

The rhythmic cycle is stated to be *evsa* not *devr-i kebir*.

Cycle divisions are generally marked  $\text{♩} \text{ } \text{♩}$ , occasionally by a dot; half cycles are sometimes marked by a dot, rarely by  $\text{♩} \text{ } \text{♩}$ .

M b 1: 9-10 share one time unit in the original. 9 c (properly  $\text{♩}$ ) looks more like  $\text{♩}$  ( $\text{♩}$ ).

M b 2: 9-10 share one time unit in the original.

H2 b 1: 8-9: the original has  $\text{♩}$ .

H3 a and b, although separated by *ve leh*, may be *prima/seconda volta* variants of a single subsection.

What is notated in 347a appears quite unequivocally as a composition in the rhythmic cycle *devr-i kebir*, and the original *evsa* of the heading would be dismissed with hardly a second thought as a straightforward blunder, were it not confirmed by 'Ali Ufkî. We may assume, therefore, either that the notation is defective, or that the piece started life in *evsa* but was later recast into a new rhythmic cycle. In either case *renotation* in *evsa* may be effected quite simply by altering the first 3 time units of each half cycle of *devr-i kebir* to fit the pattern of the first 5 time units in each half cycle of *evsa*. Accordingly,  $\text{♩} \text{ } \text{♩}$  becomes  $\text{♩} \text{ } \text{♩}$ ,  $\text{♩} \text{ } \text{♩}$  becomes  $\text{♩} \text{ } \text{♩}$ , and  $\text{♩} \text{ } \text{♩}$  becomes  $\text{♩} \text{ } \text{♩}$ . We thus obtain 347b: