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# Kār-ı muḥteşem Ḩāce'niñ devr-i Hindī 

## Ḳavl-i muḥteşem [ki] küned ḳavm-i be-yaḳīn

| Source | TR-Iüne 204-2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location | P. 116, 1. 1-p.117, 1. 9 |
| Makâm | Râst |
| Usûl | Devr-i Hindî |
| Genre | Kâr |
| Attribution | Abdülkâdir Merâgî (d. 1435) |
| Lyricist: | Ömer Hayyâm (d. 1132?) |
| Work No. | CMOv0041 |

## Remarks

Among the consulted concordances, OA564 was the only source that indicated devr-i Hindî as the usûl. All other concordances gave devr-i revân.
The scribe omitted the syllable "ki" in hem. 1.
In almost all available concordances, this piece has been transmitted with three hemistiches.
The editor believes that this piece originally had four hemistiches and that H 1 consisted of two hemistiches instead of one. This claim is further supported by the typology of the kârs by Cantemir, which has been discussed in the Introduction to this edition in Chapter 2.3.2.3. In fact, the text concordance in the manuscript NE3608 indicates one additional hemistich, before the miyânhâne. This hemistich would correspond to the missing hem. 2 and may be performed to the same melody as hem. 1. NE3608 gave this hemistich as "bend-i sāni"" [second stanza]. Hence, according to NE3608, hem. 2 is "Kavl-i dīgerān üftāde ān der-reh-i dīn". The hemistich is followed by the terennüm that connects to the miyânhâne, as is also evident in the performance instructions "vü terennümā $[t]$ hem-çü evvel miyānhāne" given by the scribe of NE3608. Hence, the new order of the hemistiches for this piece would be as follows:

1. Ķavl-i muḥteşem ki küned ḳavm-i be-yakīn
2. Ķavl-i dīgerān üftāde ān der-reh-i dīn
3. Nigāh me-bād ü ber-āyed zi-kemīn
4. Bī-haber-est reh īn ü ānest ü ne īn

For a better understanding, the editor has presented an alternative section structure in the second table.

## Structure

Performance order as in NE204

| Section | Text | Rhyme | Melody | Cycles |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| H1 | t1 |  | A | 18 |
|  | 1 | a | B | 6 |
|  | t2 |  | C | 10 |
|  | \|: t3 :| |  | D | 12 |
|  | t4 |  | E | 10 |
| H2 (m) | \|: 3 :| | a | \|: F : $\mid$ | 12 |
|  | \|: t5:| |  | \|: G :| | 8 |
|  | \|: t5 :| |  | \|: G $\mathrm{G}^{\prime}$ : | 8 |
|  | 4 | a | H | 6 |
|  | t2 |  | C | 10 |
|  | \|: t3 :| |  | D | 12 |
|  | t4 |  | E | 10 |

Performance order including hem. 2 from NE3608

| Section | Text | Rhyme | Melody | Cycles |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| H1 | t1 |  | A | 18 |
|  | 1 | a | B | 6 |
|  | t2 |  | C | 10 |
|  | \|: t3 : $\mid$ |  | D | 12 |
|  | t4 |  | E | 10 |
|  | 2 | a | B | 6 |
|  | t2 |  | C | 10 |
|  | \|: t3 : $\mid$ |  | D | 12 |
|  | t4 |  | E | 10 |
| H2 (m) | \|: 3 :| | a | \|: F : | 12 |
|  | \|: $\mathrm{t5}$ :\| |  | \|: G :| | 8 |
|  | \|: t5:| |  | \|: G' :| | 8 |
|  | 4 | a | H | 6 |
|  | t2 |  | C | 10 |
|  | \|: t3 :| |  | D | 12 |
|  | t4 |  | E | 10 |

Pitch Set


## Notes on Transcription

25 For easier navigation, the editor indicated segno signs.
27.2.1 The scribe scratched out the syllable "āh".
28.3.2 The scribe changed the rhythmic value of the first pitch sign from ${ }^{\circ}$ to ${ }^{*}$.

57-62 The scribe did not indicate any repetition signs in the music notation. The block lyrics however suggests repeating this passage.
66 The scribe corrected the first two groups of this division. The original version of this division seems to have been $\overline{\mathcal{F}} \underset{\sim}{\sim} \dot{\sim} \dot{\sim}$. The scribe changed this group to $\dot{\mathcal{F}}, \dot{\sim}$ $\dot{\sim}$
The scribe omitted the vowel "iu" of the text "Bī-haber-est reh in ü ānest". Two concordances suggest where the missing syllable could be included.

OA488 in Hampartsum notation and Armenian script solved this issue as in the following:


Figure 1: OA488, p. 16.
The same passage in TMNvUKV provides a similar solution as in the following:


Figure 2: TMNvUKV, p. 142.

## Consulted Concordances

AK916, fol. 2v; BM, p. 16; Ha, p. 31; HB1, p. 3; M1362, fol. 6v; NE3466, fol. 2r; NE3608, fol. 5v; OA488, pp. 14-17; TMKlii, no. 189; TMNvUKV, pp. 141-2.
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