

Özgün Makale

Challenges and New Insights in the Critical Edition of the Persianate Repertoire in Ottoman Music¹

Osmanlı Müziğinde Farsça Repertuvarın Eleştirel Basımında Karşılaşılan Zorluklar ve Yeni Anlayışlar

Cüneyt-Ersin MIHÇI*

Abstract

Many scribes of historical Ottoman song text collections attributed pieces related to the Persianate repertoire to renowned late medieval composers. Researchers working more closely on the early song text collections pointed to the considerable change undergone by Ottoman music repertoire at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Apparently, a shift from a popular to a more courtly style occurred, while the Persianate repertoire regained significance and was perceived as old and authoritative. How this “revived” and established repertoire was transmitted in nineteenth-century music collections is still a research topic which is pending and important. This paper looks at three vocal pieces of the *kâr* genre that derived from the Ottoman Persianate repertoire and were handed down in Hampartsum music collections. Based on Cantemir’s descriptions of the *kâr*, this paper will highlight divergences in the transmission practices relating to the Persianate repertoire and suggest alternative readings based on historical materials, both musical and textual.

Keywords: Ottoman Music, Song Text Collections, Persian Lyrics, Kâr, Vocal Music.

Öz

Birçok tarihi Osmanlı güfte mecmua yazarları Fars repertuvarlarıyla ilgili parçalarını Orta çağ’ın ünlü bestecilerine dayandırmışlardır. Erken dönem güfte mecmuaları üzerine çalışan araştırmacılar, 17. Yüzyıl başlarında Osmanlı müzik repertuvarında meydana gelen dikkate değer değişime işaret etmişlerdir. Görünüşe göre avamde daha urefâ bir üsluba geçiş olurken, Fars repertuvarı yeniden önem kazanmış ve eski ve yetkin olarak algılanmıştır. Bu yeniden canlandırılmış ve yerleşmiş repertuvarın on dokuzuncu yüzyıl nota mecmualarında nasıl aktarıldığı hâlâ tam olarak bilinmeyen önemli bir araştırma konusudur. Osmanlı Farsça repertuvarından türetilen Hampartsum müzik koleksiyonlarında aktarılan *kâr* türünden üç sözlü eserin incelendiği bu

¹ Makale başvuru tarihi: 16.03.2023. Makale kabul tarihi: 15.05.2023.

* Research Associate, Corpus Musicae Ottomanicae (CMO) Project, Münster University, mihcic@uni-muenster.de; ORCID: 0009-0006-3712-6485.

makalede, Cantemir'in *kâr* tanımlarına dayanarak, Farsça repertuarın intikal geleneklerindeki farklılıklara işaret edilecek ve tarihi müzik ve metin kaynaklarına dayalı alternatif okumalar önerilecektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Osmanlı Mûsikîsi, Güfte Mecmua, Farsça Güfte, Kâr, Sözlü Eserler.

Introduction

Persianate songs in the Ottoman music corpus belong to the most prestigious repertoire and enjoy great popularity, even today. Already in the nineteenth century, and possibly even before, the pieces attributed to early composers, such as the “Acemler” (i.e. The Persians) or “Hoca” (i.e. Abdülkâdir Merâgî) were seen as “classics” of an old repertoire that gave testimony of the prestigious masters.² Today, it is known that none of these attributions to the Persian composers is accurate,³ and that this *pseudographia*⁴ – a venerating attribution of a musical piece to an ancient composer or musician – emerged especially during the seventeenth century. Some studies have dedicated scholarly attention in a more extensive fashion to the Persianate repertoire in the Ottoman context.⁵ These pioneer studies partly based their analysis on sixteenth- to eighteenth-century song text collections and analyzed the transmission of the Ottoman vocal repertoire. One of the most important conclusions was the apparent break in the transmission of the repertoire that occurred between the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries for unknown reasons (Behar, 2020, p. 128; Feldman, 2015, pp. 92–93; Wright, 1992, p. 285).

As is generally known, Ottoman music was transmitted mostly orally in individual master-student relationships (*meşk*) over a long time period.⁶ There are, however, numerous private song text collections (*güfte mecmuası*) that reflect the repertoire of the period in which they came into being. Therefore, early Ottoman song text collections can be considered indispensable, because they give essential information about musical form, repertoire, style and language. Unlike song text collections, other sources that handed down the songs with music notation are relatively recent, if the few efforts of individuals are left aside.⁷ It was only in the nineteenth century that, besides staff notation, other reformed notation systems were used to write down instrumental and vocal songs in form of music collections (*nota mecmuası*). The nineteenth-century music collections in Hampartsum, Chrysanthine, and staff notation – the latter two both written and printed – produced a considerable corpus of Ottoman music where the older and more recent vocal and instrumental repertoire was written down.⁸ The Persianate repertoire can also be

² Primary sources both music and song text collections refer to Abdülkâdir Merâgî (d. 1435), often with the reverent title “Hoca” or “Hace”. Cantemir, for example, referred to Merâgî in his historical work *The History of the Growth and Decay of the Othman Empire (1714–1716)* as “Hoje Musicar”, and “Orpheus of the Persians” (Cantemir, 1734, vol. 1, p. 151). In his *Essai sur la musique orientale* (1751), Charles Fonton paid homage to Merâgî, declaring him “père et le restaurateur de la musique orientale” [father and renovator of Oriental music] (Fonton & Neubauer, 1999, p. 36). In this way, Fonton elevated Merâgî and his student Gulam to the level of “great masters” (Feldman, 1996, p. 416).

From the late nineteenth century onwards, Merâgî's legacy was fundamental to the construction of national myths to highlight cultural continuity of the Turkish musical heritage (Feldman, 2015, p. 129).

³ In the twentieth century, some Turkish researchers such as Suphi Ezgi (1889–1947) had already pointed out that none of Merâgî's music had survived and that the attributions that could be found in the music sources were incorrect (Behar, 2020, pp. 12–13). Also, more recent studies have shown that none of the pieces that had been attributed to Merâgî in sixteenth-century song text collections survived in the later ones, such as the seventeenth-century “Hafız Post Mecmuası” (Behar, 2020, p. 128; Wright, 1992, p. 227). For a discussion of the problems in the transmission of this repertoire, see Behar, 2020, pp. 118–120; Wright, 1992, p. 286.

⁴ Regarding the phenomenon of pseudographia in the Ottoman music repertoire, see (Feldman, 2015, pp. 130–134).

⁵ See for example (Wright, 1992; Feldman, 1996, 2015; Behar, 2020).

⁶ Regarding the *meşk* see also (Behar, 1998).

⁷ There were earlier collections with music notation such as those by 'Ali Ufki, Nâyî Ali Mustafa Kevserî and Demetrios Cantemir. Although all of these three figures are vital for musicological research, their impact on musical literacy in a broader context was more limited. For an introductory reading, see (Popescu-Judet, 1996).

⁸ On Chrysanthine notation see Introduction in (Romanou, 2010) and on Hampartsum notation, see (Jäger, 1996; Kerovpyan, 2010; Olley, 2017).

found partly in the nineteenth-century music collections. It seems, however, that considerable inaccuracies occurred in the chain of transmission during the period from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century, especially in the Persianate repertoire, as will be shown in this study.

The aim of this study is to approach questions related to the transmission of the Persianate repertoire in the nineteenth century. I argue that the Persianate repertoire, although appreciated by Ottoman musicians, was gradually lost or gave way to inconsistent transmissions of this important repertoire. This “alienation” of Ottoman musicians from the Persianate pieces can be observed on many levels: firstly, it is likely that the performers mastered the pieces by heart but did not actually understand the content of the songs; secondly, it seems as if the Ottoman singers likewise became alienated from the musical forms in which the songs were composed. One particularity of the Persianate vocal pieces is that many of them were composed in the musical forms *kâr* or *nakiş*, out of which some were probably transmitted inconsistently or erroneously. Since this problem in the transmission of the Persianate repertoire has drawn only marginal scholarly attention, the aim of this paper is to suggest – besides pointing to these inaccuracies – ways in which such inconsistencies can be detected and studied. The musical sources that will be examined in this study to approach the research question are based on the codex TR-Iüne 204-2, a manuscript in Hampartsum notation that was edited in the research project *Corpus Musicae Ottomanicae* (CMO).⁹ The case studies that will be dealt with further below also aim to find ways to deal with these kinds of inconsistencies in music transmission while preparing scholarly editions of Ottoman music sources. The theoretical ground for the analysis of the case studies is the descriptions of the vocal music genres by Demetrius Cantemir (1673–1723) in his work *Kitābu ‘ilmi’l-mūsikī ‘alā vechi’l-ḥurūfāt*, which was edited by Tura (2001). The musical analysis in this paper, which will raise questions regarding musical form and genre, will single out three vocal pieces from the *kâr* genre to exemplify the problem and support the paper’s thesis. This research will further use a selection of relevant song text collections that proved beneficial while the text editions of the Persianate repertoire written down in codex TR-Iüne 204-2 were being prepared.

Transmission of the *kâr* Genre: Three Case Studies

The *kâr* as a vocal music genre in the Ottoman music repertoire is one of the more complex ones, and difficult to grasp. It is probably for this reason that, in the latter nineteenth century, the definition of the *kârs* was rather descriptive and held in more general terms in Ottoman-Turkish music theories.¹⁰ In more recent works of the twentieth century, the *kâr* is considered an extensive secular vocal genre which is notable for its artistic character.¹¹ It combines and merges different musical sections together and has extensive *terennüm* passages that may introduce the piece or a hemistich, follow it or serve as “connector” between the various musical sections. Another particularity of the earlier *kârs* is the language, which is Persian. The complex musical structure, as well as the distiches in Persian, which at times are split by non-sense *terennüm* syllables, make it very challenging to formulate a general *kâr*-definition that could be applied to all *kârs* as a music genre. Yet, despite its complex musical structure, Cantemir accepted the challenge and gave remarkable definitions of the *kâr*. His descriptions of the *kâr* give a relatively clear idea of

⁹ The codex TR-Iüne 204-2 is kept at the Nadir Eserler Kütüphanesi of the Istanbul University. The entire volume has been completely edited in the frame of the *Corpus Musicae Ottomanicae* (CMO) by the author of the current study. Additionally, a text edition by Neslihan Demirkol and Malek Sharif was published and mainly concentrates on the scholarly edition of the song texts of the codex. The song texts that were used in this study were based on the CMO Text Edition. A preprint publication of the edition of codex TR-Iüne 204-2 is available (open access) and has the CMO reference CMO1-1/02.

¹⁰ See, for example, the very concise definition of the *kâr* in (Uz,1310 h./1892, p. 44) and (Konuk,1317 h./1899, p. 22).

¹¹ For a more recent description of the *kâr* see (Ezgi, [1935–1940], vol. 3, pp. 143–155; Özkan, 2011, pp. 103–104 (based on Ezgi); Yavaşca, 2002, pp. 403–404; Özalp, 1992, pp. 11–13).

this genre's characteristics, which were established in eighteenth-century Istanbul (Behar 2020, p. 176). Whereas Ezgi's description of the *kâr* seemed to have drawn on Cantemir's work, other scholars, such as Tura, questioned the validity of Cantemir's *kâr* definition.¹² It is certainly true that Cantemir's descriptions cannot be fully applied to all *kârs* of the Ottoman music repertoire, yet they help to classify the *kârs* into specific types and can be taken as a point of departure in the musical analysis. Cantemir's *kâr*-typology was also used in the analysis of the case studies in this paper in order to highlight divergences between the descriptions and the music sources. Thanks to these divergences, it was possible to formulate new questions, and conduct further research that eventually led to alternative readings and new conclusions.

Before turning to the case studies, let me briefly revisit Cantemir's descriptions of the *kâr*. It should be noted that, from the late sixteenth to the middle of the seventeenth centuries, Ottoman music had undergone profound changes in the repertoire. It is the period when, apparently, a new "Ottoman style" (*Tarz-ı Osmânî*) and a musical "revival" had occurred.¹³ This was also the phase when Persian *kârs* attributed to famous musicians such as Merâgî led to the formation of a repertoire of "classics". Ottoman musicians respected these composers for being old, authoritative and prestigious.¹⁴ In other words, the case studies analyzed in this paper derive from a tradition that was established only during the seventeenth century or even later. The old *kâr*, which had temporarily lost significance in the Ottoman music repertoire, celebrated a "comeback" in the seventeenth century. The parallels in Cantemir's descriptions of the *kâr* and the case studies that will be analyzed further below are remarkable. At first sight, the pieces in Hampartsum notation seemed to have followed the musical structure described by Cantemir. However, when the music sources are studied in more detail, striking divergences, which probably resulted from different transmission lines of the Persianate repertoire, become more evident. Cantemir distinguished in his work three types of *kârs* which I have labelled Type I, Type II and Type III.¹⁵ Type I refers to the *kâr* with four hemistiches, Type II to that with six hemistiches without *zeyl*, and Type III to that with six hemistiches with *zeyl*. It is important to note the two main distinctions in the *kâr* genre: one type with four and two types with six hemistiches, whereas the *zeyl* presumably introduces, structure-wise, a new section with additional lyrics and new musical material. All of the case studies that will be dealt with in this paper are of Type I or Type II and were attributed to Abdülkâdir Merâgî (d. 1435). The first case study (TR-İüne 204-2, pp. 116–117, ed. in CMO1-I/02/089) is the famous "Kâr-1 muhteşem" in makâm *Râst* and belongs to *kâr* Type I. The other two *kârs* seem to belong to *kâr* Type II: one is the "Kâr-1 bâğ-1 behişt" in makâm *Irâk* and usûl *hafîf* (TR-İüne 204-2, pp. 71–72, ed. in CMO1-I/02.053), and the other is the "Kâr-1 Şevk-nâme" in makâm *Râst* and usûl *hafîf* (TR-İüne 204-2, pp. 114–115, ed. in CMO1-I/02.88). The case studies aim to elaborate further on how Cantemir's descriptions can be applied to the three *kârs* mentioned above.¹⁶

¹² "Kantemiroğlu'nun yapmaya çalıştığı '*kâr*' tanımları ilgi çekicidir; fakat, gerek önceleri, gerek daha sonraları, epeyi serbest şekilde işlenmiş olan bu tür için, kesin yapılar ortaya koyabilmek pek mümkün değildir" (Cantemir & Tura, 2001, p. 234n234).

¹³ The new "Ottoman style", as can be observed from song text collections, gradually established not only a new repertoire but also a new way to organize the collections. Behar argues that this process of establishing an "Ottoman style" went hand in hand with a "democratization" of the musical space, which was no longer limited to the Ottoman court or private gatherings (*meclis*), but which also shifted to the public sphere. In this public environment, people of different social classes could meet and interact (2020, pp. 207, 232–235).

¹⁴ Merâgî, as a theorist and composer, played an important role during the trend of seventeenth-century musical revival (Feldman, 2015, p. 132; Wright, 1992, p. 227).

¹⁵ "Ta'rif-i Kâr: Kâr üç nev' olur: Bir dürlüsi, iki beyt, / dört mışrâ'dan; biri üç beyt, altı mışrâ'dan ve biri, Zeyl'siz olub yalnız Miyân-Hâne şâhibi olur" (Cantemir & Tura, 2001, vol. 1, pp. 175–177).

¹⁶ It should be noted that this study has greatly benefitted from the scholarly edition and support of Neslihan Demirkol, and from the edition she meticulously prepared and offered to scholarship. The text edition of the codex TR-İüne 204-2 can be accessed online (open access) and was used in this study as a main reference. Some additional transcriptions from other vital manuscripts were contributed by Mohsen Mahdavi, to whom I would like to express my heartfelt thanks.

Kâr-ı Muhteşem

The first case study of this paper is the “Kâr-ı muhteşem”, which still enjoys great popularity among the connoisseurs of Ottoman music even today. I argue that this piece belongs to Cantemir’s *kâr* Type I, which, however, becomes evident only when this *kâr* is looked at more closely. The musical analysis of this piece was based on the version in Hampartsum notation in the codex TR-Iüne 204-2, pp. 116–117.¹⁷ This piece in usûl *devr-i revân*,¹⁸ belongs to the well-known *kârs* of the Ottoman-Persianate music repertoire. The concordances that can be found in many available music sources correspond – to a larger extent – to the versions known today. In other words, by the late nineteenth century, the version of this *kâr* that was handed down in the codex TR-Iüne 204-2 had probably reached a certain level of “standardization” and can be found reproduced in the same way in many other nineteenth- and twentieth-century sources.¹⁹ The examination of the *kâr* in regard to form and genre raises, however, some important questions regarding the number of hemistiches. As mentioned further above, Cantemir distinguished between *kârs* with four and six hemistiches. However, looking at the hemistiches in the “Kâr-ı muhteşem” it is possible to point out only three hemistiches:

1. Kavl-i muhteşem ki küned kavm-i be-yağın
2. Nigâh me-bâd ü ber-âyed zi-kemin
3. Bî-haber-est reh in ü ânest ü ne in

The question that has to be raised at this point is evident: was Cantemir’s description of the *kâr* inaccurate or incomplete? Or was this piece transmitted inaccurately and possibly lacking one or more hemistiches? In order to approach these questions, the few historical music sources at hand were checked for concordances. The concordances that were found and compared did not show any great differences from the generally-known versions that seemed to have been circulating when the codex TR-Iüne 204-2 was compiled. A plausible answer could be found, however, when the research also included a great number of song text anthologies with the aim of finding further text concordances with the “Kâr-ı muhteşem”. Among the consulted text concordance sources, codex TR-Iüne T.Y. 3608 was eventually found to contain one additional hemistich,²⁰ which the scribe indicated previous to the third hemistich (or *miyân*), and labelled “bend-i sâni”. The finding of the new hemistich actually leads to a new sequence of the *kâr*’s hemistiches that correspond to Cantemir’s *kâr* Type I:

1. Kavl-i muhteşem ki küned kavm-i be-yağın
2. Kavl-i diğerân üftâde ân der-reh-i dîn
3. Nigâh me-bâd ü ber-âyed zi-kemin
4. Bî-haber-est reh in ü ânest ü ne in

Furthermore, the scribe of TR-Iüne T.Y. 3608 provided, next to the hemistich, information which Demirkol identified as the performance instruction “vü terennümâ[t] hem-çü evvel”. This brief information is essential for understanding the correct performance order of the lyrics, including the *terennüms*, within the musical sections (or *hânes*).²¹ Hence, from the scribe’s performance instructions, it is possible to conclude that the hemistich 2 had to be followed by the previous *terennüm*, which would subsequently connect to the *miyânhâne*. Although the scribe

¹⁷ For the scholarly text and music edition of this piece with critical commentaries, see (CMO1-1/02/089).

¹⁸ The scribe of TR-Iüne 204-2 gave *devr-i Hindî* as usûl. The great majority of the song text and music concordances indicated *devr-i revân*, which is probably the more accurate usûl.

¹⁹ For a list of consulted music and song text sources, see critical commentary to the music and text editions (CMO1-1/02.089).

²⁰ This concordance piece can be accessed online (TR-Iüne T.Y. 3608, fol. 5).

²¹ (Owen Wright, 1992, pp. 229–233) has elaborated in more detail on the *terennüm* sections of this piece based on five sources that partly dated from different time periods.

of TR-Iüne 204-2 was surely not aware of this missing hemistich, the scholarly edition of this piece followed the reading suggested in TR-Iüne T.Y. 3608. Because the number of syllables was equal in both hemistiches 1 and 2, the music editor could distribute hemistich 2 easily, following the pattern of hemistich 1. In this way, the editors of this codex hoped to have provided a new and alternative reading of this *kâr* based on historical sources and evidence, although the two collections, TR-Iüne T.Y. 3608 and TR-Iüne 204-2, were probably compiled during different time periods. It is also possible to find hemistich 2 in more song text collections such as TR-Itks R. 1723 and TR-Itks R. 1724.²² Interestingly, the same hemistich was handed down in multiple versions which were in some sections very different from each other. TR-Itks R. 1723, for example, changed the word order considerably and split the hemistich with a long *terennüm* section: “*hâne-i sâni* fitâde ender râhi in dîn inest [*terennüm*] kev̄m-i dîgar-î”. In TR-Itks R. 1724 the same hemistich was handed down as “*hâne-i sâni* kev̄l-î dîgar-î fitâd ender-î dîn u” which is more reminiscent of the version that could be found in TR-Iüne T.Y. 3608.²³

With the new hemistich that could be found in TR-Iüne T.Y. 3608, the “Kar-ı muhteşem” fits Cantemir’s description of *kâr* Type I. This type is composed of four hemistiches and has a *miyân-hâne* but no *zeyl* (Table 1).²⁴

Section	Text	Rhyme	Melody
H1	terennüm 1		
	hemistich 1	a	A
	terennüm 2		
	terennüm 1		
	hemistich 2	a	A
	terennüm 2		
H2 (miyân-hâne)	hemistich 3	b	B
	terennüm 3		
	hemistich 4	a	A
	terennüm 1		

Table 1: Schematic presentation according to Cantemir’s description of *kâr* Type I.

According to Cantemir’s description of *kâr* Type I, the first two hemistiches, including the *terennüms*, form the first *hâne*, whereas the last two hemistiches including *terennüms* compose the second *hâne* or *miyân-hâne*. Table 1 includes one column that indicates “Melody” although Cantemir himself did not explicitly mention the word. The word that Cantemir actually used was

²² I would like to extend my thanks to Judith Haug for drawing my attention to these two concordances.

²³ I would like to extend my thanks to Mohsen Mahdavi, who provided me with the transcriptions of the lyrics from the sources TR-Itks R. 1723 and TR-Itks R. 1724.

²⁴ “Nazar kıl ki, Terennümât’dan şürû’ idüb / ibtidâ olan mîşra’ ile ve gene Terennümât ile ve mîşrâ’-i sâni ile Hâne-i / evvel olur. Mîşrâ’-i sâlis ile mîşrâ’-i râbi’ ve gene Terennümât ile / Miyân-Hâne olur; lâkin mîşra’-i râbi’, mîşra’-i evvel ile bir terkibdedir. / Nazar kıl ki, bu Kâr, dört mîşrâ’dan, Miyân-Hâneli ve Zeyl’sizdir” (Cantemir & Tura, 2001, vol. 1, p. 175). It should be noted that there seems to be a minor yet important discrepancy in the description of the *kâr* Type I by Cantemir. Cantemir’s description suggests that each of the *hânes* should contain two hemistiches plus the *terennüms*. However, the labels that he used in his case study *Râst Kâr-ı çâr mîşra’-ı İhvâce, Hafif*, deviated from the model which he had described only few lines before. In the case study, the second hemistich is shown as “*hâne-i sâni*” (second *hâne*). Since the *kâr* Type I should have two *hânes* – the second *hâne* containing the third and fourth hemistiches – it is likely that for the second hemistich he probably meant “*mîşra-i sâni*” (second hemistich) rather than “*hâne-i sâni*”. This reading is also supported by the fact that Cantemir or another hand squeezed the confusing information “*hâne-i sâni*” into the text at a later stage (cf. Cantemir & Tura, 2001, vol. 1, p. 174).

terkîb, which might have had different meanings depending on the context in which it was used. In the descriptions of the vocal music genres *beste*, *nakış* and *kâr*, Cantemir seems to refer to a melodic section within the *hâne*. Thus, when he wrote “lâkin mışra‘-1 râbî‘, mışra‘-1 evvel ile bir terkibdedir” (Cantemir & Tura, 2001, vol. 1, p. 175),²⁵ he likely meant that the fourth hemistich is performed to the same melodic or musical section as the first hemistich.²⁶ Cantemir also used the term *terkîb* in the description for the *beste* “... Üçüncü mışra‘ı Miyân-İhâne olur. Terkibi dağı muğâyıyedir. Dördüncü mışra‘ İhâne-i ahr, ve Zemîn ile bir terkibde olur” (Cantemir & Tura, 2001, vol. 1, p. 173).²⁷ In this brief statement, Cantemir shows that the *terkib* of the *miyânhâne* alters, which is true because the *miyânhâne* usually has modulations. The fourth hemistich, which composes the last *hâne* of the piece, is, again, in the melody of the first, or the *zemîn*. Hence, it is possible to deduce from Cantemir’s description of the *terkib* the melodic relationship within the hemistiches of a vocal piece.

This interpretation of the word *terkîb* makes it possible to draw further conclusions about the similarities between the model that Cantemir described, and the “Kâr-ı muhteşem”. According to the model in Table 1, hemistiches 1 and 4 should be performed to the same musical section or melody. In the case of the “Kâr-ı muhteşem”, however, the melodies do not seem to fully coincide with Cantemir’s model.

Section	Text	Rhyme	Melody
H1	terennüm 1		
	hemistich 1	a	A
	terennüm 2		
	hemistich 2	a	A
	terennüm 2		
H2 (miyânhâne)	hemistich 3	a	B
	terennüm 3		
	hemistich 4	a	A'
	terennüm 2		

Table 2: Supposed structure of the “Kâr-ı muhteşem” in TR-İine 204-2, pp. 116–117.

Although the melody of hemistich 4 is not an exact repetition of that of hemistich 1 (Table 2), in the first *hâne*, a loose relationship can still be observed: firstly, the melody to which hemistich 4 is performed also develops within the octave of D1–D2; and secondly, hemistich 4 is performed in the same mode as hemistich 1. After the modulation in the *miyânhâne* (hemistich 3), the melody returns to makâm *Râst* with hemistich 4, and hence easily connects to the *terennüm* section (*lâzime*) of the first *hâne*. A much closer melodic correspondence can be seen if the initial words of hemistich 1, “Kavli muhteşem”, are left out. The melodic line of the words “ki küned kavmi beyakın” and of hemistich 4, “Bî hâberest rehi in ânest tü ve in”, are remarkably similar to each other and end on the same pitch *segâh* (Example 1).

²⁵ “However, the fourth hemistich and the first hemistich are in the same *terkîb*” (My translation).

²⁶ Feldman also made similar observations on Cantemir’s use of the word *terkîb* (1996, pp. 321–322). In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the term *terkîb* referred to melodic lines that were composed of small units. Hence the word *terkîb* seems to have referred to a melodic section within the composition.

²⁷ “The Third line is the *miyânhâne*. Its *terkîb* changing. The fourth hemistich is the last *hâne*, and stands in the same *terkîb* as the *Zemîn*” (My translation).



Example 1: Juxtaposition of the two musical sections in the “Kâr-ı muhteşem”: above, the section with hemistich 1, and below, the section with hemistich 4.

Based on this similarity, it is, indeed, possible to consider hemistich 4 a derivation of the zemîn, although it does not exactly repeat the same melody.

Kâr-ı bâğ-ı behişt

Similar to the “Kâr-ı muhteşem”, which, with the additional hemistich, offers a new reading of the piece, the next case study also allows alternative readings. The piece in question is the “Kâr-ı bâğ-ı behişt” in makâm *Irâk* and usûl *hafîf*.²⁸ In the consulted music sources, such as the codices TR-Iüne 204-2 and TR-Iboa TRT.MD.d 569 (pp. 79–80), this piece has four hemistiches similar to many concordances from song text collections,²⁹ including the printed song text anthology *Hânende* (1899). The scribe of TR-Iüne 204-2 gave the lyrics as follows:

1. Nemikeşed ser-i müy-i dilem be-bâğ-ı behişt
2. Zi-çâk-ı pîrehenî kerde-em sürâğ-ı behişt
3. Müdam-âyed [e]z-büy-ı tu cân eğer ârend
4. Nesim-i ‘anber-i zülfi tu der-dimâğ-ı bihişt

The musical structure, as well as the four hemistiches of the “Kâr-ı bâğ-ı behişt”, that appear in most of the historical music and song text anthologies fit Cantemir’s *kâr* Type I. Analogous to Cantemir’s reading, the “Kâr-ı bâğ-ı behişt” as it appears in codex TR-Iüne 204-2 would correspond to the structure presented below (Table 3).

²⁸ The following analysis is based on the version of this piece in Hampartsum notation which is included in the codex TR-Iüne 204-2, pp. 71–72. For a preprint edition of this *kâr*, see (CMO1-I/02.053).

²⁹ This piece appears in the song text collections TR-Iak MC_Yz_K.000431, D-Bsbha Ms. or. quart. 1578, TR-Iüne T.Y. 3466, TR-Iüne T.Y. 3866 and in the printed song text anthology *Hânende* (1899). TR-Iüne T.Y. 3866 attributed this piece to “Amel-i ‘Ayntâbi Mehmed Ağa”. For further information retrieved from the text edition consult the study prepared by Demirkol (CMO1-I/02.053).

Section	Text	Rhyme	Melody
H1	terennüm 1		
	hemistich 1	a	A
	hemistich 2	a	B
	terennüm 2		
	hemistich 2	a	B
H2 (miyânhâne)	hemistich 3	b	C
	terennüm 3		
	hemistich 4	a	B
	terennüm 2		
	hemistich 4	a	B

Table 3: Structure of the “Kâr-ı bâğ-ı behişt” according to TR-İüne 204-2, pp. 71–72.

Although the sequence seems to deviate from that in Cantemir’s description (Table 1), it is possible to recognize the structural disposition of the four hemistiches that form two *hânes*. Relationships can be observed in hemistiches 2 and 4 on a musical level, as well as on a poetical level, in regard to the rhyme scheme in hemistiches 1, 2 and 4. Based on this information, it seems plausible to consider this piece a *kâr* Type I. However, similar to the “Kâr-ı muhteşem”, also in this case did song text collections indicate one more distich. This additional distich impacts the *kâr*’s structure and changes it from a *kâr* with two *hânes* to a *kâr* with three *hânes*. Suphi Ezgi had also become aware of this fact and gave a *bend-i sânî* in his work *Nazarî ve Amelî Türk Musikisi* (vol. 3, p. 146).³⁰ Unfortunately, Ezgi did not distribute the syllables of the lyrics in the text underlay, although he seemed to have a clear idea about the piece’s performance order. It is likely that the number of syllables which he presented in the text underlay of *hâne* 1, and those that resulted from *hâne* 2, would not match. Only a few historical concordances from song text anthologies indicated a *bend-i sânî*, such as TR-Iak MC_Yz_K.000431, D-Bsbha Ms. Or. Quart. 1578 and TR-İüne T.Y. 3466. The first two labelled the *hânes* or hemistiches clearly, and provided additional performance instructions such as “terennüm kelevvel” (TR-İüne T.Y. 3466), or simply the *terennüm* syllables to be performed between the *bend-i sânî* and the *miyânhâne* (D-Bsbha Ms. Or. Quart. 1578; TR-Iak MC_Yz_K.000431). The *terennüm* section of the *bend-i sânî* ends, similar to those of the other *hânes* of this piece, with the repetition of the distich’s second hemistich, which brings the respective *hâne* to a conclusion. The additional distich that, together with the *terennüms*, composes the second *hâne* also impacts the numbering of the hemistiches and of the *hânes*.

(Hâne-i evvel)

1. Nemikeşed ser-i müy-ı dilem be-bâğ-ı behişt
2. Zi-çâk-ı pîrehenî kerd-em sürâğ-ı behişt

(Hâne-i sânî)³¹

3. Nisân-i hâne-i yâr est reķib-î rûsieh-î
 4. Zi düzeķî giriftest kes-î çirâğ-ı behişt
- (Miyânhâne)

³⁰ Ezgi gave the song text of the *Kâr-ı Bâğ-ı behişt* with the “ikinci hâne” following the music notation “Nişanhaneî yar ez rakibi mey peres zi düzah; meğer kat ez kesî çerâğî behişt”.

