TUNES FROM A SULTAN'S DIARY: MUSICAL PERFORMANCES AND MUSICIANS IN THE RÛZNÂMES OF MAHMUD I (R. 1730-1754)

by
G. HANDE BETÜL ÜNAL

Submitted to the Graduate School of Social Sciences
in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Sabancı University
July 2021

TUNES FROM A SULTAN'S DIARY: MUSICAL PERFORMANCES AND MUSICIANS IN THE RÛZNÂMES OF MAHMUD I. (R. 1730-1754)

Approved by:

Date of Approval: July 13, 2021

ABSTRACT

TUNES FROM A SULTAN'S DIARY: MUSICAL PERFORMANCES AND MUSICIANS IN THE RÛZNÂMES OF MAHMUD I (R. 1730-1754)

G. HANDE BETÜL ÜNAL

HISTORY M.A. THESIS, JULY 2021

Thesis Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Tülay Artan

Keywords: Mahmud I, Rûznâme, Ottoman Music, Musicians, Eighteenth century

This thesis examines the musical elements in the rûznâmes (the records of the sultan's daily activities) of Mahmud I (r. 1730-1754) who occupied the Ottoman throne for nearly a quarter of a century. The examination foregrounds the question of whether these records provide data on and can be useful in writing the history of Ottoman music. Based on the references to music in these sources, this study contributes to our understanding of Istanbul's musical landscape in the first half of the 18th century. Furthermore, it describes the characteristics of this music and the musical practices of this certain period, along with Ottoman music more generally. The first chapter analyzes musicians' profiles in and around the Ottoman court according to their socio-cultural and occupational backgrounds; officers, artisans, mosque singers, Sufis, and non-Muslims. The following chapter focuses on the music in the rûznâmes. It details of the genres of music and instruments that the sultan listened to, illuminates Mahmud I's musical tastes, and the musical genres and the instruments that were popular in the first half of the 18th century. Finally, the third chapter explores the locations where the musical performances for the sultan took place. It also tries to shed light on Mahmud I's Mevlevî inclinations.

ÖZET

BİR SULTANIN GÜNLÜĞÜNÜNDEN NAĞMELER: I. MAHMUD (1730-54) RÛZNÂMELERİ'NDE MÜZİKLİ EĞLENCELER VE MÜZİSYENLER

G. HANDE BETÜL ÜNAL

TARİH YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ, TEMMUZ 2021

Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Tülay Artan

Anahtar Kelimeler: I. Mahmud, Rûznâme, Osmanlı Müziği, Müzisyenler, 18. Yüzyıl

Bu tez, Osmanlı tahtında yaklaşık çeyrek asır hüküm sürmüş olan I. Mahmud'a (1730-1754) ait rûznâme kayıtlarındaki (hükümdarın günlük faaliyetlerinin kaydedildiği eserler) müziğe dair unsurları incelemektedir. Bu inceleme, söz konusu kayıtların Osmanlı müzik tarihi araştırmaları için kaynak niteliği taşıyıp taşıyamayacağı sorusunu ön plana alır. Bu kaynaklarda müziğe yapılan atıflardan hareketle bu çalışma, 18. Yüzyılın ilk yarısında İstanbul'da dolaşımda olan müziğin ne tür bir müzik olduğunu, bu müziğin niteliğini ve söz konusu dönem ile daha genel olarak Osmanlı müziğindeki müzik pratiklerinin anlaşılmasına katkıda bulunmayı amaçlar. Tezi oluşturan ilk bölüm, Osmanlı sarayında ve çevresinde bulunan müzisyen profillerini sosyo-kültürel ve meslekî arka planları yönünden incelemektedir. Bu açıdan memurlar, zanaatkarlar, cami müzisyenleri, sufiler ve gayrimüslimler gibi çeşitli müzisyen grupları tespit edilmiştir. İkinci bölüm, I. Mahmud rûznâmelerindeki müziğe odaklanır. I. Mahmud'un dinlediği müzik türlerini ve çalgıları detaylandırır, bu sayede sultanın kişisel müzik zevki ile beraber 18. yüzyılın ilk yarısında popüler olan müzik türlerine ve çalgılara da ışık tutar. Son bölüm ise, I. Mahmud için düzenlenen müzik performanslarının gerçekleştiği çeşitli mekanları inceler. Ayrıca, I. Mahmud'un Mevlevî eğilimlerini aydınlatmayı amaçlar.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Tülay Artan, not only for her insightful feedback and critical touch which have prevented me from making logical and historical mistakes, but also for her enduring patience and understanding throughout this process. Also, I would like to thank the members of my thesis defense jury, Merih Erol and Selim Karahasanoğlu who shared their precious comments with me.

Ever since my undergraduate years, the courses I have taken from Y. Hakan Erdem and Ferenc Csirkés at Sabancı University and Cem Behar, İsmail Kara, Berat Açıl, Abdulhamit Kırmızı at Istanbul Şehir University have been fed my interest in the historians' craft and fundamentally shaped my understanding of the discipline. I am especially grateful to Cem Behar, who believed in, supported, advised me to always question the existing assumptions on Ottoman music. I also would like to thank Walter Feldman, who kindly responded to my endless e-mails and questions, and whose studies introduced me to the history of Ottoman music.

Equally, I extend my gratitude to Selman Soydemir, who kindly shared the correct readings of rûznâmes of Mahmud I on several occasions, and to Faruk Yaslıçimen who not only who helped me in editing the quotations in Ottoman Turkish but also encouraged me to study history. I would like to thank Samuel Huckleberry who diligently proofread this thesis and, with his constructive feedback, helped render it into its current form. I would also like to offer my sincere thanks to Bahadır Barut of Sabancı University's Information Center and to Sumru Küçüka (FASS Dean's Office), who patiently and quickly responded to my endless problems during the last three years

My academic journey began at Istanbul Şehir University, where I experienced an inspiring, supportive and vibrant environment. Unfortunately, it was shut down during the writing of this thesis. I am indebted to the whole history faculty at Şehir – with whom I still feel strong bonds which not unlike the strings of a lute that resonate loudly and proudly in my heart.

I am also grateful to my dear friends Betül, Müberra, Neyyire Reyhan, Mesude, and Esra not only for helping me in various phases of this process but also for their friendship. It's because of our connection that I always felt comfortable sharing my

stress and happiness with.

Finally, my greatest thanks go to my family – my parents, my sister, and brother, and two dearest nephews – who have supported me in countless ways throughout my life and showed their understanding towards my emotional ups and downs in this process.

To my mum and dad

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

1. INTRODUCTION

> "[. . .] 18th-century Ottoman music was the most creative period in the whole history of Ottoman/Turkish music, no question. Far more creative than the 19th century, but in Turkey, they talk more about the 19th century simply because we have more documents. This closer in time, but in terms of real creativity, it cannot be compared to the 18th century. In the 18th-century, new and amazing things were happening in every generation, very very unexpected things. We're just beginning to the bottom of it [. . .]" (Feldman 2019a, 51:55-52:23).

These reflections are from a lecture on "leisure in the Ottoman 18th century" given in January 2019 by Walter Feldman, a leading scholar on both Ottoman and Jewish music history. Since, as Feldman pointed out, the 18th century is less documented and perhaps overshadowed by the "long 19th century" in which a set of global changes happened, 18th century musical practices is one of the most understudied areas in history of Ottoman music. However, the aim of this study is not to encompass the whole of 18th century music in all its aspects, but to add to the existing knowledge about early 18th century Ottoman music in the light of a hitherto unused primary source. Feldman's reflections that "new, amazing and unexpected things" happened in this period motivated this inquiry.

Since music is not something tangible by its nature and was rarely written in premodern Islamic societies it is less surprising that there is a shortage of documents in the history of Ottoman music. Consequently, varied and perhaps unusual sources that yield insights about the music of the period, whether they are musical treatises or not, should be consulted. In line with this perspective, I analyzed the contents of Mahmud I's (r. 1730-1754) *rûznâme*s. These are the records of the sultan's daily activities. I took note of all the references to music, musicians and musical performances to understand the characteristics of Ottoman music in the first half of the 18th century. The *rûznâmes* have generally been overlooked as historical sources. As such, this study questions whether these records provide data on and

be useful in writing the history of Ottoman music for the period in question. The boundaries between music in the city and court were not impermeable and were often intertwined. Since my main primary sources are the records of a sultan's daily activities, this study is limited to court practices.

The 18th century and *rûznâme*s are not the only neglected elements that led to the conception of this study. Mahmud I, a sultan who occupied the Ottoman throne for nearly a quarter of a century, is equally neglected as a subject of court studies. In addition to historiographical negligence, he has rarely attracted attention even by prominent scholars in the field of Ottoman musical history, despite the sultan having been a musician himself and a patron of musicians. In contrast, another sultan who was closely associated with music, Selim III (r. 1789-1807), has received substantial attention. Mahmud I's reign and the music in this era can be said to be overshadowed by the reign of his predecessor, Ahmed III (r. 1703-1730) in which courtly arts and culture are believed to have blossomed.[1]

Based on the musical data provided by the *rûznâme*s of Mahmud I, covering almost half of his reign, this study aims to contribute to the understanding of what the music in Istanbul was like in the first half of the 18th century. More specifically, it surveys who the musicians in Mahmud I's court were, takes note of the genres of music and instruments that the sultan listened to. Finally, it explores the locations where the sultan's musical entertainments took place. This survey promises to shed light on the musical practices of this certain period, along with Ottoman music more generally.

Before pursuing the traces of music in the *rûznâme*s of Mahmud I, some background information regarding such as the *rûznâme* as a historical genre, the music of the 18th century, the reign and the *rûznâme*s of Mahmud I, along with his relationship with music as a patron and a musician will help to contextualize and understand make contextualizing and understanding the issues that we will be discussing in the following chapters.

[1] A recently published edited volume, which includes articles on various subjects related to the period of Mahmud I, fills an important gap in the literature: *Gölgelenen Sultan Unutulan Yıllar*, or, in English, "the overshadowed sultan and the forgotten years" (Aynur 2020). For a monograph on the reign of Mahmud I that focusing on mostly the domestic and foreign policies in this era, see: (Kurtaran 2014).

1.1 The *Rûznâme* as a Historical Source

The term *rûznâme*, deriving from Persian, is composed of the words "*rûz*" (day) and "*nâme*" (letter, a written message) – meaning itinerary, journal, diary, daybook, or otherwise the record of daily events.[2] As a genre, the *rûznâme* documented the daily events in several fields, ranging from astronomy to finance. The *rûznâme*s studied in this thesis refer to the journals/court diaries/daybooks in which the daily activities of the sultans are recorded, regardless of the importance of the days or the incidents. The entries were written by personal secretary of sultan, called *kâtib-i esrâr* or *sır kâtibi*, who was among the *ağa*s of *Has Oda* (Privy Chamber) in *Enderûn*. We do not have any proof that the personal secretaries named their works as "*rûznâme*". The notes they kept were either entitled *vekâyi-nâme, vekâyi-i yevmiye, mazbata-i yevmiye, zabt-ı vekâyi-i yevmiyye-i hazret-i cenâb-ı şehriyârî* or had no title at all. As a term, rûznâme was retrospectively applied. Almost all the extant *rûznâme*s are single copies. It has been suggested that these texts consist of scattered notes indicating that they were designed as historical documentation rather than as literary works. However, some *rûznâme* copies, like the one kept by Hıfzî Ağa and compiled in a miscellany together with Hıfzî Ağa's poems written for Mahmud I, are artistically produced manuscripts.[3]

Since there is not much research on the genre of *rûznâme*, we mostly owe our understanding to an encyclopedia entry, written by Fikret Sarıcaoğlu.[4] According to Sarıcaoğlu, in the *rûznâme*s, there are two essential data sets or categories: one is about the sultan's official life, which is explicitly stated, and the other, about his private life articulated in more vague expressions (Sarıcaoğlu 2008, 279). Since *rûznâme*s are official sources and written by personal secretaries of the sultan, it is plausible that these scribes emphasized the official life of the sultan and provided more specific information about official events. In giving some details about the sultan's private life and his tastes – albeit rare – undoubtedly embellishes their value as historical sources.

In some of the *rûznâme*s, the sultan's daily schedule is organized over hours, and,

---

[2]How to translate the word of *rûznâme* into English is problematic. Artan calls them as "journals" (Artan 2019, 23), Karahasanoğlu as "court diaries" by distinguishing from diaries (Karahasanoğlu 2019, 214), and Woodhead as "daybook" (Woodhead, 2012).

[3]I owe this observation to Tülay Artan: Personal communication 30 July 2021. See also: (Aynur and Şen 2019).

[4]For the misuses the term *rûznâme* in a book in which the diary of Seyyid Hasan Muradî (1754-1766) is examined see: (Ahıskalı, 2016).

in others, according to five times of prayer (Sarıcaoğlu 2008, 279).[5] They record and briefly describe activities within (*suriçi*) and outside of the city walls (*surdışı*), places he visited during his pleasure outing (*biniş*)[6] and other places he visited throughout the day (Sarıcaoğlu 2008, 279). Other than places he visited, they documented the sultan's meetings with officials like grand viziers or ambassadors, the ceremonies he had attended – whether they were open to the public (such as Friday greetings [*Cuma selamlığı*], eid festivities or processions) or more intimate. Moreover, the issues concerning the life of the city, such as natural disasters like fires and earthquakes, births and deaths of prominent people, appointments, religious holidays and holy nights, important developments in foreign and domestic policy are usually included. Additionally, the names and locations of the civil, military, and religious architectural works, gardens, and other vacation places where the sultans had been, are mentioned in these accounts. These locations in particular serve as source material for historical topography and Istanbul's urban history (Sarıcaoğlu 2007, 551). Although the prose is often repetitive, and, sometimes, superficial, they provide great amount of information in various fields of study and deserve further inquiry.

The earliest example of these sources is dated to the period of Mahmud I. Even if one of Mahmud I's predecessors had *rûznâme*s as well, such records did not survive. It seems reasonable to start the tradition of writing *rûznâme* with the accession of Mahmud I in 1730. This tradition continued during the reigns of Osman III (r. 1754-1757), Mustafa III (r. 1757-1774), Abdülhamid I (r. 1774-1789), Selim III (r. 1789-1807), and Mustafa IV (r. 1807-1808). This practice sustained, indeed, with some notes belonging to the first years of the reign of Mahmud II (r. 1808-1839). In all, the tradition lasted about eighty years and, for some reason, died out.

Even though the first known example of the *rûznâme* genre was written in the first half of the 18th century, it does not mean that before that there were no historical works that shared similar characteristics with the *rûznâme*s. For instance, the work of Abdurrahman Abdi Ağa (d. 1692), who is known as the first chronicler in charge of recording the daily events by the order of Mehmet IV (r. 1648-1687), was called *vak'âyinâme* by the sultan himself, and it can be regarded as the predecessor of the *rûznâme* tradition. However, the *vak'âyinâme* genre differs from the *rûznâme* genre in that the former was not written about daily events, regardless of their importance; rather, only those events deemed important were recorded (Sarıcaoğlu

[5]These prayer times are *fajr* (sunrise prayer), *dhuhr* (noon prayer), *asr* (afternoon prayer), *maghrib* (sunset prayer), and *isha* (night prayer).

[6]The short-term excursions of the sultans on horseback or by boat. For more information on *biniş*, see: (Özcan 1992).

2008, 278-279). Similarly, in terms of being a permanent state service affiliated to the *Dîvân-ı Hümâyûn*, one can say that the first official chronicler (*vak'ânüvis*) of the Ottoman State was Nâimâ (d. 1716). He wrote about some events, even insignificant ones, in some specific detail, recalling attention to detail within the *rûznâme* genre. It is worth noting that, together with Abdi Ağa and Nâimâ, the formation and institutionalization of history writing (*vak'ânüvislik*) at the Ottoman court from the 18th to 20th centuries show parallels with the emergence of *rûznâme* genre.[7] The formation of the *vak'ânüvislik* into a state service replaced the semi-official court history writing called *şehnâmenüvislik/şehnâmecilik* (Woodhead 2012). The almost simultaneous emergence of the *rûznâmecilik* at the start of the 18th century may reflect the Ottoman court's increased interest in history writing.[8] It may also reflect emerging interests in the personal and ordinary lives of the people (here the sultan), which is the subject of another study.

1.2 The Reign of Mahmud I and the "Pax Ottomanica"

Between 1618 and 1730, the rule of seven out of ten sultans ended in assassination or forced deposition.[9] However, we do not encounter a single case of dethronement from 1730, when Ahmed III was deposed, to the dethronement of Selim III in 1807. The accession of Mahmud I was a result of the forced abdication of his predecessor and uncle, Ahmed III, by a violent rebellion in 1730.[10] Mahmud I's twenty-four year long reign was one of the longest of any Ottoman sultan. This period is generally characterized by wars with Russia, Habsburgs and Iran. Relatedly, he instituted the first Western-inspired military reforms. Sultan Mahmud I, who passed away on December 13, 1754, gave the Ottoman State its last glorious moment in the sun and left a long period of peace to his successors (Özcan 2020, 30).

The first half of the 18th century was dominated by a relatively peaceful and balanced foreign policy. Until the 1760s, there were no serious territorial losses. On the contrary, territories such as the Morea and Caucasia were reconquered. The Ottoman economy experienced growth and flourishing such as maintaining trade re-

[7] Personal communication with Tülay Artan, April 2021.

[8] For the chronology of the reign of Mahmud I based on the chronicles of Subhî, Şemdânizâde, Abdî, İzzî, and Hâkim, see: (Kayar 2020).

[9] These sultans are Mustafa I (r. 1617-1618), Osman II (r. 1618-1622), Mustafa I (r. 1622-1623), İbrahim (r. 1640-1648), Mehmed IV (r. 1648-1687) Mustafa II (r. 1695-1703) and finally Ahmed III (r. 1703-1730).

[10] For more about the 1730 Rebellion, see: (Aktepe 1958; Olson 1974; Karahasanoğlu 2009; and Konrad 2014).

lations with other realms, a rise in agricultural production, improvements in transportation technology, amelioration of roads, and an increase in manufacturing. Population growth, increased urbanization, and the expansion of the middle class paved the way for changing consumption patterns which fostered economic growth. Although by the end of the century the situation started to reverse, it is argued that the Ottoman State was in a fortunate position politically and economically at least in the first half of the century.[11] Baki Tezcan claims this as the formative period of the "Second Empire" between roughly 1580 and 1826, which is an era of political transformation, not as of decline. Furthermore, he considers the 18th century, roughly from 1703 to 1826, as the "golden age" of the Second Empire (Tezcan 2010, 195).[12]

Pointing out a more relaxed domestic atmosphere, Rhoads Murphey called half a century-long period as the "Pax Ottomanica" commencing with the reign of Ahmed III[13] in 1718 and lasted, with brief interruptions, until the outbreak of a series of wars with Russia in 1768 (Murphey 1999, 125). He associates the emerging new forms of cultural expression with the growth of a prosperous bourgeoisie, who could afford a semi-imperial lifestyle (Murphey 1999, 125). The increased urbanization, expansion of the middle class, and the growth of a prosperous bourgeoisie led to the removal of the sultan's and his family's monopoly on artistic and architectural patronage. The proliferation of patronage will be very briefly discussed in Chapter Four, which focuses on musical venues.

In terms of cultural activities and patronage of arts, Mahmud I's reign can be considered as a continuation of the preceding period, the reign of Ahmed III (r. 1703-1730). Just like his predecessor, Mahmud I was also an enterpricing patron of arts. His patronage was predominantly directed towards building book collections and libraries, as well as to architecture. He commanded to build six libraries in Istanbul and various parts of the Empire, to which he donated books. İsmail Erünsal describes Mahmud I's reign as the "golden age" for Ottoman libraries (Erünsal 2008, 57-66).[14] Furthermore, he established a paper mill in Yalova to accompany the

---

[11] For economic developments in the 18th century, see: (Yaycıoğlu 2016, 35-40; Faroqhi 2006, 365-368; Pamuk 2000, 159-170; and Genç 2000, 252-261).

[12] For more information on Tezcan's "Second Empire" thesis and a new periodization attempt of Ottoman history, see: (Tezcan 2010).

[13] For a critical reading of the idea of "Tulip Period" and its development in Modern Turkey, see: (Erimtan 2008); and (Karahasanoğlu 2016).

[14] Although Erünsal has written on this subject before, for his most recently published, revised, and extended study on the libraries of Sultan Mahmud I, the collections of the libraries and collectors, notably the sultan himself, see: (Erünsal 2020).

printing house he had reopened.[15] He initiated the construction of a socio-religious complex, later named Nuruosmaniye – but he would not live long enough to see the final product and the complex was called after his brother, Osman III.[16] Mahmud I was also the patron of many well-known buildings such as Tophâne Fountain, *Tophâne-i Âmire*, and a public bath in Cağaloğlu. He renovated many others, including the Galatasaray complex, which he reestablished as the barracks of young recruits (acemioğlan) who were going to be trained as janissaries or the sultan's *elite* infantry corps. He ensured projects aimed at meeting the water needs of Istanbul continued. The water shortage reached its peak during the reign of Ahmed III. To solve the crisis in Galata and Beyoğlu, a cistern (*taksim/maksem*) was built in the area known as Taksim today.[17] Mahmud I was described by contemporary historians as "*mu'ammir-i bilâd*", meaning "he who restored the cities and kept towns alive" (Özcan 2020, 30). Apart from the (re)constructional activities in Istanbul, he also contributed to the development of arts by supporting artists. His interests in several branches of the arts were often linked to his own practices. During the twenty-seven years he spent in a cage (kafes)[18], he had plenty of time to develop his skills in these fields. It is known that he wrote poems with the penname "Sebkatî", was interested in calligraphy,[19] engraving, and – maybe most of all – in music.

1.3 Mahmud I as a Musician and the Musicians' Patron

In the 17th and 18th centuries, there were a number of sultans interested in music and patronizing musicians; such as Murad IV, Mehmed IV, Mustafa II, Selim III, and Mahmud II. Mahmud I was one of them. We have some knowledge and accounts of Mahmud I's skills and interest in music. The French interpreter (*dragoman*) Charles Fonton (1725-1795?), who spent most of his life in Istanbul and other cities in Ottoman Empire, wrote a treatise in 1751 entitled "Essay Comparing Turk-

[15] For more information on İbrahim Müteferrika, the activities of the Müteferrika printing house during this period, and the books printed there, see: (İhsanoğlu and Aynur 2003); (Babinger 2004); (Sabev 2006); (Sarıcaoğlu and Yılmaz 2008); (Sabev 2020).

[16] Ünver Rüstem's extensive study deals with the building style of imperial mosques in the 18th century Istanbul, see (Rüstem 2019). Also, two studies, one of which deals with the new style of architecture specifically in this period, and the other on the relationship between the architecture in Istanbul and provinces, see: (Rüstem 2020; and Tanman 2020).

[17] For a study examining the Taksim water networks by focusing on the authority and legitimacy of the dynasty and the new sultan who was Mahmud I, see: (Wielemaker 2020).

[18] The cage (*kafes*), also called "*simşirlik*", is where the princes and the deposed sultans were lived in Topkapı Palace after the abolition of the system of sending to the sanjaks, administrative divisions of the Ottoman Empire.

[19] For a study on the characteristics of the art of calligraphy in the period, also see: (Schick 2020).

ish Music to European music".[20] His description of Ottoman music is one of the fundamental sources of information concerning the music and musical life in the first half of 18th-century Istanbul. He gives detailed information on subjects like the origin of "Turkish" music and its founding fathers. He explains the principles of modal music concerning the pitches (*perde*) and rhythmic cycles (*usûl*), performance practices, history and structure of the instruments in use, sometimes together with their visuals. Fonton said of Mahmud I's talent that "I heard that the sultan on the throne who himself a musician, could keep *usûl* (rhythm) with his knees[21] during the musical performances (*huzur fasılları*) and only great musicians can deserve his appreciation" (Behar 2017a, 167).

Mahmud I was very careful about the *makâm*[22] of any song or composition that he heard, and he was able to understand the similarities and nuances between them (Uzunçarşılı 1977, 97). Şeyhülislâm Es'ad Efendi (d. 1753) wrote the first and only biographical dictionary (*tezkire*) of musicians (the *fasıl*[23] composers and vocalists [*hânende*]) of Ottoman around 1730, entitled *Atrâbü'l-Âsâr fî tezkireti urefâi'l-edvâr*.[24] He was dismissed from the *şeyhülislâmlık* position after serving for a short period of time around 1748-49 and was occasionally called by Mahmud I to play the pieces that Es'ad Efendi had composed. It is rumored that he was dismissed due to one of these performances (Uzunçarşılı 2011, 335). Similarly, in his comprehensive article on the musical life in the Ottoman court based on the archival documents, Uzunçarşılı mentions that a song composed by Ahmed Refi' Efendi – a poet, composer, and a companion (*musâhib*) of Mahmud I and his predecessor Ahmed III, who exiled to Edirne for a reason – was heard and appreciated by Mahmud I, and resulted in Ahmed Ref'i Efendi's return to Istanbul from Edirne (Uzunçarşılı 1977, 97).

Kemânî Hızır Ağa (d. 1760?), a court musician and another companion of Mahmud I, compiled a treatise of musical theory entitled *Tefhîmü'l-Makâmât fî Tevlîdi'n-nagâmât* ("The Comprehension on Makâms in the Generation of the Melodies"). Hızır Ağa witnessed the reigns of six sultans from Ahmed III to Selim III, but

[20] The original title of the treatise in French is "Essai sur La Musique Orientale Comparée à La Musique Européenne" and was translated into Turkish by Cem Behar which is included in his book *Musikiden Müziğe* (Behar 2017a, 137-171).

[21] Keeping the rhythm with knees is something that has to be learned before or during to learning process of any kind of instrument or singing in Ottoman music.

[22] *Makâm* (mode) is the major organizing principle of Ottoman (and Near Eastern) music which "can be represented as a musical scale with particular set of compositional rules and practices" (Jackson 2009, 408).

[23] A program of musical pieces all written in the same *makâm* and performed in a certain order.

[24] The transliteration of the *Atrâbü'l-Âsâr* into the Latin alphabet was made by Cem Behar. Together with the text, for a comprehensive analysis on it, see: (Behar 2010).

apparently, he spent his most productive years at the court of Mahmud I (Pekin 2020, 219). He wrote that he played a *peşrev* (an instrumental genre) that he composed in the *makâm* of *vech-i arazbâr* and *usûl* of *müsebba* (both this *makâm* and *usûl* were his inventions) in front of the sultan. He was not only given compliments and many goods as gifts, but also awarded with "a handful of gold" by the sultan, who was very pleased with the invention of a new composition, a new *makâm* and a new *usûl* (Pekin 2020, 219).

Another musician at Mahmud I's court was an Armenian *tanbûr* player named Tanbûri Küçük Artin, also known as Arutin or Harutin. Around 1736, he was assigned to join the suit of the ambassador Mirahor Mustafa Paşa (d. 1756). He went to the Iranian ruler Nader Shah's court in Kandahar, Iran. After spending six years in Iran and travels to India, he returned to Istanbul and wrote an untitled treatise in Ottoman Turkish with Armenian characters on a practical theory of Ottoman music in the 18th century.[25]

The above-mentioned musical treaties written at the time of Mahmud I, or immediately after him, must be the fruits of his interest and support for music and musicians.[26] The compilers of those works were musicians who personally knew Mahmud I, and must be supported morally and materially. No doubt that his encouragement and compliments stimulated the musicians and music writers. These examples, at the same time, reveal Mahmud I's role as a patron of music.

Other than music patronage, Mahmud I was also a practitioner of music, as Fonton stated. Although there is no proof of any of his vocal compositions, we do know several of his instrumental compositions.[27] Almost all of them are either in *peşrev*

[25] For Artin's original text and an in-depth examination of his treatise, see: (Popescu-Judetz 2002).

[26] Even we do not know if he was acquainted with Mahmud I or get his support, a *Mevlevî* musician Kevserî Mustafa Efendi also has a musical theory book (*Kevserî Mecmu'ası*), was written sometime around the mid-18th century, possibly between 1720-40. His work is one the several musical treatises written throughout the 18th century, and an invaluable material in terms of providing hints of the performance practice and compositional style of Ottoman music for the period in question. It includes a set of notations majority of which were copied from Cantemir's collection. But it also gives the notes of 190 pieces from 17th and 18th centuries, that Cantemir did not include in his collection. For detailed explanations of each note in the Kevserî's collection, see: (Ekinci 2016), a critical review of this study accusing the author of the lack of coherent historiographical perspective and method, see: (Behar 2017c), and an article on this source, see: (Ekinci 2012).

[27] These pieces are listed by Uzunçarşılı as follows (Those within the brackets specifies the rhythmic cycle [*usûl*] of the pieces): "Uşşak peşrevi (devr-i kebir), Uşşak saz semaisi (aksak semai), Muhalif Uşşak peşrev (çenber), Muhalif Uşşak saz semaisi, Uşşak darbeyn peşrevi, Karcığar peşrevi (devri [sic] kebir), Karcığar saz semaisi (aksak semai), Şehnaz peşrevi (devr-i kebir-şehsuvar), Şehnaz saz semaisi (aksak semai), Hisar vech-i Şehnaz peşrevi (çenber), Hisar vech-i şehnaz saz semaisi (yörük [sic] semai), Muhayyer peşrevi (tâbdar), Muhayyer saz semaisi, Sultanî Irak peşrevi, Feth-i Bağdad peşrevi, Meclis' efruz peşrevi" (Uzunçarşılı 1977, 98). Different than Uzunçarşılı, Osman Nuri Özpekel mentioned thirty-eight pieces of Mahmud I. These are; Acemaşiran Peşrevi (Devr-i Kebîr), Acemaşiran Saz Semâisi (Aksak Semâi), Ârâm-ı Dil Peşrevi (Berefşan), Ârâm-ı Dil Saz Semâisi (Aksak Semâi), Bayati Peşrevi (Hâvî), Bûselik (Feth-i Bağdad) Saz Semâisi (Aksak Semâi), Dertli Uşşak Peşrevi (Devr-i Kebîr), Dertli Uşşak Saz Semâisi (Aksak Semâi), Dilkeşhâveran Peşrevi (Berefşan), Dilkeşhâveran Saz Semâisi (Aksak Semâi), Evc Peşrevi (Hafif), Evc Peşrevi (Bezm-i Mülûk) (Muhammes), Evc Saz Semâisi (Aksak Semâi), Evc (Bezm-i Mülûk) Saz Semâisi (Aksak Semâi), Feth-i Bağdadi (?), Hicâz (Şehsüvar) Peşrevi (Devr-i Kebîr), Hicâz Saz Semâisi (Aksak

or *saz semâîsi* forms, which shows that he had enough command of music to compose pieces. In addition to composing, he played a *tanbûr*, which was the favorite instrument during the 17th and 18th centuries.[28] Another indicator of his musical knowledge is that he invented a *makâm* in the name of "*ârâm-ı dil*". Although there is no clear evidence that Mahmud I invented this *makâm*, the absence of any other pieces composed in the same *makâm*, other than a *peşrev* and *saz semâîsi* composed by Mahmud I, strengthen the argument that the inventor of *makâm* in question was the sultan himself (Kutluğ 2000, 282). Also, the instruments brought to or made for the sultan are another indicator of Mahmud I's music curiosity. Yirmisekizçelebizade Mehmed Said Efendi (d. 1761), who took on several state positions such as ambassador and grand vizier, recognized Mahmud I's interest in music. He brought a harpsichord (known as *klavsen* or *klavsenk*, an early version of the piano) from France and presented it to the sultan (Uzunçarşılı 1977, 100).[29] Also, Uzunçarşılı wrote about a *tanbûr*, ornamented with gold and diamonds, supposedly ordered for Mahmud I (Uzunçarşılı 1977, 101).

1.4 The *Rûznâme*s of Mahmud I

Since the position of *sır kâtipliği* has been occupied by different secretaries from time to time, there are several journals identified as the "*rûznâme* of Mahmud I". The first record that we have comprises of an almost eleven-month-long period, between 28 September 1730 (15 RA 1143) and 31 August 1731 (27 S 1144)[30], including the last five days of the reign of Ahmed III, who abdicated by force due to a rebellion. The text starts with Mahmud I's enthronement (*cülus*) in 1730 and was kept by the *sır kâtibi* Hıfzî Ağa (d. 1173/1759-60).[31] This *rûznâme* covers less than a year,

---

Semâi), Hicâz-i Irak Peşrevi (Çifte Düyek), Hicâz-i Irak Saz Semâisi (Aksak Semâi), Hisar Vech-i Şehnâz Peşrevi (Çenber), Hisar Vech-i Şehnâz Saz Semaisi (Aksak Semâisi), Karcığar Peşrevi (Devr-i Kebîr), Karcığar Saz Semâisi (Aksak Semâi), Mahabbet-i Uşşak Peşrevi (Çenber), Meclis Efruz Peşrevi (?), Muhayyer "Tab-dâr" Peşrevi (?), Muhayyer "Tab-dâr" Saz, Semâisi (Aksak Semâi), Nevkeş Peşrevi (Çifte Düyek), Nevkeş Saz Semâisi (Aksak Semâi), Nikriz Peşrevi (Çifte Düyek), Nikriz Saz Semâisi (Aksak Semâi – Değişmeli), Sultani Irak Peşrevi (?), Şehnâz (Şehsüvar) Peşrevi (Devr-i Kebîr), Şehnâz Saz Semâisi (Aksak Semâi), Şevkâver Peşrevi (Hafif), Şevkâver Saz Semaisi (Aksak Semâi), Uşşak Peşrevi (Darbeyn), Uşşak Saz, Semâisi (Aksak Semâi) (Özpekel 1999, 618).

[28] Kurtaran states that, he also learned to play the violin well enough to make masters listen to him, without giving a reference (Kurtaran 2012, 13), but I have not come across with this data in any other sources.

[29] The visual of this instrument can be found in the treatise of Hızır Ağa.

[30] The transliteration of the text has prepared by Şükran Çınar as a graduation thesis in Istanbul University in 1974 with the title P*atrona Halil İsyanı'na ve Mahmud I Devrine Âit Tarihçe* (Çınar 1974).

[31] For more information on Hıfzî Ağa and his collection of poems (*şiir mecmu'ası*) written for Mahmud I, see: (Aynur and Şen 2019).

mostly related to the 1730 Rebellion and the deaths of the rebels, making it an important primary source for the rebellion in question.[32] Another *rûznâme* text comprises almost a four-and-a-half-month period (from 20 June 1734/18 M 1147 to 6 November 1734/9 C 1734) which is probably part of a larger text.[33] It was written by *sır kâtibi* Ahmed. At the end of the text, Ahmed informs us that his duty expired, and that his successor was Hıfzî Muhammed/Mehemmed Efendi from the *Has Oda* (Private Chamber), who is also the author of 1731 *rûznâme*. The records from 24 May 1735 to 10 September 1738 were kept by Hıfzî, until he handed his duties over to Salâhî on 12 June 1738. After serving for two years, Salâhî was succeeded by Kadı Ömer Ağa on 17 September 1740. Kadı Ömer Ağa kept the *rûznâme* for ten years until 1750; these records are almost entirely complete.[34]

