Özgün Makale

Music of the 16th-century Khurāsān in the 17th-century Ottoman Sources: Evidences from Darwīsh ʿAlī Changī's *Treatise on Music*[1]

17. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Kaynaklarında 16. Yüzyıl Horasan Müziği: Derviş Ali Çengî'nin *Risâle-i Mûsıki*'sinden Bulguları

Arastoo MIHANDOUST*

Abstract

The compositions attributed to the early 15th-century music theorist and composer of Jalayirid and Timurid courts, Khʷāja ʿAbd al-Qādir, in the Turkish musical repertoire, are usually considered to be a later pseudographic repertoire created with the intention of forging a link between medieval practice and the Ottoman tradition. Taking the music treatise of the late 16th-century musician from Khurāsān, Darwīsh ʿAlī Changī, into consideration, the present study sheds light on the Central Asian, Khurāsāni origins of eight such musical compositions from the 17th-century Ottoman repertoire. The results of this study show that some of the pieces mentioned by Darwīsh ʿAlī as creations of composers such as Shah Pīladūz, Riḍā Samarqandī, Darwīsh Shādī, ʿAlī Kārmāl, Khʷāja ʿAbd al-Qādir, and Sayf al-Miṣr, reappear in the late 17th-century Ottoman sources, when the names of all but two of the composers (Khʷāja ʿAbd al-Qādir and Sayf al-Miṣr) had been forgotten. Thus, the survival of a 16th-century central Asian musical repertoire in 17th-century Ottoman repertoire is demonstrated.

Keywords: Music of Greater Khurāsān, Classical Ottoman Music, Tradition, Repertoire, Oral Transmission.

Öz

Türk müziği repertuvarında 15. yüzyılın başlarındaki Celâyir ve Timur saraylarına bağlı müzik teorisyeni ve bestekâr Hâce Abdülkâdir Merâgî-ye atfedilen eserler, genellikle Orta Çağ pratikleri ve Osmanlı geleneği arasında bir bağlantı kurmak amacıyla sonradan uydurulmuş, sözde (pseudographic) bir repertuvar olarak kabul edilir. Bu çalışma, 16. yüzyıl sonlarının Horasanlı

1 Makale başvuru tarihi: 13.03.2023. Makale kabul tarihi: 17.05.2023.

* M.A., instructor, Tabriz Eghbal Azar Conservatory, Tehran Universit, Iran, arastoo.mi@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0001-8203-6485.

müzisyeni Derviş Ali Çengî'nin müzik risalesini dikkate alarak 17. yüzyıl Osmanlı repertuvarından sekiz eserin Orta Asya ve Horasan kökenlerine ışık tutmaktadır. Derviş Ali'nin Şah Pîladûz, Rıza Semerkandî, Derviş Şâdî, Ali Kârmâl, Hâce Abdülkâdir Merâgi ve Seyfü'l-Mısrî gibi bestecilere ait gösterdiği bazı eserlerin, 17. yüzyılın sonlarındaki Osmanlı kaynaklarında yeniden ortaya çıktığını; ancak iki isim hariç (Hâce Abdülkâdir Merâgi ve Seyfü'l-Mısrî) diğer tüm bestekarların unutulduğunu ortaya koyan bu çalışma, 16. yüzyıl Orta Asya müzik repertuvarının 17. yüzyıl Osmanlı repertuvarında varlığını sürdürdüğünü de örneklerle açıklamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Büyük Horasan Müziği, Klasik Osmanlı Müziği, Gelenek, Repertuvar, Şifahi Aktarım.

Introduction

The classical Turkish music repertoire inherited from the Ottoman masters of the early 20th century, includes a considerable number of vocal compositions attributed to the celebrated Iranian composer and music theorist of the late Jalayirid and the early Timurid courts, ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Marāghī[2] (d. 1435). Apart from works attributed to al-Marāghī in the modern repertoire, numerable instrumental compositions ascribed to ʿAjamlar (i.e., Iranians) found in the late 17th-century collection of notations by Dimitrie Cantemir (see Kantemir, 2001, p. XIX), have attracted the attention of some Iranian musicologists in the recent decades and even inspired a revival movement (e.g., see Darwishī, 2011; Muḥāfiẓ, 2013; Muḥāfiẓ, 2019; Darwishī, 2020).

Nevertheless, ever since their publication, the corpus of al-Marāghī compositions has been subject to much controversy. Already in the early 20th century, the Turkish musicologist responsible for publishing the al-Marāghī repertoire, Rauf Yekta (d. 1935), noted the possibility of these compositions actually being the creation of more recent composers than al-Marāghī, citing as an example, a Kār composition attributed to a certain ʿAbd al-ʿAlī in an old song-text collection, believed to have been a creation of al-Marāghī in Yekta's own time (Yekta, 1318/1900, p. 118). Yekta's pupil Subhi Ezgi (d. 1962), while still entertaining the possibility that at least a few items in the first volume of his *Nazarî ve Amelî Türk Mûsikîsi* (1933, pp. 198, 235) were authentic, completely rejected such a possibility in the fourth volume of his book, suggesting rather ʿAbd al-ʿAlī as their possible composer. His argument rested on the grounds that the modes and rhythmic cycles of some of these compositions are absent from al-Marāghī's theoretical writings, and that the texts of these pieces are not to be found in an old song-text collection containing the lyrics for many compositions of al-Marāghī (Ezgi, 1940, pp. 239-40, 255-6). Following Ezgi, Walter Feldman also pointed out the absence of the "Kār" compositional genre from the writings of al-Marāghī, postulating such compositions as "pseudographia"[3], created with the aim of establishing legitimacy for the later Ottoman music by maintaining a repertoire of "classics" which could be ascribed to important figures in the musical lineage (Feldman, 1990, p. 93-5). Adding weight to this line of thought was Owen Wright's study on a 17th-century Ottoman song-text collection compiled by Hafiz Post and its earlier precursors from the late 15th and early 16th-century, in which he made the observation that "none of the pieces in the antecedent anthologies can be identified in HP" (1992a, p. 227), concluding that "the specifically Ottoman tradition which lies at the basis of present-day classical music in Turkey can be traced back no further than the early seventeenth century" (1992a, p. 284). This line of thought was also followed by Cem Behar who considered the efforts for finding any compositions from before 17th-century to be in vain (2019, pp. 166-7).

2 The Encyclopaedia Islamica Transliteration system has been used for Arabic and Persian words in this article.

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

On the other hand, attention was drawn by Eckhard Neubauer to song-texts attributed to al-Marāghī, present both in the late Safavid Iranian anthology scribed by Amīr Khān Gurjī (c. 1697) and in the Ottoman song-text collections from the same period (1997, pp. 342-6). Identifying ʿAbd al-ʿAlī as ʿAbdʿali al-Ḫuwayzī (d. 1643), the Shīʿa polymath from Basra, and referring to the existence of pieces attributed to Safavid Iranian composers of the early seventeenth century such as Āqā Muʾmin and Shah Murād, in the Ottoman collections, Neubauer pointed to the influence of Safavid court music on Istanbul, likely as a result of Sultan Murad IV's deportation of several musicians from the captured Safavid territory to Istanbul (1997, pp. 341-2). In consecutive publications on the relationship between Safavid and Ottoman court musics, Wright shed more light on the existing similarities and differences in rhythmic cycles, modes, and a few individual song-texts common to both traditions, bridging the divide between the two (Wright, 2017; Wright, 2018, pp. 284-302; Wright, 2019). Attempting to explain the origins of the compositions attributed to al-Marāghī in both the Safavid and the Ottoman courts, Feldman noted the apparent "striking 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' (Feldman, 2015, p. 130), postulating that a learned musician of "aristocratic background" could participate creatively in his own culture, only by occasionally blurring the distinction between "transmission" and "composition", to create a full-blown "pseudographic" item (Feldman, 2015, p. 130). Thus, for Feldman, the Marāghī-repertoire was most likely the creation of the late 16th-century Iranian composers (Feldman, 2015, pp. 133-4; Feldman, 2019, p. 177).

Despite the general consensus on the late nature of the Marāghī-corpus, attention was drawn by Mehmet Uğur Ekinci and Harun Korkmaz to an early form of one late Safavid-Ottoman pseudo-Marāghī composition (i.e., Māhur Kār), to be found already in a few early 16th-century Ottoman song-text collections, where it is once attributed to a certain Haji Dada (Ekinci & Korkmaz, 2022). Thus, through demonstrating a link between the Safavid-Ottoman tradition and the antecedent tradition of the early 16th century, Ekinci and Korkmaz noted the possible survival of other old items perhaps even by al-Marāghī himself until later times (2022, p. 91). Indeed, the existence of an early version of yet another pseudo-Marāghī composition (i.e., Kar-i Muḥtasham), attributed to "Khʷāja", already in a late 15th-century manuscript, and recorded without a composer name in two early 16th-century song-text compilations of Ottoman provenance, was highlighted by the present author (2021).

Apart from the apparent rare survival of the two mentioned pieces in the Safavid-Ottoman repertoire, the origins of many other compositions attributed to Khʷāja in the song-text collection of Hafiz Post and those who follow him remain unclear. The greater similarity of Amīr Khān Gurjī's late Safavid version of the Māhur Kār composition with the earlier 16th-century version, relative to the late Ottoman one, as noted by Ekinci and Korkmaz (2022, p. 87), speaks of the existence of a solid chain of transmission in the Safavid Iran. Fortunately, glimpses into the repertoire in late 16th-century Safavid realm, which in Feldman's estimation is when and where these pieces likely originated from, are found in the musical treatise of Ṣadr ad-dīn Qazwīnī (d. 1599), where he mentions the names of composers of whom the people "had songs on the tip of their tongues" and "sang everywhere" (Qazwīnī, 2003, p. 87). As has been noted by Neubauer, quite a few of these composer names are also known from another early 17th-century source from central Asia, the musical treatise of Darwīsh ʿAlī Changī (Neubauer, 1997, p. 340). The fact that Darwīsh ʿAlī mentions the compositions of many composers of the time from different cities of the historical Khurāsān region comprising Mashhad, Herāt, Merv, Balkh, Samarkand, and Bukhārā, indicates that in the late 16th-century Khurāsān composers did indeed make their fame composing music

in their own name. Moreover, Ṣadr ad-dīn Qazwīnī's naming of many composers whose works were sung by the people everywhere, makes clear that composers of the 16th century did not necessarily need to attribute their own compositions to great composers of the past. Likewise, the various pieces recorded in the musical codex of Amīr Khān Gurjī with the names of 17th-century Safavid Iranian composers (Pourjavady, 2005, pp. 164-8), render a similar picture for the late 17th-century. Therefore, Feldman's thesis regarding the need of 16th-century composers to attribute their own compositions to great composers of the past (2015, p. 130), appears not to be supported by these sources. Thus, with the previous assumptions regarding the late and pseudographic nature of all Marāghī-compositions appearing to be less certain than previously assumed, a new evaluation of other individual pieces is required.

The recognition of Khurāsān and the milieu of the last Timurid ruler of Herāt, Sultan Ḥusayn Bayqarā, as the locus classicus for music of eastern origin by 17th-century Ottoman authors such as Evliya Çelebi and Dimitrie Cantemir (see Feldman 1996, pp. 39) encourages the investigation of textual sources from Khurāsān for clues regarding the origins of the Persianate repertoire. In this article, eight pieces by six composers including their text, mode, and rhythmic cycle as found in the treatise of Darwīsh ʿAlī Changī will be examined and their reappearance in Ottoman sources from the 17th and 18th centuries will be noted, thus highlighting the strong relationship between the repertoire known in the 16th-century Khurāsān and that known in the 17th-century Istanbul.

Darwīsh ʿAlī Changī and the Music of late 16th-century Khurāsān

Introducing himself as the son of Mīrzā ʿAlī ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad Muʾmin Qānūnī ibn Khʷāja ʿAbdallah ibn Khʷāja Muḥammad Marwārīd (n.d., fols 3r-v), Ḥāfiẓ Darwīsh ʿAlī Changī al-Khāqānī was a descendant of noblemen associated with music. The earliest musical work he authored seems to have been a *Risāla-yi Mūsīqī* (see Żerańska-Kominek, 2019, pp. 148-9), dedicated to the Shaybanid ruler of Transoxiana, ʿAbdallah Khan II (1533-98). His second musical treatise, *Tuḥfat as-Surūr*,[4] an expanded version of the first, is dedicated to the Ashtarkhanid (Janid) ruler, Imām-qulī Khan (for more information, see Dānishpazhūh, 2011, pp. 231-51).

In *Tuḥfat as-Surūr*, Darwīsh ʿAlī mentions Khʷājagī Jaʿfar Qānūnī (d. 1572), ʿAlī Dūst Nāyī, Amīr Mastī, and Ḥasan Kawkabī, as his masters in music (f. 7v), and goes on to state that whatever that is quoted (manqūl) in the treatise is heard from Mawlānā Ḥusayn Ākhund, who himself quoted them from Imām-qulī ʿŪdī, who in turn heard them from Zaytūn Ghichakī, and he from Darwīsh ʿAlī's own ancestor, Khʷāja ʿAbdallah Marwārīd, who had heard them from Zayn al-ʿābidīn Changī, who had allegedly heard them from Ḥasan Qutb-i Nāyī, who Darwīsh ʿAlī uses to connect his chain of transmission to Khʷāja ʿAbd al-Qādir, and from him through Jalayirid Sul ṭān Uways, to Khʷāja Ṣafī ad-Dīn ʿAbd al-Muʾmin (f. 8r).

The existing historical gap in Darwīsh ʿAlī's chain of transmission between Zayn al-ʿābidīn Rūmī (f. 114r), a late 15th-century figure known from actual Ottoman records (Feldman, 1996, p. 45), and Qutb-i Nāyī, who was beheaded in circa 1402 on the orders of Timur (Neubauer, 1997, p. 332-3) indicates that some of the information in the treatise of Darwīsh ʿAlī possibly stem from oral tradition. On the other hand, Darwīsh ʿAlī introduces Khʷāja ʿAbd al-Qādir as a Tajik relative of the poet Saʿdī Shīrazī, from the Nāyīn province of Iṣfahān (f. 54r), which seems to be a word-for-word borrowing from the biography of an unrelated poet, ʿAbd al-Qādir Nāyīnī, found in the *Tadhkirat ash-Shuʿarā* of Dawlatshāh Samarqandī (1382/2003, p. 186). Whether such a borrowing was directly by Darwīsh ʿAlī himself or not, is not clear. Apart from this, Darwīsh ʿAlī, introduces a piece entitled "Gulistān" as a creation of Khʷāja ʿAbd al-Qādir (f. 54v). However,

4 Although the treatise is now usually referred to as *Tuḥfat as*-Surūr (Dānishpazhūh, 2011, pp. 231-51), such a title is not to be found in consulted manuscripts.

the verse of this piece is found with minor differences, in the writings of the contemporary Muṭribī-yi Samarqandī, as a poem by the musically well-versed Muḥammad Ḥakīm Mīrzā-yi Kābulī (d. 1585), the brother of the Mughal emperor Akbar (Muṭribī-yi Samarqandī, 1382/2003, pp. 170-1). Such details speak of the fact that the material in *Tuḥfat as-Surūr* must be dealt with cautiously and despite the attribution of pieces to ʿAbd al-Qādir by Darwīsh ʿAlī, not necessarily all of them can be trusted as authentic medieval compositions by the legendary composer. Nonetheless, it is in *Tuḥfat as-Surūr* that short biographies for the famous, as well as otherwise unknown musicians of the past, are provided, along with short descriptions of their famous compositions as well as their lyrics – but never the nonsense syllables. In the following, eight such compositions famous in Darwīsh ʿAlī's Khurāsān are identified as the origins of compositions that are also encountered in later Ottoman sources.

1. An ʿAmal by Shah Pīladūz

In his short biography of his own master, Ḥasan Kawkabī, Darwīsh ʿAlī mentions the names of Ḥusayn Ākhund, Shah Pīladūz, and Tursun Baba Qamchin, as other musicians who accompanied the late Ḥasan Kawkabī, and goes on to relate that "in those days Mawlānā Shah Pīladūz composed an ʿamal in maqam ʿIrāq and usūl Mukhammas" (f. 128v). The text for this composition as provided by Darwīsh ʿAlī (fols. 128v-129r), is also found in the late 17th-century Ottoman song-text collection of Hafiz Post, in the ʿIrāq faṣl, and is entitled "Kār-i yār justam, uṣūl-ash mukhammas, taṣnīf-i Khʷāja ʿAbd al-Qādir" (f. 115v). The text in the two versions is almost fully identical (Table 1).

Darwīsh ʿAlī (late 16th-century)	Hafiz Post (late 17th-century)
Yār justam ki gham az khātir-i ghamgin bibarad	Yār justam ki gham az khātir-i ghamgin bibarad
Nī ki jān kāhad u-dil khun kunad u-dīn bibarad	Na ki jān kāhad u-dil khun kunad u-dīn bibarad
	Band-i thānī
Dil sipurdam bi-butī tā shavad ārām dilam	Dil sipurdam bi-butī tā shavad ārām dilam
Na ki taskīn u-qarar az man-i miskin bibarad	Na ki taskīn u-qarar az man-i miskin bibarad
	Miyānkhāna
Naqd-i jān dar ʿawaḍ-i khāk-i darash chīzī nīst	Naqd-i jān dar ʿawaḍ-i khāk-i darat chīzī nīst
Sud-i Jāmīst agar ān bidahad in bibarad	Sud-i Jāmīst agar ān bidahad in bibarad

Table 1: The text of the ʿamal by Shah pīladūz vs. Kār-i yār justam.

2. Tantan-i Mullā Riḍā

According to Darwīsh ʿAlī (f. 120v), his master, Ḥasan Kawkabī, along with many others such as Riḍā Samarqandī, were themselves pupils of the celebrated late Timurid composer and musician, Najm ad-dīn Kawkabī (d. 1533). In his short account on Riḍā Samarqandī, Darwīsh ʿAlī states that he had composed an Arabic-language ʿamal praising the prophet, in maqam ʿIrāq and uṣūl Mukhammas, which was famous as "Tantan-i mullā Riḍā" (f. 130r). The lyrics of this composition, are also found as the text for a piece entitled "Kār-i Khwāja, Tantan-i ʿIrāq Khafīf" in an early-18th-century Ottoman anthology compiled by Tasbīḥīzāda Amīr Chalabī (f. 13r).[5] The

5 For the identification of the manuscript as a compilation by Tasbīḥīzāda Amīr Chalabī see Korkmaz, 2021, pp. 172 & 229).

text from both sources is partly corrupted (Table 2) but interestingly, the later Ottoman version is more intelligible.

Darwīsh ʿAlī (late 16th-century)	Ottoman (early-18th-century)
Bism-i rabbi al-ashbāʾ khalāq al-walā	Bism-i rabbi mībdyī ʾashyāʾ al-khalāq al-warā
	Band-i thānī
Qad naʿtʾayna luṭfī fī madḥ-i Muṣṭafā	Qad madaḥat inna naẓmī fī-i madīḥ al-Muṣṭafā
	Miyānkhāna
ʾAdhkir laʾālī ḥidāth sayf bisab sum tuḥaf	Wa-azkarū awlādihim min Yathrib thuma an-Najaf
Thuma fī-l-baghdād mā niyā-yi ʾana ʾalam-i Karbalā	Thuma fī baghdād ṭūs sāʾiran fī-l-Kalbalā

Table 1: The text of Tantan-i mullā Riḍā vs. Kār-i Khʷāja, Tantan-i ʿIrāq.

3. Ustad Shādī's farewell ṣawt

For Darwīsh ʿAlī, the most influential composer of the early 15th-century court of Sultān Ḥusayn Bayqarā, was Darwīsh Shādī, born to Ethiopian nobility, who had numerous pupils in Herāt (f. 105r). According to Darwīsh ʿAlī, upon his capture of Herāt, in keeping his word with Kazan Khan Muḥammad Amīn, Shaybānī Khan sent Darwīsh Shādī to the latter as a souvenir of conquest. While on his way to inner Central Asia, Darwīsh Shādī composed a few ṣawt compositions, among them a ghazal in maqam Rāst and uṣūl Turk Ḍarb (f. 106v). The first two couplets of the same ghazal are found as the text for a piece in Rāst, entitled "Kar-i Biyā-yi ʿishq, ʿamal-i Khʷāja uṣūl-ash Turk Ḍarb", in an 18th-century Ottoman song-text collection (Table 3),[6] where they are followed by additional modulations to Iṣfahān and Nahāwand (İU, Ms. TY 3608, n.d., 4v) – not to be found in the *Tuḥfat as-Surūr*. This new material may presumably be an indication of structural and hence also melodic change. The surviving version of this piece recorded by Ezgi (1935, p. 54)[7] only comprises the initial section and its nonsense syllables are different from the ones found in older manuscripts.

Darwīsh ʿAlī (late 16th-century)	Ottoman (mid-18th-century)
Biyā ay ashk tā bar ruzigār-i khʷīshtan giryam	Abiyā-yi ashk tā bar ruzigār-i khʷīshtan agiryam
Chu shamʿ az miḥnat-i shab hāy-i tār-i khʷīshtan giryam	Chu shamʿ az miḥnat-i shab jāy-i tār-i khīshtan agiryam
Nadāram mihrabānī tā kunad bar ḥāl-i mā girya	Nadāram mihrabānī tā kunad bar ḥāl-i mā girya
Hamān bihtar ki khud bar ḥāl-i zār-i khʷīshtan giryam	Hamān bihtar ki khud bar ḥāl-i zār-i khʷīshtan agiryam
Marā ham dar gharībī shūkhchashmī āfat-i jān shud	Miyānkhāna
Nagūyī k-az gham-i yar u-diyār-i khʷīshtan giryam	Sāqī sharāb-i laʿl bigardan bahāna chīst
…	Dar ruzigār-i miḥnat dū zamāna chīst

Table 3: The ṣawt by Darwīsh Shādī vs. Kar-i Biyā-yi ʿishq.

4. A Ṣawt by ustad ʿAlī Kārmāl

Darwīsh ʿAlī mentions ʿAlī Kārmāl along with 11 other musicians he introduces as close associates of Darwīsh Shādī (fols. 105r-106v). The only composition of his that is found in the *Tuḥfat as-Surūr* is a Ṣawt in the maqām ʿIrāq and uṣūl Turk Ḍarb (f. 113r). In the above-mentioned early

6 Regarding the dating of the manuscript see Korkmaz, 2015, pp. 83-5.
7 I thank professor Ralf Martin Jaeger who drew my attention to the surviving version of this composition.

18th-century Ottoman anthology of Tasbīḥīzāda Amīr Chalabī, the initial couplet of the same verse is found with minor differences as the text for a piece entitled "Naqsh-i Turk Ḍarb-i Khʷāja (f. 14v), among other compositions in maqām ʿIrāq (Table 4).

Darwīsh ʿAlī (late 16th-century)	Tasbīḥīzāda Amīr Chalabī (early 18th-century)
Kunj-i gham-at dilī ki bi bī-khānagī kishīd	Kunj-i ghamda dilī ki bi ham-khānagī kishīd
ʿumrī zi dahr minnat-i farzānagī kishīd	ʿumrī zi dahr-i miḥnat-i wīrāna-ʾī kishīd

Table 4: Ṣawt of ʿAlī Kārmāl vs. Naqsh-i Turk Ḍarb-i Khʷāja.

5. ʿAmal-i Gīsū by Khʷāja ʿAbd al-Qādir

An interesting tale about how Khʷāja ʿAbd al-Qādir composed one of his pieces is found in the *Tuḥfat as-Surūr.* Darwīsh ʿAlī relates that in his youth Khʷāja was once passing by a road when he saw a girl weaving canvas while she had her hair on her back. Seeing her, he was very delighted and composed an ʿamal in the Maqlūb mode and uṣūl Turk Ḍarb over a verse he immediately created (f. 55r). An almost fully identical text is also found in the late 17th-century song-text collection of Hafiz Post (Table 5), as the lyrics for a piece entitled "Kār-i gīsū-yi Khʷāja ʿAbd al-Qādir dar Turki Ḍarb" in the Awj Faṣl (f. 127v). It is worth noting that "Maqlūb" and "Awj" are, if not alternative terms for the same modal entity, at least closely related (see below).

Darwīsh ʿAlī (late 16th-century)	Hafiz Post (late 17th-century)
Sarkhāna	
Gīsū-yi muʿanbar-i dutāyash	Gīsū-yi muʿanbar-i dutāyash
Dūd-i dil- māst dar qafāyash	Dūd-i dil- māst dar qafāyash
	Band-i thānī
Az yār man iltimās dāram	Az yār man iltimās dāram
Tā sar binaham bi-zīr-i pāyash	Tā sar binaham zīr-i pāyash
[miyankhāna]	miyānkhāna
Mashitāb khalīl, k-ātash-i charkh	Mushtāq-i khalīl shaw chu ātash
Bustan shavad az gul-i liqāyash	Bustan shavad az gul-i liqāyash
Qitʿa - Bāzgū	Khāna-yi ākhar
Mūy dar qafā-yi tu dīdam shitāftam	Mūyī tu dar qafā-yi tu dīdam bishitāftam
Guftam magar ki dūd-i dilī dar qafā-yi tust	Guftam magar ki dūd-i dilīst dar qafā-yi tust
Mūy-ash bi-ham barāmad u-āshufta gasht u-guft	Zulf-ash bi-ham barāmad u-āshufta gasht u-guft
Andīsha kaj mabar ki kamand bālā-yi tust	Andīsha kaj makun ki kamand bālā-yi tust

Table 5: The text for the ʿAmal in the Maqlūb-Turk ḍarb vs. Kār-i Gīsū in Awj-Turki ḍarb.

6. ʿAmal-i Aʿẓam or Kār-i Shahādatnāma attributed to Khʷāja

While describing the compositional form Rīkhta, which features Indian lyrics, Darwīsh ʿAlī relates that after composing a Rīkhta in praise of the Prophet, Khʷāja saw him in a dream. The Prophet spoke to him: "oh ʿAbd al-Qādir! You described us in the Indian language, do so in

Arabic as well" (fols. 32v-33r). Although Darwīsh ʿAlī does not indicate the mode or the rhythmic cycle of this Arabic composition entitled "ʿAmal-i Aʿẓam", he included its text. An almost identical text appears as the verse for a composition entitled "Kār-i Shahādatnāma-yi Khʷāja, Uṣūl-ash Duyak" among the late 17th-century additional material to an early 16th-century song-text collection (Shāpūr Qastamūnī, n.d., f. 157v). Interestingly, both texts seem to be corrupted and are mostly unintelligible (Table 6).

Darwīsh ʿAlī (late 16th-century)	Ottoman version (late 17th-century)
Fa-tan fa-qālū tabārak Allah	Fa-tan qālū tabārak Allah
Ashhadu an la ilāha illa Allah	Ashhadu an la ilāha illa Allah
qadaḥ takallam nabī-yi qādir	qaṭʿatakallam jamāl-i qādir
Ashhadu an la ilāha illa Allah	Ashhadu an la ilāha illa Allah
bi-ū man imshab nātawān būdam	hūman imsab nātawān būdam
Ki ṣifa min ṣifa mādu junun kul wa-lāḥī	Miyān-i kull l-in-nās
Ashhadu an la ilāha illa Allah	Ashhadu an la ilāha illa Allah

Table 6: The text of ʿAmal-i Aʿẓam vs. the late Ottoman Kār-i Shahādatnāma.

7. Kar-i Waṣīyyatnāma in Māhūr attributed to Khʷāja

Speaking of the last days of Khʷāja ʿAbd al-Qādir, Darwīsh ʿAlī states that, right before his death, he chose a few stanzas from Khʷājū-yi Kirmānī's poetry and composed an ʿAmal in the mode "Gardūniyya wa-Māhūr" over them (f. 57r). The verse for this composition is present among the song-texts recorded in the above-mentioned late 17th-century source, under the title "Kar-i Waṣīyyatnāma-yi Khʷāja ʿAbd al-ʿAlī" (Shāpūr Qastamūnī, n.d., 167v), and again in another mid-18th-century collection, under the title "gufta-yi Khʷājū, kar-i Waṣīyyatnāma-yi Khʷāja, uṣūl-ash Turk-ḍarb" in Māhūr (İU. TY. 3608, n.d., fol. 34v). Despite slight variances and a flipped initial verse (Table 7), the text from both the central Asian as well as Ottoman tradition is more or less identical. However, it is interesting to note that the final two couplets of the text do not appear in the original poem by Khʷājū-yi Kirmānī (1382/2003, p. 323).

Darwīsh ʿAlī (late 16th-century)	Ottoman (mid-18th-century)
Binshin nafasī tā nafasī bā tu barārīm	Az ʿumr juz in yak-du naqsh bīsh nadārīm
kaz ʿumr juz in yak-du nafas bīsh nadārīm	Binshin nafasī tā nafasī bā tu barārīm
	Band-i thānī
Juz gham bi-jahān hich nadārīm u-ghamī nīst	Juz gham bi-jahān hich nadāram wa-lākin
gar hīch nadārīm u-gham-i hīch nadārīm	gar hīch nadārīm u-gham-i hīch nadāram
	Miyānkhāna
Wīy laʿl-i rawānbakhsh-i tu mīguft bi-khʷājū	awīy laʿl-i rawānbakhsh-i tu mīguft bi-khʷājū
Khush bāsh tā ranj-i tu ḍāyiʿ nagudhārīm	Khush bāsh ki mā ranj-i tu ḍāyiʿ nagudhārīm
Bāzgū	Khāna-yi ākhar
Chi ẓulm-hā ki man az rūzigār mībīnam	Chi fitna-hā ki man az zulf-i yār mībīnam
Chi fitna-hā ki man az chashm-i yār mībīnam	Chi jawr-hā ki man az rūzigār mībīnam
Ayā ṭabīb bi-ḥāl-i dilam naẓar farmā	Ayā ṭabīb bi-ḥāl-i dilam bikun naẓarī
Ki jān-i khasta-yi khud ra fīgār mībīnam	Ki ḥāl-i khasta-yi khud ra fīgār mībīnam

Table 7: The text of Khʷāja ʿAbd al-Qādir's ʿAmal vs. the late Ottoman Kar-i Waṣīyyatnāma.

8. A *Duyak Pīshraw* in *ʿIrāq* attributed to Sayf al-Miṣr

In the chapter dealing with various compositional forms, Darwīsh ʿAlī mentions the names of the oldest musicians known to him, relating that the *Pīshraw* was invented by the masters of Timur's time, and "the first person who composed a Pīshraw in *ʿIrāq*, was Sayf al-Miṣr, which has four *sarkhānas* and is in the *Duyak* uṣūl (rhythmic cycle)" (f. 31v). A composition entitled "Pīshraw-i Sayf al-Miṣrī dar maqam-i ʿIrāq-Mukhālif uṣūl-ash Duyak" has been notated by ʿAlī Ufuqī in the mid-17th-century Istanbul (Elçin, 1976, pp. 263-4), which like most other *Pīshraw* compositions consists of a sarkhāna, mulāzima, khāna-yi thānī, and khāna-yi thālith, adding up to four sections in total. The piece is also found in the collection of notations by Cantemir, with minor melodic differences (Wright, 1992b, pp. 79-82). The inclusion of the mode name Mukhālif in the title of the work as recorded by Ufuqī is noteworthy, since in the late Safavid treatise of Amīr Khān Gurjī, Mukhālif is classified as a branch mode (shuʿba) of ʿIrāq (Pourjavady, 2005, p. 258).

Observations

Based on the eight compositions examined above, it seems that most of the pieces had kept the name of their mode and rhythmic cycle while being transferred from 16th-century Khurāsān to 17th-century Istanbul (Table 9). However, it is necessary to ascertain whether the same names correspond to identical modal and rhythmic structures in both traditions.

Although Darwīsh ʿAlī does not provide the exact intervallic structure of the modes known to him, it is nevertheless possible to compare the structure of the modes of the eight pieces (i.e., ʿIrāq, Rāst, Maqlūb/Awj, and Gardūniyya wa-Māhūr), as known from the 16th-century Safavid musical treatise *Taqsīm an-naghamāt*, with those described in the 17th-century Ottoman sources (Table 8). Maqām Rāst as described in the *Taqsīm an-naghamāt* (Wright, 2018, p. 361) is virtually identical with the one known to Cantemir in the late 17th-century Istanbul in terms of its finalis and intervallic structure (Tura, 2001, pp. 48-9). The same is also true of the mode ʿIrāq (Wright, 2018, p. 364; Tura, 2001, pp. 46-47). The mode Maqlūb which is a branch (shuʿba) of ʿIrāq in the *Taqsīm an-naghamāt* (Wright, 2018, p. 379), comprises the same octave compass as Cantemir's Awj, which he describes as the higher octave variant of ʿIrāq (Tura, 2001, pp. 66-7). Apart from a slight microtonal difference in the seventh degree of the scale, the mode Māhūr described in *Taqsīm an-naghamāt* (Wright, 2019, p. 388), also resembles the one described by Cantemir (Tura, 2001, pp. 84-6).

ʿIrāq	*Taqsīm an-naghamāt*		7-	1	2	3-					
	Cantemir		7-	1	2						
Rāst	*Taqsīm an-naghamāt*	6	7-	1							
	Cantemir	6	7-	1	2	3-					
Maqlūb	*Taqsīm an-naghamāt*		7-	1	2	3-	4	5	6	7-	
Awj	Cantemir		7-	1	2	3-	4(#)	5	6	7-	
Māhūr	*Taqsīm an-naghamāt*			1	2	3	4	5	6	7-	1
	Cantemir			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1

Table 8: The modes ʿIrāq, Rāst, Maqlūb, Awj, and Māhūr according to *Taqsīm an-naghamāt* and Cantemir.

As for the rhythmic cycles known in 16th-century Khurāsān and 17th-century Istanbul, the rhythmic cycle, Duyak, according to both Darwīsh ʿAlī (fols. 24v-25r), and the 17th-century Safavid-Ottoman sources (Wright, 2017, p. 55), comprises eight time units (naqra). However, such a straightforward correspondence is not the case with the other rhythmic cycles. For instance, uṣūl Turk Ḍarb comprising 12 time units for Darwīsh ʿAlī (f. 25r), differs from the Turk Ḍarb known from the late 17th-century Safavid-Ottoman sources (Wright, 2017, pp. 62-3). Moreover, uṣūl Mukhammas, comprising 20 time units and 5 attacks (ḍarb) in the *Tuḥfat as-Surūr* (fols. 24r-v), actually comprises 20 attacks and 16 time units in the late 17th-century Safavid-Ottoman sources (Wright, 2017, pp. 63-4). The fact that a composition by Riḍā Samarqandī in the 16th-century Khurāsān, despite retaining its name (i.e., Tantan) and mode (i.e., ʿIrāq) in Istanbul, had its rhythmic cycle changed from Mukhammas to Khafīf, may be of significance in this regard, since it is easier to imagine a change of rhythmic cycle from a Mukhammas of 16 time units – rather than 20 – to a Safavid-Ottoman Khafīf of 32 time units (see Wright, 2017, p. 64). Considering how the late 15th-century Timurid treatises also describe Mukhammas as a cycle of 16 time units (Khaḍrāyī, 1383/2004, p 70; Khaḍrāyī, 1386/2007, p. 109), it is also possible that Darwīsh ʿAlī or his source were not very accurate in describing the exact structure of the rhythmic cycles.

	Darwīsh ʿAlī – 16th-century			Ottoman – 17th-century		
Number	name	mode	Rhythmic cycle	name	mode	Rhythmic cycle
1	-	ʿIrāq	Mukhammas	Kār-i yār justam	ʿIrāq	Mukhammas
2	Tantan-i Mullā Riḍā	ʿIrāq	Mukhammas	Tantan- ʿIrāq	ʿIrāq	Khafīf
3	Ṣawt	Rāst	Turk Ḍarb	Kār-i Biyā-yi ʿishq	Rāst	Turk Ḍarb
4	Ṣawt	ʿIrāq	Turk Ḍarb	Naqsh-i Khʷāja	ʿIrāq	Turk Ḍarb
5	ʿAmal-i Gīsū	Maqlūb	Turk Ḍarb	Kār-i Gīsū	Awj	Turki Ḍarb
6	ʿAmal-i Aʿẓam	-	-	Kār-i Shahādatnāma	-	Duyak
7	-	Gardūniyya wa-Māhūr	-	Kār-i Waṣīyyatnāma	Māhūr	Turk-ḍarb
8	-	ʿIrāq	Duyak	-	ʿIrāq-Mukhālif	Duyak

Table 9: Titles, modes, and rhythmic cycles of the eight pieces, as known in Khurāsān vs. Istanbul.

Conclusion

Considering how the name, mode, rhythmic cycle, and the verse for eight compositions mentioned by Darwīsh ʿAlī, are also found in Ottoman song-text collections of the 17th century and onwards, it is safe to assume that the pieces in Ottoman sources indeed stem from their 16th-century prototype recorded in Khurāsān. The fact that Darwīsh ʿAlī does not seem to have been aware of the late nature of some pieces he has recorded (i.e., ʿAmal-i Gulistān), as well as the name of their real composers, and the presence of historically incorrect information in his treatise, are all indicative of the fact that the pieces – as well as information about them – were

passed on for a considerable amount of time or through long distances, in the oral transmission. Thus, Feldman's suggestion regarding the possible continuous history of the repertoire in the east (2019, p. 177) appears to be well-founded as the real composer names appear to have simply been forgotten, even when the pieces themselves survived and were wrongly attributed to Khʷāja ʿAbd al-Qādir and ʿAbd al-Alī.

For a repertoire that appears to have survived through a considerable time period, it is well-expected to find changes in the texts and nonsense syllables. However, the modal structures of the pieces appear to have been preserved rather faithfully on their way to the Ottoman realm. Although the same could be said of the rhythmic cycle Duyak, Darwīsh ʿAlī's seemingly imprecise way of describing rhythmic cycles does not allow for an exact assessment of if or how the rhythmic cycles Turk Ḍarb and Mukhammas developed before reappearing in the late 17th-century Ottoman sources. What is clear, is that the structure of Turk Ḍarb in late Safavid Isfahan and Ottoman Istanbul differed (see Wright, 2017, pp. 62-3), therefore, pieces in this rhythmic cycle may have evolved in distinct paths in the two realms. As for the compositional forms, the fact that many early "ʿAmal" compositions were later recalled as "Kār", suggests that in practice, the latter word was no more than a Persian translation of the former. On the other hand, the survival of two early "Ṣawt" compositions as "Kār" and "Naqsh" appears to bear witness to a loss of sensitivity to early definitions of musical forms in the later Ottoman practice.

The survival of actual 16th-century compositions famous in Darwīsh ʿAlī's Khurāsān, in the 17th-century Ottoman musical repertoire, points to the possible antiquity of other "ancient" items in the repertoire of Ottoman music. Thus, the two early pieces highlighted by Mihandoust (2021) and Ekinci and Korkmaz (2022) may not be rare exceptions, but perhaps part of a larger surviving early repertoire. With the origins of such compositions now clear, and the strong relationship between the music of 17th-century Istanbul and the repertoire known for Darwīsh ʿAlī and Qazwīnī in late 16th-century Khurāsān and eastern Safavid Iran manifest, studies on the structural affinities and the stylistic similarities of music in Central Asia, Iran and Turkey may bring forth a better understanding of the 16th-century common ancestor to the three traditions.

All in all, this article illuminated the relationship between 16th-century urban musical repertoire practiced in historical Khurāsān region and 17th-century Ottoman court repertoire witnessed in anthologies authored in Istanbul. To substantiate this relationship, a comparison between eight compositions documented by Darwīsh ʿAlī Changī al-Khāqānī in late 16th-century Bukhārā and their later form in a few 17th-century Ottoman song-text collections was conducted and striking similarities in text, modes, forms, and to a lesser extent, rhythmic cycles were uncovered. This result sheds more direct light on the relationship between the repertoires of Central Asian (i.e., Shaybanid and Jānid), Iranian (Safavid), and Turkish (Ottoman) musical practices of 16th and 17th centuries and paves the way for future comparative studies on these musical traditions.

References

Anonymous. (n.d.). *Mecmua-yı Makamât-ı Dede Efendi* [*Fasıl Mecmuası*]. İstanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi. TY 3608.

Awbahī, ʿAlīshāh bin ḥajī būka. (1390/2012). *Muqaddimat al-uṣūl*. Bi kūshish-i Sayyid Muḥ ammad Ḥusaynī. Tihrān: Farhangistān-i hunar.

Behar, C. (2019). *Aşk olmayınca meşk olmaz: Geleneksel Osmanlı/Türk müziğinde öğretim ve intikal,* Genişletilmiş 7. Baskı. İstanbul: YKY.

Dānishpazhūh, M. (2011). *Fihrist-i āthār-i khaṭṭī dar Mūsiqī (Farsī, ʿArabī, wa-Turkī)*. Tihrān: Markaz-i Nashr-i Dānishgāhī.

Darwīsh ʿAlī Changī al-Khāqānī. (n.d.). *Tuḥfat as-Surūr.* Manuscript no. 264. Tajikistan, Markazi Merosi Khatti (Маркази мероси хаттӣ).

Darwīshī, Muḥammadriḍā. (1390/2011). Shawqnāma: bāzkhwānī-yi taṣnīf-hā-yi mansūb bi ʿAbd al-Qādir Marāghī [CD]. Tihrān: Kānūn-i parwarish-i fikrī-yi kūdakān wa-nawjawānān.

Darwīshī, M., & Mīrzāyī, B. (1399/2020). Az Gulistān-i ʿajam: majmūʿa-yi haft taṣnīf wa-bīst pīshraw-i ʿajamī [CD]. Tihrān: Muʾassisa-yi farhangī-hunarī-yi Māhūr.

Dawlatshāh Samarqandī. (1382/2003). *Tadhkirat ash-Shuʿarā*. Bi-ihtimām wa-Taṣḥīḥ-i Edward Browne. Tihrān: Intishārāt-i Asāṭīr.

Ekinci, M. U., & Korkmaz, H. (2022). Kadim musiki geleneğinin hayatta kalan örneği: Mahur Kâr. *Osmanlı Araştırmaları,* 60(60), pp. 61-96.

Elçin, Ş. (1976). *Ali Ufkî, hayatı, eserleri ve Mecmua-i Saz ü Söz.* İstanbul: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.

Ezgi, S. (1933). *Nazari ve ameli Türk musikisi,* I. Ankara: Millî Mecmua Matbaası.

Ezgi, S. (1935). *Nazari ve ameli Türk musikisi,* II. Istanbul: Kaatçılık ve Matbaacılık Anonim Şirketi.

Ezgi, S. (1940). *Nazari ve ameli Türk musikisi,* IV. Istanbul: Hüsnitabiat Matbaası.

Fallahzadeh, M. (2005). *Persian writing on music: A study of Persian musical literature from 1000 to 1500 AD*. Sweden: Uppsala University.

Feldman, W. (1990). Cultural authority and authenticity in the Turkish repertoire. *Asian music, 22*(1), pp. 73-111.

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

Feldman, W. (2015, July). 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 *Writing the history of "Ottoman Music"* (pp. 87-138). Ergon-Verlag.

Feldman, W. (2019). The emergence of Ottoman music and local modernity. *YILLIK: Annual of Istanbul Studies,* 1(1), pp. 173-179.

Hafiz Post. (n.d.). [*Fasıl Mecmuası*], Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi, Revan 1724.

Kantemir, D. (2001). Kitâb-ı İlmü'l-Mûsikî alâ Vechi'l-Hurûfât (haz. Yalçın Tura). İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yay.

Khaḍrāyī, B. (1383/2004). Dawr-hā-yi īqāʿī az dīdgāh-i Bināyī. *Mahoor Music Quarterly,* 6(22), pp. 69-75.

Khaḍrāyī, B. (1386/2007). īqāʿ dar risāla-yi *Muqaddimat al-uṣūl,* athar-i Niẓām ad-Dīn ʿalīshāh b. ḥajī buka awbahī (qarn-i nuhum q.), *Mahoor Music Quarterly,* 9(36), pp. 105-120.

Khʷājū-yi Kirmānī. (1382/2003). *Dīwān-i ghazaliyyāt-i Khwājū-yi Kirmānī.* Comp. Ḥamīd Maẓharī. Kirmān: Khadamāt-i Farhangī-yi Kirmān.

Korkmaz, H. (2021). *Türk musiki tarihinin kaynağı olarak güfte mecmuaları*. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Istanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Marāghī, ʿAbd al-Qādir. (1388/2009). *Jāmiʿ al-alḥān*. Ed. B. Khaḍrāyī. Tihrān: Farhangistān-i hunar.

Mihandoust, A. (2021). A Tasnif Attributed to Khâje Abdolqâder Marâghi. *Mahoor Music Quarterly,* 24(95), pp. 89-92.

Muḥāfiẓ, A. (1392/2013). ʿAjamlar: guzīda-ī az āthār-i āhangsāzān-i Īrānī-yi darbār-i ʿUthmānī-yi muqārin-i dawra-yi Ṣafawī dar risālāt-i Ufkī wa-Dimitrie Cantemir. Tihrān: Muʾassisa-yi farhangī-hunarī-yi Māhūr.

Muḥāfiẓ, A. (1398/2019). Nīshābūr: guzīda-ī az āhangsāzī-hā-yi mansūb bi mūsīqīdānān-i Īrānī dar risāla-yi Kawtharī (qarn-i 18-um). [CD]. Tihrān: Muʾassisa-yi farhangī-hunarī-yi Māhūr.

Muṭribī-yi Samarqandī. (1382/2003). *Tadhkirat ash-Shuʿarā*. Tihrān: Markaz-i Pazhūhishī-yi Mīrāth-i Maktūb.

Neubauer, E. (1997). Zur Bedeutung der Begriffe Komponist und Komposition. *Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Arabisch-islamischen Wissenschaften*, 11, pp. 307-363.

Pourjavady, A. H. (2005). *The musical codex of Amir Khān Gorji (c. 1108–1697)*. (Doctoral Dissertation). University of California, Los Angeles.

Qazwīnī, Ṣ. (2003). Risāla-yi ʿilm-i Mūsiqī. Edited by Āriū Rustamī. *Mahoor Music Quarterly, 5*(18), pp. 81-96.

[Shāpūr Qastamūnī]. (n.d.). *Musiki Mecmuası*. Süleymaniye. Bağdatlı Vehbi, Manuscript. 1002.

Tasbīhīzāda Amīr Chalabī. (n.d.). [*Fasıl Mecmuası]*, Ankara Dil Tarih Coğrafya Fakültesi Kütüphanesi, Muzaffer Ozak, I-523.

Wright, O. (1992a). *Words without songs*. Routledge.

Wright, O. (1992b). *Demetrius Cantemir: The collection of notations. Volume 1:* Text. London: School of Oriental and African Studies.

Wright, O. (2017). Amīr Ḫān Gurjī and Safavid-Ottoman Usul Parallels. In Z. Helvacı, J. Olley, R. M. Jäger (Eds.). *Rhythmic Cycles and Structures in the Art Music of the Middle East* (pp. 49-68). Würzburg: Ergon Verlag Würzburg in Kommission.

Wright, O. (2018). *Music theory in the Safavid era: The taqsīm al-naġamāt*. Routledge.

Wright, O. (2019). Bridging the Safavid-Ottoman divide. In R. Strohm (Ed.). *The Music Road: Coherence and Diversity in Music from the Mediterranean to India* (pp. 168-192). Oxford University Press.

Yektā, R. (1318/1900). *Asātidh-i Alḥān, ʿadad: 2, Khwāja ʿAbd al-Qādir Marāghī*. Farīdīyya Maṭbaʿa-si.

Żerańska-Kominek, S. (2019). Writing the History of Unwritten Music: On the Treatise of Darwesh ʻAli Changi (17th Century). In R. Strohm (Ed.). *The Music Road: Coherence and Diversity in Music from the Mediterranean to India* (pp. 148-167). Oxford University Press.