

H1 a

b

c

M a

b

H1 a 1: 5-6 could be read *Bd*, but (a blotted) *A*, by analogy with 2: 5-6 is preferable. 3: 5-6 is also not completely clear: possibly in both cases *d* was written first and then clumsily corrected. Similarly also with M a 1: 13-14.

H1 b 1: 3: this again looks like *d* with some later overwriting.

H2

H3 a

b

1) It has been assumed that H2 5 is not to be repeated. Accordingly, the repeat of H3 b may be considered doubtful.

3) Yekta (Lavignac), 2979-80. $1 = \downarrow$. Time signature 14 : 8.

H1 c: 1 c, 2 Bd.

H3 a 1: 1 d.

Despite the *devr-i kebir* heading and the evident distribution of the melodic material, reinforced by the internal punctuation given above the cycle divisions, into blocks of 14 time units, the piece as a whole is singularly unidiomatic when considered against the patterns of melodic-rhythmic congruence typical of *devr-i kebir*: in not one cycle is the natural 3 + 4 + 3 + 4 structure fully articulated, and in many pitches are tied across two or three internal boundaries. A fully idiomatic *devr-i kebir* structure may be obtained by assuming that, unannounced, the piece has been notated in the *vezn-i şağir* cycle. We would then have 348b: