

CMO1-VI/2.4

P. Ēvicara, o. düeēk, dilhayat'ın

Critical Report

Salih Demirtaş

Funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft
(DFG, German Research Foundation) - Project number 265450875

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution- ShareAlike 4.0 International License

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>



The electronic version of this work is also available at:

<https://corpus-musicae-ottomanicae.de>

P. Ēvicara, o. düeēk, dilhayat'ın

Source	TR-Içağatay YZPER2
Location	Fol. [04r], ll. 1–14
Makâm	Evcârâ
Usûl	Düyek
Genre	Peşrev
Attribution	Dilhayât Kalfâ (d. ca. 1735)
Work No.	CMOi0016

Remarks

Heading (2nd hand): 'Dilhayât'ın evc-ârâ düyek'.

The eight beat düyek is written as ağır (slow) düyek because of the division of the one usûl cycle into four groupings.

Among consulted concordances, the most similar version to the YZPER2 manuscript is located in TR-Iüne 210-8.

No other consulted concordances include sextuplets similar to those found in YZPER2 version of the composition.

The relevant concordance located in TR-Iüne 211-9 mentions 'Sultân Selîmiñ cāriyesiniñ' in its heading. The index included in TR-Iam 1537 mentions 'Cāriye-i Selîm Hân' for the attribution of the composition. The piece is attributed to Selîm III in TR-Istek [1], TR-Istek [2]. The remaining consulted concordances attribute the piece to Dilhayât Kalfâ.









Fol. [04v] includes sketches of Hampartsum notation with black ink. While the size of the notational script is bigger compared to other folios in TR-Içağatay YZPER2, the hand writing style of the notation on fol. [04v] is identical to the other notations in TR-Içağatay YZPER2.

Structure

H1		9	:	3(T)	:		
H2		10	:	3(T)	:		
H3	:	6	:	4	:	3(T)	:
H4		10	:	3(T)	:		

Pitch Set

Notes on Transcription

- 9.3 There is a tie above the six-note group. No rhythmic indication is given for the group. It is interpreted here as a sextuplet. A number of other interpretations are possible, e.g. . Similar cases feature in 23.3, 36.3, 40.4, 44.4 and 48.3.
- 12.2.1 Based on the seyir of the Teslîm, it is evident that the kisver above the pitch sign  (dügâh) is missing. The editor interpreted this sign as  (kürdî).
- 24.2.1 The scribe mistakenly wrote the pitch sign for nevâ first, then corrected the sign to yegâh by scratching out the diagonal line of the sign.
- 31.1.4 In the manuscript, the first grouping of the division includes another pitch sign between  (sünbüle) and  (tiz segâh) that looks like either  (evc) or  (tiz çârgâh). Because the scribe combined the sign with  (tiz segâh), based on the seyir of the division, the editor interpreted this section as a correction by the scribe and this pitch sign is ignored in the transcription.

Consulted Concordances

TR-Iüne 204-2, p. 5; TR-Iüne 210-8, no. 87; TR-Iüne 211-9, pp. 49–51; TR-Istek [1], p. 100; TR-Istek [2], fols. 52v–53r; TR-Iam 1537, p. 59; TR-Iboa TRT.MD.d 400, pp. 491–92.

S.D.