewise the somewhat lighter Iranian courtly form the *naqş* (*nakiş*) appears with lesser frequency. Popular forms, such as the *şarkı* and the *savt*, appear infrequently as well. The folkloric forms *türkü* and *varsâğı* are excluded. Thus, while the ponderous *kar* is rather rare, the central genres of the *fasıl*, the *murabba' beste* and the *semâ'î* are dominant, while the *nakiş* makes a respectable appearance. All lesser forms are either marginal or excluded entirely. Wright has published a comparison of the vocal genres found in the "*fasıl-i hüseyinî*" of Hâfiz Post and of Ali Ufki (*Mecmû'a-i Saz ü Söz*), and the difference is striking. Hâfiz Post's original collection contains 51 *murabba' beste*'s in this *makam*, 32 *semâ'î*'s, seven *nakiş*, two *kârs*, three *şarkı*s and one *savt*. Ali Ufki included 10 *murabba'*s and only three *semâ'î*'s. There are no *kârs* or *nakiş*. But the largest group by far are the *türkü*s, numbering 16. There are five *varsâğı*s, four dance-songs called *raksiye*, and two *ilâhî* hymns (cf. Wright 1992:159).

In Ali Ufki's texts it is probably necessary to connect the total absence of *kâr* with the absence of the *nakiş* and the very small number of *semâ'î*'s, on the one hand, and with the very large number of *türkü* and considerable number of *varsâğı*'s and *raksiye*'s on the other. Ali Ufki was indeed a trained court musician, but it would appear that the repertoire required of a court musician in his time was quite different from what would be required 50 years later. This is not to say that

¹⁵ Wright treats the *kâr* in some detail (1992:167-72). He concludes, on the basis of the textual appearance of the *kârs* in Hâfiz Post and of Cantemir's detailed descriptions in his work of theory (chapter 10), that the form was closely connected with the earlier genre *'amal*, and that therefore shows considerable continuity with the "antecedent," i.e. sources earlier than those dating from the mid-17th century.

the older and more complex courtly genres had been totally forgotten. According to the statement of Evliya Çelebi, when he performed before Sultan Murad IV in 1636 he sang one *kâr* and one *türkü*. Since Evliya and Ali Ufkî were contemporaries, this would seem to show that some *kârs* were still known. But the juxtaposition of the *kâr* and the folkloric *türkü* would suggest that this sultan was not interested in a full classical concert, but something more like a variety show. By the time of Hâfiz Post, barely one generation later, such a performance would not seem to have been acceptable at the Ottoman court, and by the time of Cantemir, 60 years later, totally out of the question. Despite the low profile of the *kâr* at the court of Murad IV, and with it the probable loss of older repertoire in the genre, the fact that it reappears in Hâfiz Post and in Cantemir suggests that some items as well as the structural principles had survived, most likely among aristocratic “amateur” singer/composers like Koca Osman, even while they were not in much demand at the court. We will treat this issue further below.

Cantemir chose to notate only instrumental items—mainly *peşrevs*—and among these there was both a high level of correspondence between his repertoire and that of Ali Ufkî. As I show in my book of 1996 (pp. 350-58) even within these identical *peşrevs*, while Cantemir’s version occasionally shows characteristics of the later style of composition, on the whole the preservation of instrumental repertoire from the early to the late 17th century is remarkable. But this speaks only to the stability of this *peşrev* repertoire, which had its own official means of support. Even without notations, the vocal repertoire presents a very different picture. As we have seen, both the *Hâfiz Post Mecmû’â*, Revan 1723 and Cantemir’s *edvâr* reveal a fundamentally different repertoire, which is neither the same generically as the pre-17th century “international” courtly repertoire, nor identical to the folkloricized repertoire of the first half of the 17th century. This would strongly suggest that while the army and other official institutions were committed to preserving the *peşrev* genre, no corresponding means of preservation were in place for the vocal repertoire performed at the court.

In comparing the instrumental repertoires (especially *peşrevs*) in the collections of Ali Ufkî Bey and Prince Cantemir, Wright states:

Indeed, comparison with the mid-century collection of ‘Ali Ufki Bey suggests, despite a number of significant changes, a generally high level of continuity in the many pieces common to both. The most striking differences between them relate, rather, to the nature of the repertoires they contain. Whereas the various types of vocal and instrumental music included by ‘Ali Ufki give a fair idea of the wide range of vocal and instrumental music that would have been encountered at court, from lengthy and complex *peşrevs* to strophic folksongs and dance pieces, Cantemir is narrower in his approach...implying a distinction that may have been unknown to ‘Ali Ufki, his concerns are restricted to what may be described, however awkward the term, as the art-music end of the spectrum (Wright 2000:7).¹⁶

¹⁶ While there is much continuity between the instrumental repertoires in these two musical collections, a closer examination of pieces in the Cantemir Collection which are attributed

The Issue of Art-Music

How can we interpret this difference? More recently Behar sees this as a function of the social background of the two East European Ottoman authors: “In Cantemir’s mind, if the expression is permissible, there was a ‘class consciousness’ with regard to music. Because, before all else, the Moldavian Prince Beyzade Demetrius Cantemir was a European aristocrat” (Behar 2008: 66). There is no doubt that Demetrius Cantemir was brought up as an aristocrat, a Moldavian *boier* and the younger son of the ruling Voivode. His private education in Moldova in his father’s palace was extensive, but it did not seem to include Western music. While Cantemir’s fortunes in Istanbul as a princely “hostage” were far grander than Bobowski’s, as a slave-musician or even as court interpreter there is reason to suggest—as Behar does—that Bobowski was also from an aristocratic background before he was captured in warfare and sold into slavery. Bobowski’s knowledge of musical notation and his great facility with European languages—in this regard in no way inferior to Cantemir’s—does not suggest a lower-class autodidact, especially considering the class divisions in the Eastern Galician province of the Polish Commonwealth into which he was born in 1610. If Bobowski ignored social distinctions between musical repertoires, it is doubtful that this was because his lowly social origin and current status in Turkey rendered him uninterested in them. But could it be, as Wright suggests, that he was “unaware” of them—i.e. that they did not exist in Turkey? His contemporary Evliya Çelebi compiled great lists of musical genres that he or other musicians performed, ignoring any distinctions between courtly and popular, or religious and secular categories. Obviously Evliya, who began as a Qur’anic cantor, knew the structural and cultural differences between Qur’anic *tevcit* and courtly *murabba’*, or between folkloric *varsâği* and Sufi *ilâhî*, but to him they were all parts of a single musical continuum. Perhaps all that the performer needed to know was when, where and for whom each was appropriate.

Yet in Bobowski’s own description of the Ottoman Seraglio, written in 1665 in Italian—and hence for a European readership—he makes the following distinction while speaking about Turkish musical instruments. One group of instruments were used to “accompany the delicate songs,” while another group—mainly of the long-necked lute *saz* family, such as *çagana*, *çöğür*, and *tambura*—were the “other instruments to accompany the common songs called turkey [*türkü*].” Anyone who wrote such sentences could not have been totally “unaware” of the distinction between art music and folk music. Significantly, he wrote this speaking as a Westerner addressing other Westerners, assuming that his educated readers would have known and expected a distinction to exist between the “delicate songs” of the court and the “common songs” of the people. We should also note that this text

to composers of the earlier 17th century often display the structural characteristics of Cantemir’s own generation. See Feldman 2012.

is later than his notated collection, a good 25 years after the death of Sultan Murad IV, and was written during the reign of Mehmet IV in whose time the “art of music” was becoming more formalized at the court, and where a great many composers were active in the “classical” genres.

It seems clear that the court of Murad IV, at any rate, allowed for a broad mixture of these different musical types. This can be seen also from some of the notes in Bobowski’s own MS. Turc 292, where he lists *türküis* to be performed. The sheer numbers of *türküis* and *varsâğis* in the two Bobowski manuscripts—113 in the *Mecmû’â-i Saz ü Söz* alone—show that these “common songs” enjoyed a considerable place in the performances at court. While it is true, as noted above, that there was rather little structural difference separating “courtly” from “folkloric/popular” songs in his generation, greater sophistication in language and poetic style, probably coupled with differences of instrumentation and perhaps vocal ornamentation and timbre—in addition to the kinds of small but significant structural differences noted above in section 3—might have been enough to distinguish the “courtly” from the “folkloric” genres. Did the order of performance depend largely on the tastes and whims of this musical but rather strong-willed sultan? While we do not have definitive answers to these questions, they are suggestive of the “mood” in which music of different types may have been performed at the court at that time.

Fifty odd years later, Prince Cantemir does not want to acknowledge any musical continuum between “delicate” and “common songs”, because for him there are first and foremost the concepts of *‘ilm-ül mûsîkî* (the science of music), and *usûl-i mûsîkî* or *mûsîkî kaidesi* (the rules of music)—which became “the art of musick” in his later Latin/English text—and which prevents him from considering anything but a courtly, and hence “art-music” repertoire. In his chapter on musical forms—although he fails to mention the once omnipresent *türkü* and *varsâğı*—he begins by dismissing the rude folkloric *ırlayış* and *deyiş*, which are accompanied by the *çoğur*, as unworthy of serious attention as they are outside of the rules of music (Cantemir, ca. 1700, chapter X:97). He does mention the urban popular *şarki*, which had come to be accepted even by courtly poets after the middle of the 17th century—hence they were no longer strictly folkloric, and also appear in the Hâfız Post Anthology. The older folkloric repertoire is almost totally absent from Revan 1723 as well, except for one *varsâğı* in *usûl devr-i revân*, *makam eviç* by none other than Osman Efendi(!). It is not unlikely that its status as a composition by the venerable Osman allowed it to survive within the new musical conditions.

It is doubtful that Cantemir could have acquired this point of view in Moldova where, despite his aristocratic upbringing, such distinctions between musical repertoires could not have been very deeply ingrained, and where the basic distinction was between the “esoteric” music of the Orthodox church and the “exoteric” (i.e. secular) music of every other kind. It is far more probable that Cantemir learned this distinction from his music teachers in Istanbul—whether Orthodox Christian, Jewish or Muslim—because this distinction was part of the “art of mu-

sick” that had been “revived” since the mid-17th century, but which may not yet have been a dominant concept when Ali Ufkî and Evliya Çelebi were musicians at the court of Murad IV. It is highly probable that this distinction between an artistic and folkloric/popular repertoire had been part of the development of music in Istanbul since the time of Koca Osman and his students, such as Buhurîzâde Mustafa Itrî and Hâfîz Post. Meanwhile, Sultan Mehmet IV (with a forty year reign from 1648-1687) seems to have approved of and furthered the development of generic distinctions by patronizing composers in these “serious” genres. Moreover this generic distinction itself was nothing new, but simply a return to earlier Islamicate courtly practice, and hence part of a local musical “renaissance.”

As I noted in my larger work (1996), one rather extensive treatment of the repertoire of the antecedent Turco-Iranian musical tradition is the chapter on the musicians at the court of the Timurid Huseyin Bayqara (1469-1506) in the Baburnameh (ca. 1530). This chapter comments in some detail on the leading musicians of that court, on the instruments they mastered, and the repertoire that they performed and composed. As I noted then: “The compositional genres mentioned are few; only the vocal *kâr*, *savt* and *naqsh*, and the instrumental *pesbrav*. This indicates that the courtly repertoire concentrated on a few items, implying a clear distinction between an art and a popular repertoire...popular genres were not the responsibility of the performers or composers of courtly music” (Feldman 1996: 42-44).

The musical text anthologies (*mecmû'â*) dating from the 15th, 16th and 17th centuries studied by Wright—to be discussed in detail in the next section and apparently all of Ottoman provenance (the last is the Hâfîz Post anthology)—concentrate on the established courtly genres of their respective eras (Wright 1992a). The same is true of the earlier treatments of repertoire, including notation by the 13th century Iranian Qutb al-Dîn Shirâzî, and the 14th century Tunisian musician Al-Tifashi, who comments on a classical art repertoire. Examples could be multiplied from several periods and regions of the Islamicate civilization, but they all point to the same conclusion, namely that once a distinct artistic repertoire began to be created, certainly by the 9th century, and a largely shared art music practice and repertoire came to be elaborated, eventually breaking up into a predominantly Eastern school in the Fertile Crescent, Iran and Transoxiana, and a predominantly Western school in the Maghreb and Spain, with Tunisia as the border territory between them. In both regions there was considerable continuity in the theory and practice of music for many generations over a rather wide area of linked urban and courtly centres. Even the catastrophe of the Mongol conquest did not result in a major musical regression, as the new rulers soon proved to be avid patrons of music, and the Pax Mongolica provided enhanced geographical mobility for musicians. Nor was a possible negative clerical reaction a major issue for most of the relevant courts, as the Mongol dynasties tended to exalt the position of art and artists in their service.

Bearing all this in mind, the situation described by Evliya Çelebi and exemplified by Ali Ufkî Bey in earlier 17th century Istanbul, appears as something of an anomaly. Despite his European origin, Cantemir’s attitude at the beginning of the following century fits better into the normative attitude of any court in a more productive era of Islamicate high civilization, although certainly not for every era. The weakening of distinctions between courtly (“artistic”) and popular genres—which we see in the works of Evliya Çelebi and Ali Ufkî Bey—implies a degree of cultural loss, however much a ruler such as Murad IV enjoyed and participated in music.

A related issue is my eighth point in defining the Ottoman musical tradition—namely the ordering of all repertoire items into a specific sequence during performance, which is seemingly implied by the term *fasıl*. This issue, which has come to be termed “cyclicity” in much of the musicological discussion of Islamicate art musics of the past 25 to 30 years, has been raised with regard to repertoires as diverse and geographically distant as the *nauba* of Morocco and the *Shashmaqom* of Bukhara (in present-day Uzbekistan and Tadjikistan). In particular, musicologists from the former Soviet Union have come to stress this practice (in Russian “*tsikl’nost’*”) of grouping the concert items into a “cycle”; Western musicologists have often used the term “suite” for this phenomenon. The advantage of the rather unusual neologism “cyclicity” over “suite” is that it does not carry with it the baggage of Western musicological associations. Almost all modern art musics of the Islamicate world conceive of their repertoires in terms of large “cycles,” employing varying rhythmic structures, usually grouped from the longest to the shortest. Even the *âyîn* of the *Mevlevî* dervishes follows the cyclical principle, although without the absolute progression from long to short rhythms. However, despite the near unanimity of virtually all modern repertoires on this point (including those of Iran and Caucasian Azerbaijan, which almost totally lack compositions per se, but whose partly improvised repertoire items are grouped cyclically), the historical record is less easy to interpret.

It would appear that through much of the history of Islamicate art musics, various considerations in performance practice may, at times, have overrode the principle of strict cyclicity. Moreover, the medieval sources pay little attention to compositional forms, much less to cyclical arrangements. At various periods and places in post-Abbasid culture the Arabic word *nauba* (turn) has been used to refer to a cyclical performance of composed items. Wright summarizes the situation in his article on Arab Music in the *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (Wright 2000b:809):

A similar obscurity surrounds the emergence and evolution of the most extended form, the *nauba*. In the 13th century, five constituent parts were reported, and in the 14th, three. However, it is clear that for most of the 14th and 15th centuries the eastern *nauba* consisted of a cycle of four songs, all in the same mode, and using a restricted range of rhythmic cycles...For ‘Abd al-Qadir, the *nauba* was clearly the most important form (he attempted, unsuccessfully, to enlarge it by

adding a complex fifth element). By the late 15th century, however, it was evidently in decline, and soon afterwards it disappeared.

The *Baburnameh*, written in the early 16th century, uses the word *nawba* in its original, non-technical meaning, as a “turn” at performance (in this case). This would imply that by this time the technical usage—as an extended cyclical performance—was becoming obscure or even obsolete. It is difficult for us to interpret the cultural significance of the decline of the *nawba* cycle. In general it would seem that if the principle of extended cycles were falling into disuse, that would suggest a musical decline or erosion, unless a new principle came to take its place. Such a new principle does not seem to appear until the emergence of the *taksim* improvisation at the beginning of the 17th century in Istanbul (or somewhat earlier). But in viewing the 15th century Timurid court in Herat, where music was evidently held in such high esteem that leading courtiers studied musical theory and composition, and even utilized musical notation, “decline” and “erosion” are hardly appropriate descriptions.¹⁷

In this regard, Cem Behar’s recent observation in *Saklı Mecmua* (2008:157-160) about the relative status and order of repertoire items in Ali Ufkî’s work is well-taken: “But it is necessary to note that neither in the Turc 292 manuscript, nor in the Mecmua-i Saz ü Söz is there any clear expression as to in which order such musical forms as *kâr*, *semâi*, *nakis* were or should be performed within the *fasıl*.” While Behar accepts that a clear order of items within the *fasıl* was already established in Cantemir’s time, he says “It is not possible to know exactly how and when the order of items that Cantemir gives as the standard *fasıl* of the beginning of the 18th century came into being. Cantemir himself gives no clue on this topic.” While it would seem that the *fasıl* as such must have been established by the time of the Moldavian prince’s first sojourn in the capital (1685-1693)—or else he surely would have remarked on its novelty—how far back into the century we can push this development is unclear. It would seem that my earlier (1996) acceptance of the existence of an internally ordered *fasıl* as an institution already in 1630-1640—based on the use of the term *fasıl* by Evliya Çelebi—probably does not accord with the musical practice of the time of Murad IV (1623-1640). At any rate, the *fasıl* must have become accepted at the court sometime between 1650 and 1685, during the musically creative reign of Mehmed IV. Thus, while the existence of a fixed musical cycle cannot be taken as absolute evidence for the “artistic” nature of music at a court in all cases, in 17th century Turkey it does seem to go together with the recreation of a norm of a restricted group of courtly musical forms, even though these were only partly similar to the forms employed in the previous two centuries.

Evliya Çelebi does use the word *fasıl* to describe the performance of a solo instrumentalist. For example, when citing the names of several masters of the

¹⁷ See Owen Wright, “Abd al-Qadir al-Maraghi and ‘Ali B. Muhammad Bina’i: Two Fifteenth-Century Examples of Notation,” Pts. 1 and 2. Oxford University Press: The School of Oriental and African Studies, vol, LVII, 1994 and LVIII, 1995.

kanun, he states: “All of these are excellent masters who can perform a *fasıl* on the kanun in the presence of the Padişah” (Özergin 1972: 6032, trans. Feldman 1996:156). But in instrumental music there were only three genres—*peşrev*, *taksîm*, *saz semâ’îsi* (or *semâ’î*)—so this usage does not reveal a structuring of an entire concert with its primary vocal genres.

The evidence of both Ali Ufki and Evliya Çelebi prove that the word *fasıl* already possessed a technical, musical meaning early in the 17th century. This *fasıl*, however, was not yet a kind of *nawba*. At this time *fasıl* did imply that the items to be heard together were all connected by *makam*, but not that there was a fixed order in which they would be performed. The use of the term *fasıl* by Ali Ufki as a means of grouping his repertoire items in the *Mecmû’a-i Saz ü Söz* would seem to imply his acknowledging modality (*makam*) as a principle in grouping pieces, even in performance, but not that these pieces in the same *makam* needed to be performed in a fixed order according to genre. It would seem that this looser usage was rather short lived, as the time between the emergence of *fasıl* as a technical term connected with common modality, and the creation of a *nawba*-like suite or cycle out of it could not have been more than fifty years.

Historical and Social Factors

Turning from this close analysis of the repertoire and its musical terminology, we must ask the broader question: how can we integrate the musical changes we have observed with known patterns of Ottoman history and society? In trying to evaluate where to place the early 17th century Ottoman repertoire within some sort of historical continuum, there are only a few historical signposts to direct us. During the early 15th century the Eastern Islamicate civilization—of which the Ottomans and the other Anatolian Turkish dynasties were a part—was still capable of producing a major composer and theorist in the person of ‘Abd al-Qâdir Marâghî. The Ottoman rulers were avid patrons of music, as were some other Anatolian states. The Ottomans took both the son and the grandson of Marâghî into their service, and there is every indication that they viewed themselves as part of this broader Eastern Islamicate musical world. Musical lyrics at the court were still in Persian and Arabic, even though the rulers patronized poets writing in Turkish. The Ottomans were also aware of musical creativity taking place in the Timurid courts of Eastern Iran and Central Asia, which continued well into the later 15th century, and which became a kind of legend in Turkey. Thus, for the Turco-Islamic courts of Greater Iran and of Anatolia the 15th century was very much a continuation of the artistic (including musical) renaissance typical of the Islamic Mongol Courts.¹⁸

¹⁸ The general political and cultural conditions under such states are described by Hodgson (1977) in Volume 2, “Mongol ideals: the potential for renewal in the military patronage state.” For musical life, the classic study is Neubauer 1969.

Nevertheless, all this activity in the 15th century did not lead to a great musical efflorescence anywhere in the Eastern Islamic world in the following century, except for India under the Moghuls. The later Ottoman musical tradition passed over the entire 16th century in trying to link up the memory of ‘Abd al-Qâdir with Ottoman composers and musicians of the mid- and later 17th century. From the 16th century it was mainly the Crimean Tatar Ghazi Giray Khan who remained and who was not an Ottoman by education. Thus, from the point of view of the later Ottoman tradition, not much of musical significance happened during the 16th century.¹⁹

To date, the most in depth study of any 16th century Ottoman musical source was accomplished by Owen Wright in his 1992 book *Words Without Songs*. Here Wright focused on five musical lyric anthologies, one of which (preserved in the Bodleian Library of Oxford University, with another copy in the Süleymaniye) dates from mid- to late 16th century Turkey.²⁰ Wright scrutinized every aspect of this record of the musical repertoire to determine how it relates to an antecedent anthology of the 15th century, and how the later 17th century Hâfiz Post collection relates to it in turn. As usual his methodology is extremely precise and meticulous, and we cannot enter into it here in detail. But his conclusions are relevant to our questions about the nature of courtly musical life in 16th century Turkey. In comparing the 15th century and 16th century texts, he is able to arrive at some conclusions. In brief they may be summarized as follows:

- 1) The 15th century anthology shows considerable evidence of contemporary musical creation, along with some preservation of older pieces, although the *nawba* cycle is not fully preserved;
- 2) The 16th century anthologies show a complete breakdown of the *nawba*, and also highly variant arrangement of the verbal and structural elements in pieces bearing the same text and mode as in the earlier anthology—i.e. which must have been considered as the “same” piece—indicating that the musical form in

¹⁹ We should note Amir Hosein Pourjavadiy’s recent edition of the 16th century Iranian treatise: Nasimi, *Nasim-I Tarab, The Breeze of Euphoria (a Sixteenth Century Persian Musical Treatise)* (Pourjavadiy 2007). The terminology of Nesimi’s treatise points to certain commonalities in musical thinking from 16th century Iran to 17th century Turkey.

²⁰ Wright is characteristically cautious about attributing any but the *Hâfiz Post Mecmû’ası* unambiguously to an Ottoman source, although he admits that “Ox and the other antecedent collections could justifiably be termed Ottoman too” (Wright 1992:7-21). But it would seem clear (to this author, at any rate), on the basis of the references to Ottoman rulers, the Turkish names of some composers, and the use of Turkish in the margins, that the 16th century (ca. 1550-1570) anthologies that he terms Ox (Oxford) and S (Süleymaniye) could only have been produced in a Turkish-speaking city of the Ottoman Empire. The later 15th century (ca. 1480) anthology termed NO (Nur Osmaniye) and G (Gotha) is more ambiguous, but is also probably Ottoman. But even were it not, it needed to have been created in another Persianate court whose repertoire must have had many similarities with the one performed in contemporaneous Bursa or Istanbul.

which they had been “preserved” is rather suspect. That is to say, the 16th century “version” is very likely a totally different piece than the reputed 15th century “original”;

- 3) The 16th century anthologies show a growth in the number of pieces assigned to much earlier composers—often two to three centuries earlier—as compared with the 15th century text, whose creator was closer in time to these early musicians. Wright’s conclusion is that this attests to the emergence of pseudographia—spurious works falsely attributed to much earlier and prestigious composers—precisely at the time when the actual works by these musicians were falling into oblivion. The reasons for this oblivion are evidently two-fold: on the one hand the relative complexity of the earlier compositional forms rendered them unwieldy for the musicians of the later 16th century; and gaps in the process of transmission—probably due to lack of patronage or interest on the part of the court—prevented the newer generations from gaining access to the works of earlier composers. Thus Wright concludes that, as compared with the 15th century, and also the later 17th century (Hâfiz Post), the 16th century source attests to a decline and erosion in musical standards; a kind of cultural stagnation which was disguised in part by the creation of pseudographia to give the impression that the musical culture was still wholly intact.

It is possible to supplement the evidence of these *mecmua* anthologies through the instrumental *peşrev* repertoire that Ali Ufkî and Cantemir attribute to musicians of the 16th century, such as the anonymous *Acemler* (the “Persians”) or the mehter Nefiri Behram, and works imitating or inspired by these (in Cantemir’s Collection they sometimes appear on the same or succeeding pages). The instrumental repertoire surviving from this era generally shows a rather simple structure. Absent are the wide-ranging modulations typical of antecedent art music (as documented by Qutb-u Dîn Shirâzî for 13th century Iran and Baghdad and Bina’î for 15th century Herat), nor do we see the sophisticated melodic progressions of later Ottoman music.

In my work of 1996 I characterized the instrumental *peşrevs* of that era as follows:

Hânes [sections] composed of one or more *terkîbs* [sub-sections]. Melodic unit is usually the *usûl* cycle or the half-cycle (in short *usûls*). Repetition and imitation are fundamental compositional techniques. Cycle or half-cycles are often structured in AAAB or ABAB sections. There are no developed melodic progressions. Modulation is not essential, but when it appears it may involve entire *hânes* or *terkîbs*, but not smaller units or single note alterations (Feldman 1996:325).

While we cannot always prove the correctness of the attribution of each item, the stylistic integrity of this group of pieces seems quite clear. The impression they give is of a kind of simplification, perhaps a folklorization of the repertoire. This assessment would apparently correspond to the poverty of both transmission and new creation in the 16th century source.

The breakdown of the older art music led to an entirely novel situation by the early decades of the 17th century. The *narvba* was forgotten entirely, but gradually—probably not until after mid-century—a new form of concert-suite was created under the name *fasil*. This consisted of the classical Persian forms *kâr* and *naqsh* plus developments of the Turkish folkloric forms known as *murabba'* and *semâ'i*. Melodically the minor-like mode with dominant fifth degree (termed *kiirdî* or *hüseynî*)—which is the mode par excellence of Anatolian folk music—took pride of place, and the entire courtly repertoire thus drew closer to Anatolian Turkish folklore. Perhaps by default—i.e. with the decline of the older Persian courtly repertoire, and the lack of a new one—a sort of “national” Turkish style was in place at court. It seems that a number of musicians of Iranian origin took part in this Turkish repertoire formation. Most of these individuals were native Turkish-speakers and were undoubtedly familiar enough with folkloric styles to participate in the creation of a new musical “koine.”

Toward the end of the 16th century the one major musical innovation, and perhaps in part as a compensation for the loss of a complex and sophisticated composed repertoire—was the emergence of developed improvisation, both for voice and instruments, which earned a new name—the *taksîm*. In time the *taksîm* allowed for a new freedom in modulation and more developed conceptions of melodic progression. Thus, although it could not leave any record in the anthologies or collections of repertoire, the *taksîm* played a very important role in the development of courtly Ottoman music. As I had noted in 1996 (p. 293), a *gazel* of the poet Cevri (1595-1654) clearly alludes to this modulatory function of the *taksîm*:

*Eylese şevk ile taksim-I dîi-beyti ağaz
Gösterür cümle makamatt be kavî-I edvar*

*“When he commences to passionately sing a taksim of two couplets
He demonstrates all the makams according to the theory of music.”*

To sum up, the Ottoman repertoire and performance practice of the first half of the 17th century—the music that was played and documented by Ali Ufkî Bey—was not simply one generation within a steady evolution and development of the Islamicate art music of the previous centuries. Even given the highly incomplete state of our knowledge of the art music of the 15th-16th centuries, enough evidence survives to prove that the early 17th century vocal repertoire and performance practice—aside from the important development of the improvised *taksîm*—was simpler and less “artistic” than that of the past in many respects. Yet it was not a total break from the past, as it still utilized a fairly rich modal system, and quite a complex system of rhythmic cycles, while some of the older compositional forms—notably the instrumental *peşrev*—still survived and were productive.

It is by no means easy to account for this musical decline in Turkey, especially as it is not long after the era of the greatest expansion and wealth of the Ottoman state. For historians of the visual arts and architecture, the 16th century is an ex-

tremely rich period, during which some of the most impressive monuments of Ottoman civilization were built. Up until the very end of the 16th century the Ottomans patronized major poets in the Turkish language, to the extent that this century is regarded as the classic era for Ottoman literature. Nor were the Sufi orders in decline. Several of them were influential at the court and also patronized music. The *Mevleviye*—who were still largely based in Konya—were elaborating their ritual and its music. It is true that the two strongest rulers—Selim I (1512-1520) and Süleyman I (1520-1566)—were relatively uninterested in music, and this period of over fifty years without any great royal interest in itself could have produced a negative effect. In this era—when court music was still largely reliant on the pages educated at the court itself and on foreign experts, not on the more numerous musicians of the city as would become the case later in the 17th century—this royal neglect could have serious results. The limited scope for art music in 16th century Ottoman society—a context in which musical education was mainly confined to the slave-musicians of the palace service—did not permit these foreign (usually Iranian) musical masters to effect a fundamental transformation of Ottoman musical life. Court records survive for the musicians of both Ottoman rulers and we know that Süleyman employed an Iranian, Hasan Can, as his leading musician. Indeed some of his compositions appear in both the Bobowski and Cantemir Collections, and in his reign ‘Abdülali is noted as a leading composer of vocal music. The Süleymanie and Oxford anthologies of the later 16th century contain a handful of composers’ names that indicate unambiguous or probable Anatolian Turkish origin. Among the former is Bayazid Akşehirli and Seyyid Ali Çelebi, and among the latter is Öksüz Ali and Salğur Şah (Wright 1992: 20). But these few Anatolian Turkish musicians are a small minority among others of probable Iranian or other origin, and in any case all were totally forgotten by the following century—not one appears either in the *Hâfiz Post Mecmû’ası* or in *Atrabiül Asâr*. Thus Wright’s characterization of the Ottoman courtly repertoire of the 16th century as being of “high prestige” but “limited diffusion” and purveyed by “professional musicians trained elsewhere” would seem to be accurate.

Despite the earlier development of music in some of the Eastern Anatolian cities in pre-Ottoman times, the shift of the political and cultural center to the extreme northwest of the country, far from the more thoroughly Islamicized regions of the east—first to Bursa and then to Istanbul—rendered the Ottomans more dependent on foreign, mainly Iranian, musical expertise. We must also recall the depopulation of Constantinople at the end of Byzantine rule and hence the need for Sultan Fatih Mehmed to repopulate the city. The broad diffusion of art music among the urban middle classes of all religions, including the Muslim *ulema* which was to occur after the later 17th century, had not yet begun.

A major contemporary literary source offers some complementary information. The well-known biographical dictionary (*tezkiye*) of Aşık Çelebi, written in 1565, contains data about 26 individuals who were known both as poets and musicians.

These were all men who attended the private *meclis* gatherings of the Ottoman elite, and recited their new poems in the Turkish language. While a few of them—such as Meşrebi and the appropriately named Makami—were considered experts in musical theory, most composed songs, and the nature of their repertoire is revealing. The *kâr*—with its Persian-language text—is not mentioned, although there is occasional mention of the related ‘*amel*’ form. The instrumental *peşrev* is never mentioned. Not uncommon is the form *nakış*. We know from Wright’s study of the nearly contemporary Oxford *Mecmû’â* (Ouseley 127) that in that document the *nakış* is the only vocal form using Turkish texts. And almost all of these *nakış* (84 out of 90) were composed by a single composer named Karaca Ahmet. The *Oxford Mecmû’â* contains a more strictly courtly or “classical” repertoire, based largely on *kâr* and ‘*amel*. The *nakış* stands out as being a “lighter” form of classical song, and so is composed in the Turkish rather than the Persian or Arabic languages. It was known for using a middle range of rhythmic cycles (*usûl*) and to feature long *terennüms* (syllabic sections), without any poetic text. Thus, in the Oxford *Memua*, the *nakış* represents a “light” classical repertoire.

However, in Aşık Çelebi’s text the most common vocal form seems to be called indifferently *murabba’* and *türkü*. The latter has retained its meaning as the general appellation for a folk song of Anatolian Turks. Recently Ersu Pekin (2012), concludes that “it is clear that, as a musical term *türkü* is used, while as a literary term *murabba’* is used.” In Aşık Çelebi’s text *türkü* is frequently associated with a popular song, even a dance song.

Examples include the following:

- Tabi: “The *türkü*s that he composed in the *makam hüseyinî* were common on the tongue of both the great and the humble in *Arabia*, *İrak* and *Hijaz*, in Persia in *İsfahan* and *Shiraz*.”
- About ‘*İlmi*, who composed a *türkü* about a Frankish boy named Levize: “At one time the singers would chant it, and even the harp-playing dancing women would sing it.”

The text that Aşık Çelebi gives for this *türkü* tends to confirm Pekin’s judgment about its identity with the *murabba’* form, in that it seems typical of the literary style of the *murabba’*s in the Ali Ufki Collection, and is not as folkloric as the *türkü*s in the latter source. Thus we should not equate the situations of the mid-16th century with that of the mid-17th century. Aşık Çelebi wrote his *tezkire* over 80 years earlier than the *mecmû’â* of Ali Ufkî, so it is not surprising that in the latter source the forms *türkü* and *murabba’* show some musical differentiation. It is possible that the *murabba’* in the mid-17th century was already beginning the process that would lead to its further development as the *murabba’ beste* at the end of the 17th century. Aşık Çelebi may represent the first stages of the incorporation of the *murabba’* as a musical genre standing in between an older artistic and a current folkloric/popular repertoire.

Wright has repeatedly stressed the evident lack of structural and other continuities from the *Nurosmâniye Mecmû'â* of ca. 1480 and the two later 16th century Ottoman anthologies. Thus, for whatever reason, by the middle of the 16th century Ottoman music making had taken a decidedly populist turn. On the whole these vignettes of the entertainments of the Ottoman elite in the middle of the 16th century may tie in with Wright's hypothesis of an “indigenous Ottoman tradition of urban music-making” which was also patronized by that very elite but in less formal settings. While similar informal *meclis* gatherings had also occurred earlier, what must have been new was that the older courtly repertoire apparently lost its currency even among the courtly elite in stages that we cannot easily reconstruct today. What is crucial for our purposes is that in the mid-16th century the *meclis* gatherings of the aristocratic/bureaucratic elite emphasized musical forms tending toward the middle to the lighter range of the classical repertoire, as well as a substantial repertoire that could only be described as popular/folkloric. This would suggest that, although the classical forms and repertoire were still known to some extent (as seen in the contemporary Oxford Mecmû'â), they were not receiving much encouragement at the highest social level.

Thus, a process of musical erosion and simplification occurred in Turkey, leading to the cultural situation at the court of Murad IV, as documented by both Evliya Çelebi and Ali Ufkî. As I attempted to demonstrate in my earlier study (1996), it was only the fundamental societal changes within Ottoman Turkey after the middle of the 17th century that allowed artistic music to reach a much larger segment of the urban population. This led both to its greater cultural grounding and to official encouragement for artistic experimentation and innovation, which in turn produced the many changes and developments of the first “classical” age of Ottoman music, from the beginning to the final third of the 18th century.

The Iranian Factor

Through much of their earlier history the Anatolian Turks were still rather dependent on musical developments in the Iranian world. Since internal events and cultural situation within Ottoman Turkey do not fully explain the reasons for the partial break in musical continuity at the end of the 16th century, it would seem legitimate to look at the contemporary situation in neighboring Iran. The available evidence, thanks to several histories, biographical dictionaries and musical treatises, while not inconsiderable, does exhibit contradictory features that would seem to bear more than one interpretation.²¹ Nevertheless, I would contend that these features are relevant to the contemporaneous Ottoman situation.

²¹ Several basic sources on the history and theory of music in Safavid Iran were presented by Amir Hosein Poujavadid (2005), to which I refer frequently in this section.

At the beginning of the 16th century the brilliant musical life of the Timurids in Herat and Central Asia was brought to an end, and continued on a much less elevated level after the Sheybanid Uzbeks drove them from power. While initially the Iranian Safavids sought to preserve the musical heights that had been reached by the Timurids, by the following generation, the Safavid ruler Shah Tahmasp decreed an absolute ban on music in 1533, even murdering some of the leading musicians. This ban seems to have been enforced throughout western and central Iran for five decades! Even toward the end of his reign, in 1571-72 Tahmasp “ordered a royal *farman* to kill instrumentalists and singers of all the cities and in particular Ostad Qasem Qanuni.”²² Only the Safavid princely governors of Khorasan and the semi-independent rulers of Gilan on the Caspian Sea still patronized music openly, thus allowing the Timurid repertoire and style to flourish for almost a century longer. Judging by the descriptions of music and musicians written by Safavid writers like Prince Sam Mirza (1517-75), author of *Tohfa-yi Sami* (1550), and Eskandar Beg Munshi, the years of intense persecution by Shah Tahmasp had perceptible effects on the following generation. The damage was clear in the new capital Qazvin during the brief reign of Tahmasp’s successor Esmail II (1576-77), whose musical life was described in some detail by Eskandar Munshi. While Esmail did patronize both singers and instrumentalists, there is no mention either of new compositions or of the performance of the instrumental *pishrow*. As Pourjavadiy suggests, if *pishrows* were performed at the Safavid court in Qazvin, they must have originated with musicians from Khorasan. According to Darvish ‘Ali Changi, who wrote in Bukhara in the last third of the 17th century, *pishrows* as well as vocal *naqsh* and *sorvt*’s by the unfortunate Qasem Qanuni of Mashhad were still performed. Vocal music was divided into the mainly religious (and metrically free) genres performed by the *hâfêz* or *guyanda*, and the primarily metrical courtly genres sung by the *khananda*. According to Eskandar Munshi the religious *guyandagi* repertoire was sung mainly by singers from “Iraq” (western Iran) and the secular *khanandagi* by singers from Khorasan (Pourjavadiy 2005:74-77). Technically this meant that the complex, composed vocal repertoire (the *kâr*, *naqsh* and *sorvt*) were preserved and developed mainly in Khorasan (and to some extent in Gilan).

Nevertheless, this negative situation cannot be accepted categorically. The musician and treatise writer Mir Sadr al-Din Mohammed Qazvini (d. 1599) was credited as a composer of all the serious classical vocal genres, such as *qazvel*, *amal*, *kâr* and *naqsh*. His date of birth is not known, but as his father died in 1561 and Qazvini was already a music tutor at the court of Sultan Mohammed Khodabanda (1577-1587), he was probably born between 1530 and 1540. He later became a boon companion (*nadim*) of Shah Abbas I. Thus his years of musical education corresponded to the period of Shah Tahmasp’s ban on music. Because his

²² This information comes from the 17th century history *Tarikh-e ‘Alamara ‘Abbasi* by Eskandar Beg Torkaman, as translated by Amir Hosein Pourjavadiy in chapter 3 of his dissertation, p. 62.

family were *seyyeds* (descendants of Mohammed) and had served as courtiers and poets for generations, his family evidently found ways to continue his musical education despite the ban, which was strongly in effect in their region. Mir Sadr al-Din Mohammed's career is more typical of the life of a respected aristocrat than that of a musician, and it is difficult to assess how widely heard his classical compositions were during his lifetime.

Probably more typical are the careers of two musical figures of the mid-17th century, Na'ini (1592-1640) and Aqa Momin (c.1600-c. 1655). Born in central Iran, Na'ni studied with a well-known local poet. Rather than attempt to enter the court of Shah Abbas in Isfahan, he moved to Khorasan (Mashhad and Harat), where he was able to perfect his musical art and education. Thereafter he emigrated to India, where he first served Jahangir in Ajmir, and then Shah Jahan, who acceded to the Moghul throne in 1628. Na'ni spent the rest of his life in India, where he became proficient also in Indian art music, and wrote the treatise *Zamzama-ye Vahdat* which he presented to Shah Jahan. The treatise treats both Persian and Indian art music. The biographer Nasrabadi even states that he became a follower of Hinduism in Banaras, before finally making the pilgrimage to Mecca and dying shortly thereafter in Iran. One Persian biographer who had met him in Patna states that he composed mainly in the lighter classical *naqsh* genre, as well as Indian music (Pourjavadiy 2005:22). While of course we cannot gauge the culture of an entire era by the career of a single individual, it is at least suggestive that a talented musician from a non-aristocratic family found it more appealing to pursue his musical interests first in Khorasan and then in India, rather than attempt to enter the court in Isfahan. The biographer Nasrabadi mentions another important Iranian composer, Saber Shirazi, who moved to India and died there in the middle of the 17th century.

Perhaps the career of Aqa Momin can suggest more about the musical situation at the court in the first half of the 17th century. While his exact dates are unknown, Aqa Momin was a singer, instrumentalist and composer who became the *chalchi bashi* (chief musician) at the courts of Shah Safi and Abbas II in Isfahan. His first piece was evidently composed in 1622 (to commemorate the taking of Qandahar), while he seems to have been in the royal service until perhaps 1655. Toward the end of his life he wrote a musical treatise to which he appended a list of all the songs that he had composed during his career. Many of them were occasional pieces, directly commissioned by the ruling shah. In some cases the shah gave him the poem for him to set to music, in other cases the words were his own. We may also surmise that he was an instrumental composer as well, as four *peşrevs* (*pishrows*) bearing his name are included in the notated Collection of Prince Cantemir (ca. 1700). Several of his *nakş* compositions are also recorded in the nearly contemporary anonymous *mecmua* Revan 1723 (ex. *fasl-i saba: fer'*, *nakş* Ağa Mumin).

While, like all other Safavid theorists, he employed no musical notation, and indeed seems to have known relatively little musical theory, his treatise is a very

significant document for the state of musical life at the court in Isfahan in the first half of the 17th century. In the theoretical part of the unnamed treatise, Aqa Momin demonstrates an adequate knowledge of the distinctions between the classical and folkloric vocal genres, as well as the theory of the modal entities. Nevertheless, his list of his 54 vocal compositions reveals a rather different picture. Similar to his Turkish contemporary Ali Ufkî, the heavier classical genres *kâr* and *'amal* are absent. Only a single item contains a modulating section (*miyankhana*), and belongs to the *qowl* genre. Aqa Momin employs the general term *tasnif* for all vocal items. According to a later Safavid source of Amir Khan Gorji (see below), *tasnif* was equivalent to the folkloric Turkish *varsâğı*. In Ali Ufkî's collections *varsâğı* usually has a modulating section, which Aqa Momin's pieces lack. Pourjavadiy concludes that the majority of them are *sawt*. This was also a quasi-folkloric genre, and in his *fâsil-i hüseyinî*, Hâfiz Post includes only a single *sawt*. But the very fact that Aqa Momin feels no need to specify the genre beyond the term *tasnif*, without the rhythmic cycle, (although with the *maqam* or other mode), seems to indicate that, despite his statements to the contrary in his treatise—de facto in the music which he composed and performed at the Safavid court—these distinctions made little difference, as all were simply “songs” with a relatively simple structure.²³ In addition, looking at the modality of his songs 14 of them were either in *maqam hüseynî* or in related entities like *mohayyer* or *dugâlb*. This concurs with all 17th century Ottoman sources, from Ali Ufkî and even to Cantemir. It is, of course, no accident that *hüseynî* (*hüseynî*) is the *maqam* closest to both Anatolian and much of Iranian folk music, being particularly widespread among the Kurds on both sides of the border. In older Turkish usage the *maqam* was indeed named *kürdî*.

Unlike Sadr al Din Mohammed, who was an aristocrat and courtier, and Na'ini, who was a poet and what we would call today a “spiritual seeker”, Aqa Momin composed and performed the musical styles that were in demand at the Safavid court. It is almost uncanny that the repertoire he presents seems so familiar from that of Ali Ufkî, who is the major contemporary Ottoman source. As the *chalchi bashi* of the court in Isfahan he was a respected and well-known figure, to the point that four of his *peşrevs* were preserved in Turkey for almost 50 years, and a number of *kârs* and *nakş* appear in Revan 1723. Assuming that at least some of these attributions are accurate, this would attest to his knowledge and skill in the older courtly repertoire. While there is no doubt that he, and other more or less learned musicians knew the rules defining the courtly vocal genres, in his generation there must have been little professional demand for them.

²³ The fact that Agha Momin composed many poems given to him by the Shah, suggests that he was using popular forms, in that classical forms probably demanded that the poem be set to a pre-composed melody (see Aksoy 2008:17-35). Aksoy mentions the reference of the Venetian ambassador Giovanni Battista Donado, to Turkish courtly songs that he heard in Istanbul during the 1680s.

The last major Safavid source on music from the 17th century, the treatise of Amir Khan Gorji written in 1697, presents an equally enigmatic picture. The treatise was commissioned and presented to Shah Sultan Hoseyn, despite the fact that two years previously, in 1695 (only one year after ascending the throne), the new Shah banned music, along with all other “non-sharia” activities, such as wine-drinking, prostitution, gambling, backgammon, chess, opium and other drugs. In addition to the treatise being created at all in these circumstances, equally surprising is that it contains a thoroughly “classical” repertoire, emphasizing the forms *kâr* and *‘amal*. In the theoretical section, and for the first time in 17th century Iran, the rhythmic cycles (*usûl*) are given numerical time values. Previous Safavid treatises had not given details of the *usûls*, except for the Nasim-I Tarab, written in Gilan by a certain Nasimi in the first half of the 16th century. As noted by Pourjavadiy (2007:xxiii), there is some alignment with 16th century Ottoman rhythmic terminology and structure. However, in comparing Amir Khan’s treatment with that of Nasimi almost a century and a half earlier, we can see that their *usûls* are almost never in agreement, and moreover his are not simple expansions or developments of Nasimi’s. The latter gives 33 *usûls* while Amir Khan gives only 16. The names of only five of Amir Khan’s *usûls* appear in Nasimi’s work, and of these five, only one has the same number of beats: *mukhammas* in 20 beats. Given this fundamental disagreement, it is very unlikely that any classical repertoire could have survived from Nasimi’s time to that of Amir Khan. This information from Amir Khan Gorji’s treatise would suggest that, on the one hand, a courtly repertoire was in use toward the end of the 17th century—and this despite the new ban on music—but that this “classical” repertoire had been created mainly by composers of his own generation. This is also borne out by the few biographies of composers whose works are represented in his collection.

From the information cited above—incomplete and sometimes contradictory as it is—we may conclude that the persecutions of Shah Tahmasp, probably along with other less well-documented cultural dislocations, created an atmosphere unfavourable to serious art music, except for aristocratic individuals who could avoid many of the official strictures. By the first half of the 17th century the level of music at the Safavid court in Isfahan had become largely an “entertainment” repertoire. During this interval most of the older classical repertoire, along with many older rhythmic cycles were forgotten. Some knowledge of the principles of composition survived among aristocratic amateurs, so that a musical “revival” could come about in the second half of the 17th century. But it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the evident decline in the creation of new artistic compositions in Iran could only have had a negative effect on the same repertoire in Ottoman Turkey. During the 16th century this was still a “high prestige” repertoire of “limited diffusion” (in Wright’s terms) partly performed and overwhelmingly composed by foreign born, largely Iranian professional musicians, not by Turkish musicians trained at the Ottoman court.

If we attempt to integrate this relatively new information into the few but significant facts already known about musical relations between Iran and Turkey in the first half of the 17th century, we may arrive at a more refined view of these connections. Turkish sources agree 1638 was important in this regard, because in that year Sultan Murad IV conquered both Erivan and Baghdad, retaking the latter from the Iranian control under Shah Abbas I that had been in place only since 1623. Both Evliya and Es'ad Efendi mention a number of outstanding musicians (Es'ad Efendi puts them at twelve) whom Sultan Murad had captured in Baghdad and taken back with him to Istanbul. These are referred to as Persians (*acemler*). This would suggest that Baghdad had retained something of an older Persianate artistic style and musical repertoire, despite the persecution of musicians in Isfahan and Qazvin. This is not very surprising, as Baghdad had been under Ottoman control from 1534 until 1623, and moreover had a culturally active *Mevlevihane*. Art historical research indicates that the *Mevlevîye* there were active patrons of painting in the last part of the 16th century (Milstein 1990). This being the case, we would expect them also to patronize and encourage both mystical and secular art music, as they did elsewhere. The connection of Baghdad with the cities of the "Jazeera" (northern Iraq) and south eastern Anatolia were close through the caravan trade, which was still significant through the 16th and first half of the 17th centuries. All of this would link this broad region in a Persianate musical style, but, more significantly, would allow the older Persian courtly repertoire and performance practice to survive better than in western Iran proper.

Es'ad Efendi (writing roughly a century later) includes the names of many composers coming from the largely Kurdish cities of Diyarbekir, Mardin, Urfa and 'Ayntab. As I noted in 1996, this group accounts for the largest number of composers originating outside of Istanbul. While it is true—as Behar has noted more recently—that Es'ad Efendi sometimes adds belittling remarks to their biographies, this is not always the case (Behar 2010:159). The fact remains that the notable musicians hailing from this region far outnumber those coming from the more "central" European provinces of the Empire, such as Macedonia, Bulgaria or Serbia. The condescending tone very likely comes from the newly re-established pre-eminence of Istanbul as a musical capital, which was certainly evident by the generation of Es'ad Efendi and Cantemir. Both Es'ad Efendi and Evliya Çelebi consistently apply the term *acemane* (in the Persian manner) to musicians from this Eastern region. But Evliya, who had actually travelled and worked there as a musician roughly a century before Es'ad Efendi wrote his *tezkire*, never uses a condescending tone in describing these men. On the contrary, he links *acemane* to the revered "style of Khorasan" and the "*fasıl* of Hüseyin Baykara" (Timurid ruler of Herat). This usage alone suggests that Istanbul did not have the centrality in the patronage and composition of music in the early 17th century that it would attain by the early 18th century, and that might justify Es'ad Efendi's condescension toward some of the provincial "Easterners."

Both Evliya and Cantemir stress the importance of Emiranoğlu, the former governor of Erivan and who had gone over to the Ottoman side, as a connoisseur of music. In his *History* Cantemir relates an anecdote in which he stops to interview a passing Greek aristocrat who had been singing a “Persian air,” praising his expertise. We may assume that Emiranoğlu had been an effective patron of music while still in Erivan, and this seemingly unusual and anomalous fact may help us to understand the careers of two of his Caucasian countrymen—Şeştâri Murad Ağa and Amir Khan Gorji. Es’ad Efendi speaks at length about a “Murad Ağa” who had been born in “Persia” (*diyar-i acem*) but was captured by Sultan Murad in Baghdad and brought to Istanbul. Evliya Çelebi mentions a “Nahçevenli Murad Ağa” who was a player of the *şestâr* and had come with Emiranoğlu from Erivan. Es’ad speaks only of Murad Ağa’s singing, but then it was his policy to focus on vocal and not instrumental music and musicians. The later Ottoman tradition contains a few vocal compositions attributed to “Şeştari Murad.” While it is possible that these were two different musicians, it seems more likely that they were one and the same person. Es’ad Efendi was writing almost a century after the fact, while Evliya had known Murad Ağa, and even mentions in which neighborhood he was settled in Istanbul.²⁴

We can compare this with contemporary Persian data. Writing in 1697 (he was born in 1620) Amir Khan states that he was a native of Georgia and had grown up speaking Turkish and Georgian. He had evidently learned Persian and entered the Safavid service. As we have seen, his treatise is distinguished by a thorough knowledge of the classical Persian genres and the ability to compose in them. It might seem anomalous that a musician coming from as far to the northwest as Georgia would be in command of a courtly Persian repertoire, but if we take this information in conjunction with the Safavid governor’s court in Erivan—whose influence certainly extended into Nahçevan and possibly to Georgia as well—we may perhaps discern a pattern that would have been favourable to music, even during times of persecution in more central areas of Iran. Whether this patronage began with Emiranoğlu, or had already existed somewhat earlier is at present moot. But even if it had only begun with him that would suffice to explain the prominence of musicians such as Şeştari Murad and Amir Khan Gorji.

In trying to compare the situation of courtly or “artistic” music in Ottoman Turkey and Safavid Iran from the middle of the 16th until the end of the 17th century, periods of patronage and encouragement alternate with neglect and persecution (the latter only on the Safavid side). Shah Tahmasp’s prolonged official persecution of music and musicians, culminating in the physical liquidation of many prominent performers and composers, could not but have a chilling effect on the following generation. While “music” as such certainly did not disappear, the evi-

²⁴ See Feldman 1996:66-67, Behar 2010:74-78. The present discussion assesses Murad Ağa’s significance for Ottoman music rather differently than Behar does in these pages.

dence of Aqa Momin's career and repertoire—as well as those Iranian musicians who emigrated to India—would suggest that professional musicians were discouraged from pursuing the more demanding “classical” repertoires and styles. This must have been true of the central Iranian provinces, but less so in the East (Khorasan) and in the West (South Caucasus). At present we cannot be certain whether the evident contemporary decline in musical standards in the Ottoman court was a reflection of the Iranian situation or of local official neglect; probably it was a mixture of both factors, as well as others that have not yet been discovered.