³¹ This distich indicated as “bend-i sânî” was adopted from TR-İüne T.Y. 3466 and was transcribed by Mohsen Mahdavi for this paper.

5. Müdâm-âyed [e]z-büy-ı tu cân eğer ârend
6. Nesîm-i ‘anber-i zülf-i tu der-dimâğ-ı behişt

Hence, whereas hemistiches 1 and 2 constitute the first *hâne*, the *bend-i sânî* with the hemistiches 3 and 4 form the second *hâne* and are performed to the same music as *hâne* 1. The third *hâne* (or *miyânhâne*) is composed of hemistiches 5 and 6. Thus, the additional second distich, which is provided in the textual concordances, shows that this *kâr* actually does not belong to Cantemir’s *kâr* Type I as previously assumed, but fits the characteristics of Type II, which consists of six hemistiches, including *miyânhâne* but no *zeyl*.³² The example that Cantemir provided in his treatise for *kâr* type II (Table 4) actually coincides in terms of structure very much with that of the “Kâr-ı bağ-ı behişt”.³³

Section	Text	Rhyme
H1	terennüm 1	
	hemistich 1	a
	hemistich 2	a
	terennüm 2a terennüm 2b ³⁴	
H2 (bend-i sânî)	terennüm 1	
	hemistich 3	b
	hemistich 4	a
	terennüm 2a terennüm 2b	
H3 Miyânhâne	terennüm 3	
	hemistich 5	b
	hemistich 6	a
	terennüm 4 terennüm 2b	

Table 4: Schematic presentation of Cantemir’s description of *kâr* Type II.

The initial *terennüm* section is followed by the first two hemistiches, which are performed successively. The first *hâne* ends with a second *terennüm* section. *Hâne* 2 is introduced by the same *terennüm* as *hâne* 1 and is followed by the next two hemistiches of the *bend-i sânî*, which are probably sung to the same *terennüms* as *hâne* 1.³⁵ The second *terennüm* section follows, and eventually connects to the *miyânhâne*. The *terennüm* that follows the last hemistich 6 of the third *hâne* draws on *terennüm* 2b and brings the *kâr* to a conclusion. A very similar structure would be observed in the “Kâr-ı bağ-ı behişt”, if the *bend-i sânî* was implemented (Table 5).

³² “İkinci nev’i altı mışra’dan, Zeyl’siz olur”. Cantemir described this *kâr* Type II as follows: “Nazar kıl ki mışra’ı ve terennümât ile Hâne-i evvel olur. İki / mışra’sı dağı ve Hâne-i evvel’in terennümü ile Hâne-i sânî olur. / İki mışra’sı dağı kendü terennümât(ı) ile ve terennümât-ı sânî ile Miyân-hâne olur” (Cantemir & Tura, 2001, vol. 1, p. 179).

³³ Cantemir gave a *kâr* in makâm *Uşşâk*, usûl *hafif* with hemistich 1 “Şahn-ı büstân zevk-bağş (u) sohbet-i yârân hõşest” attributed to Koca Osmân.

³⁴ *Terennüm* 2 is relatively long compared to the other *terennüm* sections of this piece. It is likely that *terennüm* 2 is composed of two subsections. The first “Dilâ dilâ dir dir[...].Ra’nâyı men”, and the second “âhâ hey âhâ hey[...].işve-bâz-ı men”. In order to differentiate between these two sections, I have labelled the latter one “*terennüm* 2b”. It seemingly has the function of the *lâzime* and is supposed to be repeated at the end of the *miyânhâne*, as evident in the instruction “tâ âhırın” [until the end] (Cantemir & Tura, 2001, vol. 1, p. 179).

³⁵ See Cantemir’s instruction “Hâne-i sânî: Terennümât-ı evvel” (Cantemir & Tura, 2001, vol. 1, p. 175).

Section	Text	Rhyme	Melody
H1	terennüm 1		
	hemistich 1	a	A
	hemistich 2	a	B
	terennüm 2		
	hemistich 2	a	B
H2 (bend-i sânî)	terennüm 1		
	hemistich 3	b	A
	hemistich 4	a	B
	terennüm 2		
	hemistich 2	a	B
H2 (miyânhâne)	hemistich 5	c	C
	terennüm 3		
	hemistich 6	a	B
	terennüm 2		
	hemistich 4	a	B

Table 5: Supposed structure of the “Kâr-ı bâğ-ı behişt” including the *bend-i sânî* based on TR-lüne 204-2, pp. 71–72.

Kâr-ı Şevk-nâme

To conclude this study and to offer one more example that shows the discrepancy between the transmission of the *kârs* in music and song text collections, the following case study will look at one more piece. The *kâr* has the programmatic title *Şevk-nâme* and is in makâm *Râst* and usûl *hafîf*. It was included in TR-lüne 204-2, pp. 114–115, which was also used in this study as the main music source.³⁶

Section	Text	Rhyme	Melody
H1	terennüm 1		
	hemistich 1	a	A
	hemistich 2	a	B
	terennüm 2		
	hemistich 2	a	B
H2 (miyânhâne)	terennüm 3		
	hemistich 3	b	C
	terennüm 4		
	hemistich 4	b	B
	terennüm 2		
H2 (miyânhâne)	hemistich 4	b	B
	terennüm 3		

Table 6 : Structure of the *kâr* “Şevk-nâme” in TR-lüne 204-2, pp. 114–115.

³⁶ For a preprint edition of this piece, see (CMO1-I/02.88).

The *kâr*'s structure (Table 6) seems, at first sight, to coincide again with Cantemir's *kâr* Type I (Table 1). Codex TR-Iüne 204-2 and other music sources generally provided the following four hemistiches:

1. Ez-şevk-i tu ân zülf-i cemâl-i tu nedidim
2. Ez-pâyi fütâdîm bigüyîd neresîdîm
3. Feryâd besî kerdem ü feryâd-resî nist
4. Güyâ ki der-in kûbbe-i firûze kesî nist

Similar to the previous case studies, the “Kâr-ı Şevk-nâme” also seemed to have been transmitted inaccurately in the nineteenth-century sources. An additional distich was found in two song anthologies and was indicated as “bend-i sâni” (D-Bsbha MS. Or. Quart. 1578) or “hâne-i sâni” (TR-İtks R. 1723). Among the twentieth-century music sources, Ezgi seemed to have been the only one who included the second distich as “zinci hâne” in the block lyrics.³⁷ The *bend-i sâni* is supposed to be performed to the same musical material as *hâne* 1. As in the previous case study, the additional distich changes the *kâr*'s typology from Type I to Type II: a *kâr* with six hemistiches, *miyânhâne* but no *zeyl*. The complete hemistiches of the “Kâr-ı Şevk-nâme” would be numbered as follows:

(Bend-i evvel)

1. Ez-şevk-i tu ân zülf-i cemâl-i tu nedidim
 2. Ez-pâyi fütâdîm bigüyîd neresîdîm
- (Bend-i sâni)³⁸
3. Nâm-i tu neburdîm ki az hîş nereftîm
 4. Yâd-i tu nekerdîm ki ez hîş remîdîm
- (Miyânhâne)
5. Feryâd besî kerdem ü feryâd-resî nist
 6. Güyâ ki der-in kûbbe-i firûze kesî nist

Although it is possible to find and reconstruct the missing distich, it is hard to actually apply the syllables of the lyrics to the music scores that are at hand. In many cases, the number of syllables do not correspond with those that were indicated by the scribe of the music score. Another problem derives from the different transmissions of the words, which often differ in the sources. Hence, more scholarly dedication is necessary to study the song texts systematically. This would help to develop a method that would facilitate finding or producing more accurate version of the hemistiches which would go together with the musical and formal disposition of the *kâr*. For the time being, it is only possible to consider additional hemistiches in the theoretical structure of the piece based on the characteristics that Cantemir described. How the “Kâr-ı Şevk-nâme” could have looked with the additional distich is presented in the following table (Table 7).

³⁷ The additional distich was indicated as “nâmi tü ne bürdîm ki ez huş bireftîm; yâdi tü kerdîm ki ez hun ne tabîbîm” (Ezgi, vol. 3, p. 148). Interestingly, Ezgi attributed this piece to Abdül Ali (d. 1575?) instead of Merâgî. The only primary source that attributed this piece to Abdül Ali was TR-Iüne T.Y. 5644, fol. 10a. The lyrics in this source show a high level of congruency with those in Ezgi's edition. It is therefore very likely that Ezgi's assumption were based on the song text collection TR-Iüne T.Y. 5644.

³⁸ This distich indicated as “hâne-i sâni” was adopted from TR-İtks R. 1723, fol. 4b. and was transcribed by Mohsen Mahdavi for this paper.

Section	Text	Rhyme	Melody
H1	terennüm 1		
	hemistich 1	a	A
	hemistich 2	a	B
	terennüm 2		
	hemistich 2	a	B
	terennüm 3		
H2 (bend-i sâni)	hemistich 3	a	A
	hemistich 4	a	B
	terennüm 2		
	hemistich 4	a	B
	terennüm 3		
H3 (miyânhâne)	hemistich 5	b	C
	hemistich 6	b	B
	terennüm 2		
	hemistich 6	b	B
	terennüm 3		

Table 7: Supposed structure of the “Kâr-ı Şevk-name” including the *bend-i sâni* based on TR-Iüne 204-2, pp. 114–115.

Another important topic that deserves more scholarly attention is this *kâr*'s title. The programmatic title *Şevk-nâme* [Book of Love] can be found, without any exception, in all of the late nineteenth- and twentieth-century sources that were consulted for this study. The earliest known source that mentions this piece with the programmatic title is probably TR-Iüne T.Y. 5644. If Wright's assumption about the manuscript date is correct (1992, p. 291), it is likely that this programmatic title emerged in the early eighteenth century. There are, however, other song text collections, probably from the same century, such as TR-Itks R. 1723 and D-Bsbha Ms. or. quart. 1578,³⁹ which did not use the programmatic title. The latter two sources gave, in addition to information such as music genre, composer and *usûl*, the term “*durâkı*”, which however, could not be further contextualized at the time of writing. More research is necessary in order to arrive at further conclusions.

Conclusion

As previous research has shown, the Persianate repertoire in Ottoman music derived from the emergence of a new “Ottoman style” that became established mainly in the eighteenth century. It seems, however, that in the nineteenth century, when music notation was used more extensively, musical form and the transmission of lyrics had been already in a period of decline. The Persianate vocal repertoire, which has survived until today in nineteenth-century Hampartsum

³⁹ The eighteenth-century being the supposed date for the song text collections TR-Itks R. 1723 and D-Bsbha Ms. or. quart. 1578 is based on Wright's assumption (1992, pp. 288–289).

music collections, is relatively small compared to the extensive repertoire that can be found in many of the song text collections that are still waiting to be studied. Did the repertoire gradually fall into oblivion because of a trend change in the transmission culture? The decline in the Persianate music repertoire is also evident in the inaccurate transmission of the songs, such as missing hemistiches or distiches. This was not only limited to the music collections but seemed also to be the case in song text anthologies. For nineteenth-century Ottoman musicians it was seemingly unproblematic to perform the above-mentioned *kârs* with four instead of six hemistiches. Even the “Kâr-1 muhteşem”, which had only three hemistiches and did not coincide with any of the *kâr* types that were described by Cantemir, did not seem to have drawn any particular attention.

Likewise, the theoretical descriptions of the *kâr* genre showed considerable changes in quality. Whereas Cantemir gave relatively clear descriptions of the *kâr* using specific technical terminology as well as case studies to exemplify his theory, the few *kâr* definitions from the nineteenth century, such as those by Uz and Konuk, remained, compared with those of Cantemir, quite rudimentary. Therefore, for this research, the study of Cantemir’s theories together with seventeenth- and eighteenth-century song text collections turned out to be very beneficial. Based on Cantemir’s *kâr* descriptions, it was possible to become aware of the fact that the “Kâr-1 muhteşem” seemingly was transmitted with three instead of four hemistiches. In order to prove the theory of the missing hemistich, numerous handwritten song text collections had to be examined until the hemistich was eventually found in relatively few manuscripts in slightly different versions.

It would be interesting to fathom ways in which these findings could be considered in today’s performance practice. The recordings that are available today relied on versions with lyrics that were incomplete. For historically informed performance, and for musicology, it would be beneficial to use these kinds of research findings and suggest new ways of reading and performing these pieces. This would motivate more researchers to conduct further studies of the Ottoman Persianate repertoire and similar cases, and propose further solutions for today’s performance practice.

Whereas this paper’s focus was on few pieces from the *kâr* genre, a similar paper could also be prepared for the *nakış*, which is another music genre that had emerged in the Persianate repertoire. Similar to the *kâr*, Cantemir also provided descriptions of the *nakış*. Whereas the scribes of the late nineteenth-century music manuscripts identify the *kâr* genre correctly, the *nakış* genre gives more room for misinterpretations, but the songs which belonged to it could be identified thanks to their musical structure.⁴⁰

The scholarly editions of Ottoman vocal music, especially those of the Persianate repertoire, have shown that this repertoire creates great challenges for scholarship that cannot be met by one academic discipline only. To approach this topic at a scholarly level, many skills are required. Besides having good knowledge of Ottoman music history and archival work, it is necessary to have expertise in Ottoman, Persian and Arabic languages and literature – and even more so when taking into consideration the numerous unstudied and important music sources that deserve more scholarly attention.

⁴⁰ For the treatment of the *nakış* genre in the edition of codex TR-Iüne 204-2 see Introduction to the Music Edition.

References

A. Manuscript Sources

Istanbul Atatürk Kitaplığı:

TR-Iak MC_Yz_K.000431. (n.d.). [Song text anthology]

Istanbul University – Library for Rare Works

TR-Iüne 204-2. (n.d.). [Mixed music collection in Hampartsum notation].

TR-Iüne T.Y. 3466. (n.d.). [Song text anthology].

TR-Iüne T.Y. 3608. (n.d.). [Song text anthology].

TR-Iüne T.Y. 3866. (n.d.). [Song text anthology].

TR-Iüne T.Y. 5644. (n.d.). [Song text anthology].

Museum of the Topkapı Palace - Library for Manuscripts

TR-Itks R. 1723 (Revan Köşkü Kitaplığı). (n.d.). [Song text anthology].

TR-Itks R. 1724 (Revan Köşkü Kitaplığı). (n.d.). [Song text anthology].

Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin Preußischer Kulturbesitz:

D-Bsbha Ms. or. quart. 1578. (n.d.). [Song text anthology].

T.C. Cumhurbaşkanlığı Devlet Arşivleri Başkanlığı

TR-Iboa TRT.MD.d.569. (n.d.). [Music collection in staff notation]

B. Secondary Literature

Behar, C. (1998). *Aşk olmayınca meşk olmaz: Geleneksel Osmanlı / Türk müziğinde öğretim ve intikal*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Behar, C. (2020). *Orada bir musiki var uzakta: XVI. yüzyıl İstanbulu'nda Osmanlı/Türk musiki geleneğinin oluşumu*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Cantemir, D. (1734). *The history of the growth and decay of the Ottoman Empire* (N. Tindal, Trans.). London: James, John, and Paul Knapton.s

Cantemir, D., & Tura, Y. (Eds.). (2001). *Kitābu 'ilmi'l-mūsīkī 'alā vechi'l-ḥurūfāt: Mūsikīyi harflerle tesbî ve icrâ ilminin kitabı*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Demirkol, N. & Sharif, M. (Eds.). (2021). *Codex TR-Iüne 204-2: Text Edition*.

———. (2021). *Kār-ı Bâğ-ı behişt Hâce*. CMO1-I/02.053t (Preprint publication).

———. (2021). *Kār-ı Şevk-nāme hafif*. CMO1-I/02.88t (Preprint publication).

———. (2021). *Kār-ı muhteşem Hâce'niñ devr-i Hindî*. CMO1-I/2.89t (Preprint publication).

Ezgi, S. (ca. 1935–1940). *Nazarî, amelî Türk musikisi* (Vol. 3). İstanbul: Bankalar Basımevi.

Feldman, W. (1996). *Music of the Ottoman court: Makam, composition and the early Ottoman instrumental repertoire*. Berlin: VWB – Verlag für Wissenschaft und Bildung.

———. (2015). 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” Repertoire. In M. Greve (Ed.), *Writing the history of “Ottoman Music”* (pp. 87–139). Würzburg: Ergon Verlag.

Jäger, R. M. (1996). *Türkische Kunstmusik und ihre handschriftlichen Quellen aus dem 19. Jahrhundert*. Eisenach: Karl Dieter Wagner.

- Kerovpyan, A. (2010). *Klasik Osmanlı müziği ve Ermeniler* (A. Yılmaz, Trans.). İstanbul: Surp Pırgıç Ermeni Hastanesi Vakfı.
- [Konuk], A. (1317 h./1899). *Hānende: mūntaḥab ve mükemmel şarḳı mecmūʿası*. İstanbul: Kütübḥāne-i Cihān Şāḥibi Mihrān.
- Mihçı, Cüneyt-Ersin (Ed.). (2021). *Codex TR-Iüne 204-2: Music Edition*.
- . (2021). *Kār-ı Bāğ-ı behişt Hāce*. CMO1-I/02.053 (Preprint publication).
- . (2021). *Kār-ı Şevk-nāme ḥafīf*. CMO1-I/02.88 (Preprint publication).
- . (2021). *Kār-ı muḥteşem Hāce’niñ devr-i Hindī*. CMO1-I/02/089 (Preprint publication).
- Neubauer, E., & Fonton, C. (1999). *Der “Essai sur la musique orientale” von Charles Fonton mit Zeichnungen von Adanson*. Frankfurt am Main: Institute for the History of Arabic-Islamic Science.
- Olley, J. (2017). *Writing music in nineteenth-century Istanbul: Ottoman Armenians and the invention of Hampartsum notation* [Doctoral dissertation, King’s College London].
- Özalp, M. N. (1992). *Türk mûsikîsi beste formları*. Ankara: TRT.
- Özkan, İ. H. (2014). *Türk mûsikîsi nazariyatı ve usûlleri kudüm velveleleri*. İstanbul: Ötüken.
- Popescu-Judet, E. (1996). *Meanings in Turkish musical culture*. İstanbul: Pan.
- Romanou, K. (2010). *Great theory of music*. New Rochelle: The Axion Estin Foundation.
- [Uz], Kāzım (1310 h./1892). *Mûsikî ıtlāḥātı*. İstanbul: Maḥbaʿa-yı Ebū Elzīyā.
- Wright, O. (1992). *Words without songs: A musicological study of an early Ottoman anthology and its precursors*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
- Yavaşca, A. (2002). *Türk mûsikîsinde kompozisyon ve beste biçimleri*. İstanbul: Türk Kültürüne Hizmet Vakfı.