

1. 163

14/8

H1

M a

teslim

b

teslim

M a: the arrow seems to indicate onset of repetition, so that the *teslim* is to be interpreted not as a *seconda volta* variant but rather as a continuation or coda. Confirmation is provided by M b, where the (slightly varied) repeat is written out, and by the Kevşeri version, where M a 2: 1-5 has been copied, but then struck through (as an unnecessary writing out of what would be repeated anyway).

M b 1: 11-12: although the durations are clearly marked here there might be a case for substituting those of 2: 11-12, as happens in the Kevşeri version (with one minor alteration). The change would also reinforce the parallelism with 1,2: 4-5.

H2

z



1) H2 1: 2: the original has $c\sharp$, but that this is a slip is suggested strongly by the parallel passage (with $c\sharp$) in 2.

H3 2: 3-4: over these 3 notes is a horizontal bracket, which seems to provide a correction model for the previous 3 notes. These look as if they were originally written as $\text{♩} \text{♩} \text{♩}$, the 1 being subsequently altered to 2. Possibly related to this is the later marginal comment *hâne gâlısta bir darp nokşandır* ('H3 is one beat short'), although it could equally well relate to the fact that the 2 final notes of the section originally had the duration $\text{♩} \text{♩}$. The correct $\text{♩} \text{♩}$ duration is added below (in a different (blue) ink and hand).

3) Kevşeri (reproduced in Sürehan, 92).

H3 2: 1 $f\sharp g$ a ($\text{♩} \text{♩} \text{♩}$), 3 A ♩ .

Sürehan 93-4 (transcription of Kevşeri version). 1 = ♩ . Time signature 28 : 8. Tempo ♩ = 66.

Ezgi 4, 217-8 (and thence Popescu-Judetzi 19 (343-5)). 1 = ♩ . Time signature 28 : 8. $B\sharp$ is rendered by Bb .

M a: -2.

M b 1: 2 $c\sharp$, 3 ed , 11 Bb $c\sharp$ ($\text{♩} \text{♩}$).

H2 1: 1 A $B\sharp$ ($\text{♩} \text{♩}$), 2 $c\sharp$, 3 $B\sharp$ $c\sharp$ ($\text{♩} \text{♩}$).

H3 2: 7 + a, 10 + $f\sharp c\sharp$ ($\text{♩} \text{♩}$), -11-12.

Z is omitted after H3.