But equally important as this pattern of decline and erosion is the striking “revival” that took place more or less simultaneously in both Turkey and Iran. In Turkey Cantemir clearly identified one aristocratic amateur composer—Koca Osman—and his students as the principal agents in this musical renaissance. While Es'ad Efendi—in keeping with his principles as a writer of a biographical dictionary—never makes such sweeping judgments, the position he allots to Koca Osman also suggests the latter's pre-eminence in his generation. Behind the hyperbolic praise of Osman by his contemporary Evliya Çelebi—who was not known for carefully calibrated opinions—there seems to be a real recognition of his special position with regard to courtly music. In Iran neither Amir Khan nor other writers mention a single individual as being so influential, but the overall effect must have been rather similar. The only individual whom we can pinpoint would seem to be Mir Sadr al-Din Mohammed Qazvini, a *seyyed* and descendent of poets and scholars, who was a composer in the serious genres and the author of a musical treatise. However his work also included an unfinished biographical dictionary of poets, and he was the music tutor of a royal prince and later a boon companion of Shah Abbas I (r. 1587-1628), a position which he held only in the last twelve years of his life. Most of his career was spent in more private and intimate pursuits, and unlike Aqa Momin or Amir Khan, he could not be described as a “court musician”. With both Sadr al-Din and Koca Osman the paradigm seems to be that of an aristocratic “amateur” who has mastered both theory and composition.

Unlike Sadr al-Din, Osman never held any official position at the court. Rather he had a wide circle of students, some of whom were performers for the reigning Sultan. Through these students, and especially Mustafa Buhurizade Itri, his influence reached Prince Cantemir, and is therefore reflected in the latter's musical treatise. By Cantemir's generation the Ottoman court had become a great centre of patronage for music, especially during the famous Tulip Period, ending in 1730. Most of the 18th century saw the continuation of this lively patronage for music, which indeed led to the most rapid and varied developments in the entire history of Ottoman music. We know of a great many composers, some of whom also wrote treatises in the Turkish, Armeno-Turkish and Greek languages. Both the practice of, and the discourse about, music become far livelier than in the previous two centuries, and for the first time both involved all of the urban communities in the

major Ottoman cities, including the non-Muslims. Thus, in assessing the significance of the 17th century, the 18th century cannot furnish a cultural model. For heuristic purposes it may be more useful to turn to a later era, the second half of the 19th century, to gain some perspective on these earlier developments. In particular we need to focus on the interplay of the court and the “amateur” musical establishment in both its secular and Sufi zones. Without entering into much detail concerning this relatively well-known history, I would like to point out a couple of key patterns. For this we will need to “fast-forward” from the 17th to the 19th century.

The Function of Pseudographia in Later 19th Century Turkey

The year 1839 marked a turning point in the history of Ottoman music. In that year Mahmud II, the last sultan who may be taken as a serious and knowledgeable patron of Ottoman music, died and he was succeeded by Abdülmecid (1839-1861), the first sultan to openly support Western music at the court. Seven years later, in 1846, Ismail Dede, the greatest composer of the 19th century, left the court, saying “this game has lost its taste”, and died on the pilgrimage to Mecca. From this point on—until the end of Empire—Turkish art music suffered from official neglect. While Western music had official status at the court through the Italian teachers Donizetti Pasha (Giuseppe Donizetti, 1788-1856) and Guatelli Pasha (1819-1900), it did not receive the kind of high level dissemination through (at least) the upper levels of society that would be sponsored in Egypt by the Khedive Ismail or in Republican Turkey by Kemal Atatürk. After the accession of Sultan Abdülhamid II in 1876 the dominant movement in urban music became not Western, but the “middle-brow” version of art and popular entertainment music associated with the new nightclubs known as *gazino* (It. “casino”), in which Western music played a minor role. Some of the musicians from aristocratic and bureaucratic backgrounds continued to work at the court, but a number of them, notably the composer Şevki Bey (1860-1891) and the multi-instrumentalist and composer Tanburi Cemil Bey (1871-1916), avoided the court and accepted aspects of the *gazino* style as part of the creative flux of the musical tradition. However, a major group of aristocratic “amateur” musicians and composers, most of them associated with the *Mevlevi* Order, were less accepting of this popularization and attempted to preserve an older courtly performance standard. To their number should be added several outstanding cantors of the Greek and Armenian churches as well as the major synagogues, who were also important connoisseurs and composers of secular Ottoman music. Without much coordination several of these musicians and music teachers attempted to preserve and transmit what they regarded as most valuable in the courtly music of the past. Their task was aided by the strength of the immediately preceding generation, so that literal transmission of their style and repertoire (known as *meşk*) could be practiced effectively. But the

popularization of a somewhat hybridized performance and compositional style complicated their task. A highly significant new factor was the appearance of printed Western musical notation of Turkish music, a development that allowed “unauthorized” versions of classical pieces to circulate without the approval of traditional masters. Some of these publications openly advertised that the repertoire they contained had been notated “in the commercial style” (*piyasa tarzında*)—and not in the style in which their original composers had created them.

In general the response of the heirs of the courtly tradition was two-fold. Led by the *Mevlevi* musician and student of the great *Mevlevi* composer Zekâî Dede (1825-97, himself known as “the Teacher”, *boca*), Rauf Yekta Bey, Western notation was employed to fix—often for the first time—masterpieces of the courtly repertoire. Other, in a sense more “traditional” musicians, such as the court musician Ismail Hakkı Bey and even Rauf Yekta’s colleague Dr. Subhi Ezgi, utilized modern notation to create “pseudographia.” These were of two general types: Ismail Hakkı Bey claimed to have discovered ancient pieces, such as a *peşrev* by Cellalüddin Rumi’s son, Sultan Veled, or the *peşrevs* by “Farabi” (d. 950) all of which bear a striking resemblance to items in the Cantemir Collection, to which he had access.²⁵ Dr. Subhi Ezgi did not resort to such “traditional” methods; rather he, together with his teacher Şeyh Abdülhalim, “reconstructed” ancient pieces according to their “intuition” of how they should have been performed. In his publications Ezgi never presented these as his creations, they were rather “scientific” reconstructions of the proper form of antiquity. Like Ismail Hakkı Bey, Dr. Subhi was a serious and successful traditional composer in the style of the later 19th century. These new or “reconstructed” pieces by Ismail Hakkı Bey and Dr. Subhi Ezgi are fundamentally modern, but they do make significant gestures to the musical style of several generations earlier, but not to the time of the reputed composers. That is to say, they are the kind of “antiquity” that acts as a foundation for the currently known musical style. The earliest starting point for this “antiquity” can only be the oldest notated examples, in this case the early 17th century repertoire notated by Prince Cantemir. So in this case Cantemir’s Western inspired effort to notate the earliest surviving repertoire was put to use two centuries later in order to buttress a thoroughly traditional, emic perception of an indigenous repertoire. Without the existence of this early collection, created by a European in an Islamic notation system, neither Ismail Hakkı nor Subhi Ezgi would have had sufficient criteria for judging antiquity. The latter seems to have developed his critical abilities to the point that he was probably sensitive to internal musical data to some degree, but for the former “antiquity” was a catch-all concept from which he could dig out items to be labelled “10th century”, “13th century” or “17th century”, as the need arose.

²⁵ I discuss the issue of Ottoman pseudographia in Feldman 1990-91.

At the same time both Ismail Hakkı and Dr. Subhi passed down other sorts of pieces—some of them fairly accurate versions of mid- to later 18th century musicians, others were obvious 19th century pseudographia bearing the name of a 17th century or even earlier composer. Nowhere do they indicate any principles of musical changes that could have validated or invalidated the attributions of these items. Looking at these three musicians—as well as many of their contemporaries, such as Ahmed Avni Konuk, Zekâîzâde Ahmed İrsoy, and Abdülkadir Töre—we can see a variety of responses in their attempt to preserve both the repertoire and the creative means of Ottoman music against the twin challenges of Western music and that of the “commercialized” (*piyasa*) style of Turkish music.

In his numerous publications Rauf Yekta never criticized his two contemporaries for their manipulation of musical sources. At the same time he must have understood that such methods ran counter to his own attempt to place the transmission and study of Ottoman music on a more empirical basis. Indeed it was only his writing—and not that of Ezgi—which appeared in a Western language for a Western public. Yet, when we look more closely at the apparent “empiricism” of Rauf Yekta Bey, it appears always to conform to the general mythic history of Ottoman music that we know from much earlier sources. While Yekta initiated an important series of booklets called “The Masters of Music”, in which he dealt with the life of his own teacher Zekâî Dede, and of his teacher Ismail Dede, but the first book in the series is the life of none other than ‘Abd al-Qâdir Marâghî, the mythical *hoca*, the “Teacher” who “founded” Ottoman music. Although he owned the manuscript of Cantemir’s treatise and Collection as well as that of Mustafa Kevserî, and had access to the principal sources of Ottoman music, Yekta never attempted to create a history of Ottoman music that indicated any principle of change. His goal—like that of his colleagues and followers—was to present a description of an essentialist music, that had been passed down at least since medieval Islam to the Ottoman Turks. At times, however (mainly in his footnotes), he does indicate structural changes that he observes in the repertoire. But he never generalizes about how these changes could have effected major structural differences between older and newer items or entire musical eras. Evidently it was only a monolithic, essential and unchanging music that was judged to have a chance to withstand the onslaughts of both elite Westernization and popular vulgarization. By the following generation—that of Sadrettin Arel—this essentialist music would be renamed “Turkish Music.”²⁶ It is perhaps surprising that Prince Cantemir, in 1700, was more empirical in describing both the music he worked with and its history than Rauf Yekta was writing in 1922. However, despite his immersion in Turk-

²⁶ Despite the fact that he entitled his famous French essay “*La musique turque*” (in the Lavignac Encyclopedia vol. 5, article from 1922), this was to aid in its identification by a European readership. In the text itself the music under discussion is “*la musique orientale*.” In the historical part of his text his sources are drawn variously from medieval theorists writing in Arabic and Persian. No earlier Turkish source is adduced.

ish life and culture, Cantemir was at heart a man of the European Age of Reason, whose deepest cultural (and certainly political) identification was not Ottoman, whereas—despite his involvement with French language and culture—Rauf Yekta's certainly was.

Despite the vast differences in historical circumstances, my assessment of the motivations of key musicians and musicologists of the late-19th-early 20th century in Turkey display patterns that seem to be quite comparable to those of a previous period of musical erosion and consolidation—the 17th century.

Pseudographia and the “Marâghî” Repertoire in Iran and Turkey

Going back to the 17th century in either Ottoman Turkey or Safavid Iran, we will not find most of the cultural factors that loomed so large in later 19th century Turkey. Even the role of the *Mevlevî* dervishes—who were just beginning to become a significant presence in the life of the elite in the Ottoman capital during the reign of Murad IV—was not really comparable in these two eras. Nevertheless, what seems striking about both eras, even encompassing 17th century Turkey and Iran, is the ability of highly cultured aristocratic individuals to effect a “revival” of an older courtly style, even when the court was hostile, indifferent or moving toward “popular” taste. Within this revival the role of theoretical knowledge, transmission of older repertoire, reconstruction or outright fabrication of ancient repertoire, as well as high level performance practice are deeply interconnected. In our terms, the roles of performer, composer, musicologist and music theorist are combined or even confused. Given the cultural instability that often surrounded secular music, the absence of widely used notation, and the agrarianate principle that “the past was, per se, authoritative,” there was apparently no other way that a learned musician of aristocratic background and tastes—hence with no immediate concern about the acceptability of his music at court or in society at large—could participate creatively in his own culture, than by occasionally blurring the distinction between “transmission” and “composition,” to create not simply a new “version” of an older piece, but a full-blown pseudographic item.

Thus, in assessing the repertoire attributed to ‘Abd al-Qâdir Marâghî (d. 1435) in later Ottoman sources we must note where and how he is cited, as well as what evidence we may have to relate these references to his actual compositions. Wright presents a thorough analysis of the relationship between one piece notated by Marâghî himself with its “reincarnation” in the Nurosmaniye anthology created 50 odd years after his death. His conclusion is: “Thus, while it cannot be proved that the two pieces are not related, the lack of a single demonstrable common element means that it would be reasonable to conclude, after all, that they are more likely to be completely independent and separate pieces...” (Wright 1992a:226). But it is clear from his analysis of this piece in NO (pp. 220-226) that the later 15th century version was in many ways expanded, and not reduced.

The *Cemaat-i Mutriban* list of 1525 mentions ‘Abd al-Qâdir’s grandson, the *udist* and theorist Dervîş Mahmud bin Abdülkadirzâde (Feldman 1996:72). While it is not impossible that he possessed some of the courtly songs of his grandfather, this is not stated clearly and we do not know the subsequent fate of these songs. In the anthologies of what Wright terms the “antecedent tradition” he appears as either ‘Abd al-Qâdir or “*Khojâ*” (*hoca*—the “Teacher”), but he is not the only earlier composer to be mentioned. Safi al-Din is cited numerous times in both the later 15th and 16th century sources (NO/G and Ox/S), along with “Ali Şitai.” In the two 16th century anthologies the otherwise unknown Gazanfar Mirza holds a prominent place with nearly one hundred compositions! Thus, even though it seems unlikely that ‘Abd al-Qâdir’s songs were still known 50 years after his death, much less 150 years after, he was remembered as one of a handful of major early composers. It was only in the 17th century, and probably in the latter part of that century, that he was turned into a near-mythical exemplar of musical virtue.

One early Ottoman document is the *tasnîf persikon* attributed to Marâghî in a Greek manuscript of 1572, recently published by Kalaitzidis (2012:268). The published transcription utilizes in part the “modern” form of the *makam hüzzam*—unlikely for a piece from this era—but this seems to reflect the assumptions of the modern transcriber, given the lack of written indications, as Kalaitzidis admits.²⁷ While the *usûl* is apparently not given, the structure of the piece suggests the 16/4 meter supplied by the transcriber. The structure of the piece is consistent with the *murabba’* melodies recorded by Ali Ufkî roughly one century later, except for the appearance of lengthy sequences, which instead resemble some of the 17th century *peşrevs* recorded by Cantemir. It would seem to have nothing in common with melodies composed by or from the era of Marâghî, and thus forms a tantalizing link with the semi-folkloric vocal repertoire of the early 17th century, while still showing evidence of a more sophisticated style. It also bears no particular resemblance to the “Marâghî” pseudographia current in the 19th century. While other “*persikon*” items appear in these Greek sources, Marâghî’s name is dominant in the 18th century manuscripts, such as that of Petros Peloponnesios (d.1778). On the other hand, Marâghî fails to appear in the repertoire collected by Ali Ufkî Bey, nor is he a prominent figure for Evliya Çelebi, for whom the locus classicus of Persian music is the court of Hüseyin Baykara in Herat (1469-1506).

Behar notes that the text of one “*kâr*” attributed to Marâghî in modern Turkey (“*Ey Şebînşâb-I Horasan*” in *makam segâb*) appears on page 305b of Ali Ufkî’s Paris MS, but without either music or attribution, as “*segâb kâr hafîf*” (Behar 2008: 68). This reference in the Paris MS does demonstrate that Ali Ufkî was indeed aware of the *kâr* form—as was Evliya Çelebi—even though it was not a staple of the courtly repertoire in their time. But the appearance of this form and text without any composer’s name is in itself negative evidence for the status of Marâghî in the

²⁷ *Hüzzam* is described by Cantemir (chap. VI), see discussion in Feldman 1996:246.

first half of the 17th century. Dr. Subhi Ezgi had already written in 1953 (Ezgi, vol. 4) that several of the *kârs* attributed to ‘Abd al-Qâdir appeared in 16th century *mecmuâ* collections under the name of ‘Abd al-‘Ali (‘Abdûlali), “Hoca-i Sani”, the “Second Teacher.” He also seems to have been the earliest Turkish musicologist to categorically reject the possibility that the known repertoire of “Meraġi” could possibly have been created by the historical ‘Abd al-Qâdir Marâġhî (Ezgi, vol. 4, 239-40, 255-56).²⁸ Of course the coincidence of the text, *usûl* and makam with the 19th century repertoire of Marâġhî is no accident. While not bearing any necessary connection to the composer ‘Abd al-Qâdir, whether it might bear an antecedent relationship with this later repertoire is (at present) a moot point, which may be somewhat better understood after a thorough analysis of the whole of this modern repertoire.

In both Turkey and Iran in the later 17th century a repertoire of vocal compositions, attributed to the composer and theorist ‘Abd al-Qâdir Marâġhî were essential parts of the musical revival. In discussing the repertoire attributed to Marâġhî in the Hâfiz Post Anthology in the context of possible continuities between the repertoires documented in sixteenth and seventeenth century sources, Wright concludes:

Discontinuity in the repertoire thus appears not merely radical but total. The *kâr* may correspond, directly or indirectly, to some of the other earlier forms, but none of the pieces in the antecedent anthologies can be identified in HP, so that there are no earlier versions that can be compared with the many examples of this form in HP attributed to ‘Abd al-Qâdir al-Maraghi. Any consideration of the mid-seventeenth century ‘Abd al-Qâdir al-Maraghi corpus should be based on the premise that these are pieces which had by then achieved the status of ‘classics’, deserving therefore to be attributed to a venerable figure of authority whose authorship would confirm their worth, but which in purely chronological terms were unlikely to be older than the century itself: that among them might be found survivals from the antecedent tradition is most unlikely (Wright 1992a:227).

By the last third of the 17th century the canonicity of this “Marâġhî” repertoire in Turkey is confirmed by its position in the Hâfiz Post Anthology, in Revan 1723, and is remarked upon by Cantemir in his *History*. Since Cantemir did not notate any vocal items, and as they do not appear at all in Ali Ufkî, we have no contemporaneous document with which to compare the modern repertoire of this type. However, Wright’s comparison of one item—the *rast kavîl-i muhtesem*—confirms his judgment that “they were unlikely to be older than the century itself”:

... it may be said in general the melodic style of this piece, in a rhythmic cycle that has retained the same morphology as in the seventeenth century, is not too dissimilar to what we encounter in ‘Ali Ufkî and Cantemir. (Wright 1992, 235).

Thus these pieces had become “classics” with remarkable rapidity. As Wright confirms, continuity from the repertoires of the 16th century was nil. Where might

²⁸ Behar (2010:71) also stresses the significance of Ezgi’s position, quoting him at some length, and I had noted Ezgi’s unusually critical judgment in my *Asian Music* article (1990:93).

these new “classics” have originated? In the Istanbul of the previous generation, the outstanding master of the *kâr* form was none other than Koca Osman. While Es’ad Efendi mentions the over 200 items he had composed in the *murabba’*, *kâr*, *nakiş* and *şarkı* forms, he singles out his *kâr-i musanna* in the *makam buselik usûl türk-darb* for special praise, bringing in the figure of Marâghî’s “slave” Gholam Shadi. Clearly Osman had transmitted his own *kâr* repertoire, most probably along with another, apparently “older” repertoire. For this there only two possibilities—either he composed them himself, as pious pseudographia, or he had them from another, probably foreign, source. In this case the former seems less likely, because Osman was a well-known figure with many prominent students. It is hard to imagine that he could have “discovered” such a repertoire while occupying such a public position. The foreign source seems more likely, and if there was one, it must have lay within Greater Iran or its peripheries. This brings up the status of the purported “Marâghî” repertoire in Iran.

Hâfiz Post’s contemporary, Amir Khan Gorji discusses Marâghî explicitly. As noted by Pourjavadiy:

Amir Khan mentions first that the best examples (and probably the most classic) of vocal compositions known in his day was the *kâr* “*rokhsar*” composed by Marâghî which was written in three rhythmic cycles of *zarb al-fath*, *mokhammas*, *khafif*. This *kâr*, as Amir Khan states, was the best model of composition against which all composers could test their ability and skill. Subsequently, he claims that he could outrank Maraghi by composing a *kâr* in four *osul* cycles, adding the *ravani* to the three other *osuls* used by Marâghî (Pourjavadiy 2005:161.)

Since Amir Khan adduces this famous *kâr* “*rokhsar*” of “Marâghî” as a well-known model, within the broader public sphere of the educated musical public it cannot be his own creation, and it is very likely older than one generation prior. Even though the *kâr* had little currency at the court in the previous generation, as the leading court musician Aqa Momin failed to include any in his own *mecmû’â*, the Turkish tradition, at any rate, remembered him as a composer of *kârs*, among other forms. The author of *Revan 1723* noted Aqa Momin as the composer of two *kârs*: *çargâlb diyyek*, and *evç hafif*, as well as two *nakiş*: *şehnaz evfer* and *segâlb türki-zarb*.

The biographical notices of Mir Sadr al-Dîn Mohammed (d. 1595) indicated that he composed in the *kâr* form, but (not surprisingly) they do not mention Marâghî in this connection. Quite possibly in this earlier generation—a century before that of Amir Khan and Hâfiz Post—there was no need to link the *kâr* form only with Marâghî. Had some of Mir Sadr al-Dîn’s *kârs* become known as compositions of “Marâghî” by the mid-17th century? Might they have travelled up to Emirgan’s court in the South Caucasus or to Baghdad? While we have no documentary evidence, these are surely among the possibilities. Since there was evidently a functioning repertoire of *kârs* at least in some aristocratic circles in Greater Iran during the 16th century, it is quite conceivable that they would have formed part of the repertoire brought to Turkey by Murad Agha or other of the *acemler*

musicians coming either from the South Caucasus or from Baghdad in 1638. Thus they would have formed part of the musical revival beginning to brew at that time, in which both the native Koca Osman and foreign born Murad Agha were major figures. By the next generation—that of Hâfiz Post and Itrî—the “Marâghî” repertoire of what were termed *kâr* would have been an established part of the musical canon in Istanbul. Therefore, despite problems in musical transmission in both Safavid Iran and Ottoman Turkey during the 16th century, it would seem that the much greater decentralization of Persian music, as compared to the centreing of music within Istanbul and the Ottoman court, enabled the more esoteric and erudite element of the Persianate courtly repertoire to survive in various locations in Greater Iran, so that they could then reach Istanbul at a given point and help to effect a musical revival there. Of course much of the above argument is hypothetical, and it is unlikely that complete textual documentation will ever emerge in sufficient quantity to enable us to create a clear “narrative” of musical creation and transmission. Nevertheless, it seems worthwhile to combine the known facts about the varying status of the *kâr* repertoire in 16th and 17th century Iran and Turkey—as well as the better known conditions leading to musical pseudographia in a later era—in order to create a theoretical model that might help to explain how this repertoire was created, why it retains the musical shape that is currently has (in Turkey), and what cultural function it has served over time, thus bringing the entire topic into the sphere of historical ethnomusicology.

Conclusion

The central dilemma addressed here concerns what can be known about the technical stages through which the Turkish repertoire and performance practice passed in the course of the 17th century, leading to a system that, while not identical to the one documented in the Hamparsum notations of the early 19th century, was directly antecedent to it. It would seem that enough documentation of various types have been identified which demonstrate a process that can be schematized in the following manner. But—as Wright has observed—we cannot assume a neat chronological succession, as some features must have coexisted among different social strata for some time:

- 1) Decline or marginalization of the older “Persianate” courtly repertoire (starting in the second half of the 16th century).
- 2) Increasing acceptance of semi-popular Turkish repertoire, even at the court and among the elite.
- 3) Musical “revival” or “renaissance” during the second half, and especially the last third of the 17th century, whose groundwork had been laid by certain musicians earlier in the century.

Specifically this new system contained the following:

- a) Expansion of the *murabba'* into the *murabba' beste* by introducing a wide variety of *usûls*, slower tempos and serious Turkish poetic texts, as well as the *teren-nümat* section, linking the *beste* to the older *kâr* and *naqsb/nakış* forms.
- b) Reinstatement of the “classic” *kâr* with Persian texts as well as the *nakış* with either Persian or Turkish texts.
- c) Creation of the *ağır semâ'î* form out of the older vocal *semâ'î*.
- d) Elimination of all folkloric genres.
- e) Elevation of the urban popular *şarkı*.
- f) Fixing of the order of performance in the *fasıl*.
- g) Increasing development of *peşrevs* with slower tempos and greater melodic density.
- h) Creation of the newer form of *semâ'î-i sazende* in *aksak semâ'î* (10/8).
- i) Greater expansion of the improvised *taksim* form both for instruments and voice, with wider use of modulation within it.

The musical phenomena listed above all have their own inner logic in purely musical terms. How this “musical logic” related to social and historical facts is another matter, for which purely musicological analysis cannot suffice. A deeper understanding of the cultural “meaning” of the musical facts presented above must take into account many social, religious, ethnographic and political factors both within Ottoman Turkey and Safavid Iran. This is not the kind of question that can be “solved” by summing up the arguments listed above, but rather can only emerge as the result of much deeper multi-disciplinary research.

But as a first step, we might note that the sources for the history of music in Safavid Iran are becoming more accessible, and so it is possible to attempt to integrate this history into the Turkish developments. As we have seen, during most of the 16th century the factors affecting music in Iran were quite negative. For the Ottomans to lose the support of their principal musical source—Iran—proved to be problematic for the maintenance of older standards of artistic musical practice and the older repertoire. We may conclude at this stage that a series of interlocking historical events in both Ottoman Turkey and Safavid Iran led to a partial stagnation of musical creation in the second half of the 16th century at the level of the court. Within Greater Iran, however, aristocratic individuals acted both as composers and patrons to ensure the survival of the principals of courtly music. This process must have been characterized by a mixture of new composition in traditional forms and transmission of older items. However, within a relatively short time some of the new compositions must have become part of a pseudographic repertoire which would become canonical, mainly under the name of the late 14th-early 15th century Iranian composer ‘Abd al-Qâdir Marâghî. The importation of major “peripheral” Iranian musicians to Istanbul following the conquest of Erivan and Baghdad in 1638—most importantly Murad Agha—facilitated the transmission of an older Ira-

nian courtly repertoire that had been lost in Turkey (and partly in central Iran as well) and also the relatively recent pseudographia of “Marâghî.” This somewhat older and more sophisticated Iranian element proved critical to the burgeoning group of serious musicians in Istanbul, apparently clustered around Koca Osman. The new compositions of Osman, his contemporaries ‘Ama Kadri, Sütçüzade İsa, and his students Buhurîzâde İtrî, Hâfız Post and several others set the stage for the further development of a native compositional style—which would now diverge significantly from the earlier Iranian standards and from the Turkish folkloric style that had succeeded it—by their students, among whom the Moldavian Prince Cantemir and the Mevlevi dervish Osman Dede were among the most eminent. This pairing of the Greek Orthodox Moldavian aristocrat and the *Mevlevi* dervish is not fortuitous. After this point there occurred a steady development and expansion of the newer musical principles, very probably with new practices and concepts entering through the other great musical tradition of the Ottoman capital, that of the post-Byzantine tradition of the Greek Orthodox church, as well as those of the highly esteemed *neyzen*s and composers of the *Mevlevi* dervishes. While the term may perhaps be overly grand, it may not be inappropriate to speak of a musical “renaissance”, in which the older principles of musical composition (especially *usûl*) were reformulated along with newer principles to create a new genre system and a novel repertoire that embodied it, whose creators were almost exclusively musicians trained within the Ottoman culture—and not foreign Iranian musicians, even though some of them—like Tanburi Angelos, Tanburi Çelebi (Chelebico), and Prince Cantemir, as well as other contemporaries such as Yahudi Harun (Aaron Hamon), “Ermeni Murad” et al.—were non-Muslims.

In Iran, although there was a similar “revival” of classical musical practice in the second half of the 17th century, this revival did not have the required political stability or social encouragement to continue for long. Nevertheless, when the Ottoman Armenian Tanburi Harutin visited Iran with an official delegation to Nader Shah in 1736—fifteen years after the fall of the Safavid Dynasty—he found that Persian musicians still knew of the Ottoman composers and compositions (including *bestes*), and among the composers, Buhurîzâde Mustafa İtrî.²⁹ But, by the early 18th century—and for the first time in their long mutual relations—cultural developments in Iran had no effect on Turkey, a striking contrast to the musical situation exactly a century earlier. While the current Persian musical system—known as the *radif*—had its inception in the middle of the 19th century, and is associated with one family of Tehran musicians—the Farahanis—the antecedents of this system were developed over the course of the second half of the 18th century, even while remnants of the older *maqam* system and compositional forms may have still existed. As shown recently by Hooman Asadi, this transformation of the practice and con-

²⁹ Tanburi Harutin, *Rukovodstvo po vostochnoi muzyke* (Handbook of Oriental Music), edited and translated by Nikoghos Taghmizian. Yerevan: Akademia Nauk, 1968:121.

ceptualization of music took place over several generations, beginning in the early Qajar period (after 1787) (Asadi 2001). While the revival of musical thought did produce some novel theoretical outlooks in relation to the concepts of *gushe* and *radif*, the political disaster of the sack of Isfahan and the fall of the Safavid Dynasty rather quickly spelled the end of continuity in Persian court music, at least at the level of repertoire and compositional form. Among the casualties of this cultural rupture in Iran were the pseudographic vocal compositions of “Marâghî,” along with all other complex metrical compositions.

The combination of diverse social, political and religious factors that combined to weaken the older courtly repertoire within 16th century Ottoman Turkey require still require further research. But from both the Ottoman and the Safavid materials presented here an important social phenomenon emerges that has not received sufficient attention in previous scholarship. Namely, this involves the ability of well-educated and prestigious musicians—especially when their musical ability was combined with social position—to preserve elements of an older and more high-prestige repertoire and to create new works combining these older principles with newer musical ideas, even without the overt support of a courtly patronage system. Both in Turkey (and probably also in Iran for a time) the students of such individuals were able to transform the musical landscape to a substantial extent. Much more research on existing sources is needed in order to further elucidate the complex relationship between older repertoire and practice, newer musical concepts, and the creation of a pseudographic repertoire of “classics” and their function in legitimizing the newer music under the agrarianate cultural principle of the authoritativeness of the past.

Among many other pseudographic compositions in the Ottoman repertoire, the so-called “Marâghî” corpus holds a special place. They probably represent a mixture of simple misattributions from the actual repertoire of the Ottoman ‘Abd al-‘Ali or several Iranian musicians, plus purposeful pseudographia created in Turkey and/or Iran, apparently between the later 16th and the early 17th centuries. Unlike other Ottoman pseudographia they do display a high degree of stylistic integrity which, while certainly not identical to anything of the above temporal provenance, makes clear gestures to musical principles known in that era, while differentiating themselves from the dominant semi-folkloric vocal style dominant at the court and documented by Ali Ufkî Bey. By the generation of Hâfiz Post and then of Cantemir they were accepted as genuine exemplars of an earlier high style of Iranian courtly composition. While having no relation with the historical Marâghî, this corpus is of both great beauty and interest, and is worthy of investigation from several points of view as an evident “blend” of compositional practices of the 19th and the 17th centuries.³⁰

³⁰ It is not unlikely that some of the notations of the pieces attributed to “Marâghî” in 18th century Greek manuscripts (referred to or published by Kalaitzidis 2012) may help to explain the stylistic evolution of these items.

In Turkey Ali Ufkî Bey, like Evliya Çelebi, lived through an era in which new and creative musical ideas were in an inchoate form. While we are grateful for the quirk of history that allowed Wojciech Bobowski (Albertus Bobovius) to acquire the identity of Ali Ufkî Bey and to utilize his Western musical training to document the music of Ottoman Turkey, it is important to recognize the unique and transitional nature of the musical culture in which he participated. By the second half of the 17th century musical developments in Istanbul were moving along two interrelated tracks: on the one hand the more sophisticated vocal repertoire originating in later 16th and early 17th century Iran was being integrated into the music of Istanbul, and on the other, new compositional principles were being developed. Together these set the stage for the musical “renaissance” or “first classical age” of the turn of the 18th century. The next era in the more mature development of “the art of musick” in Turkey would be documented by Demetrius Cantemir, the Mevlevi Osman Dede (d.1730), and several Constantinopolitan Greek musicians and cantors such as Panagiotis Khalatzoglou (d. 1748), Kyrillos Marmarinos (d. 1756) and Petros Peloponnesios (d. 1778). Among the rich new repertoire that their generation of musicians would create and transmit, there would also be the beloved compositions attributed to “Marâghî,” which formed a real stylistic link with the beginning of the living musical tradition within the Iranian artistic repertoire of the first half of the 17th century, but which were conceptualized as a link with their still earlier, medieval musical forebears.