Hence, we have an almost uninterrupted series of records of a decade of the reign of Mahmud I from 1740 to 1750, as well as the scattered notes from 1730-31 and 1734.[35] Since the *rûznâme*s from 1731-1733 and 1734-1740 appear to be missing, the *rûznâme*s from 1731, 1734 and between 1740-1750 are examined in this study. With the exception of the 1734 *rûznâme*, all other *rûznâme* texts are transliterated into Latin alphabet as graduation theses at Istanbul University in 1960s and 1970s. As I only have access to these transliterations, and given that these texts are rife with mistakes of various sorts, I have decided to correct the minor typos that I took note of, but I did not have the opportunity to check with the original manuscripts. Hence my reservations are indicated by "[?]". I have transcribed only the *rûznâme* of 1734. All mistakes regarding this text are solely mine.[36]

Although the sultan's daily affairs are generally told in a detailed manner, one should bear in mind that they are state documents written by official scribes. Expecting these scribes to tell how things really happened, much less secrets would be unrealis-

---

[32] Hakan Yılmaz argues that this *rûznâme* text has another copy in a *mecmu'a* (pamphlet) located in the library of Belgrade University, and provides an image of the first pages of this second copy (Yılmaz, 2018).

[33] The *rûznâme* of 1734 was introduced by a study by Efgan Uzun in 2013 (Uzun 2013). However, Uzun preferred to introduce the text he discovered to those who are interested in, rather than examining it in depth.

[34] The transliteration of the text of Ömer Ağa was prepared as graduation thesis at Istanbul University, see: (Özcan 1965); (Oral 1966); and (Bayrak 1972).

[35] Apart from these texts, there is also another one written by Köprülüzâde Hafız Ahmed Efendi, dated 1731-32, which includes the 1730 Rebellion and the events that followed. It was identified by Selim Karahasanoğlu, which was entitled as "Patron Halil Rebellion" in the catalogue (Karahasanoğlu 2009a, 173). Hakan Yılmaz, on the other hand, claims that it is a *rûznâme* (Yılmaz 2015). Also, for another description of the several days in the first two months of 1730 rebellion, see: (İlhan, 2012).

[36] (DABOA.TS.MA.d.10732. 18 M 1147 / 20 June 1734-09 C 1147 / 6 November 1734) In June 2021, when this thesis had already been completed, the transliterated text of 1734 *rûznâme* is published by Kaan Doğan (Doğan 2021).

tic.[37] In other words, *rûznâme* texts are very different than personal diaries. As with other documents produced by the imperial court, looking out for the interest of the sultan and state is part of their nature. There must be many topics that *rûznâmeci*s did not write about. In this respect, it would not be wrong to suggest that these scribes played a sensory role determining what was to be recorded, or not. In any case, concentrating on what we have will manifest a no less useful understanding of the Ottoman musical world in the early 18th century.

Mahmud I's *rûznâme* was written neither eloquently nor vernacularly, but rather in a literary language in prose style that one can easily understand. When we look at the content of the *rûznâme*, we can see that sultan's daily activities are sometimes very detailed and sometimes just repeat a formula. Partly because of the changeability of his program, some days are reported with every detail giving time slots in accord with the five prayer times of the day. Others report that he stayed at his palace and took a rest or went to somewhere and then returned.

The sultan's daily activities are quite routine. He was evidently always on the move, as he left Topkapı Palace, or wherever he stays at that time, to the pavilions, kiosks, or gardens either dependent of Topkapı and it's around, or to those in the shores of Bosphorus, in Golden Horn or in the vicinity of Istanbul every day. He busied himself with watching horse races, *cirid* competitions, gunshot practices, swimming and running competitions, *tomak*, hunting, passing ships and boats[38] or musical performances. Before, after, or during these entertainments, which usually lasted until afternoon (*'asr*), Mahmud I grazed drank coffee before returning to the place where he was staying. We also get a flavor for where he performed his prayer (salaat) during these trips. One-day excursions are called "*biniş*" (*biniş-i hümâyûn* or *biniş-i saltanat*) and were made via boats or on horseback, depending on where he went.

Although it provides Mahmud I's daily routine program in a pretty standard way, we can also learn interesting (and sometimes funny) details, and nuances related to his personal taste. These accounts tell us when he caught cold, for example, or the fact that he liked cherries. We also learn about a mute (or supposed to be mute) *bî-zebân* Hasan Ağa, who burst out when he saw a snake. Equally, there are references to a person, Gül Muhammed/Mehemmed, who was so talented in preparing *baklava*[39] that he prepared some for Mahmud I and was rewarded with

[37] Even some major events such as 1740 Rebellion, are missing from the *rûznâme*s of Mahmud I.

[38] For a comprehensive analysis of Mahmud I's passing ships and boats, see: (Artan 2020).

[39] *Baklava* is a very sweet dessert made of layers of flaky pastry filled with nuts or pistachios.

gold coins (*zer-i mahbûb*) as a result of the sultan's enjoyment.[40]

1.5 Music in the *Rûznâme*s of Mahmud I

One of the most mentioned activities in the *rûznâme*s are Mahmud I's one-day excursions, which included musical performances in the various places he visited. Generally, even though most of these performances reveal that "he spent time with music and had fun",[41] they also provide concrete details such as the names of the musicians and instruments. They describe the kind of music he listened to and where the musical gatherings took place.

Selman Benlioğlu's studies on the *rûznâme* of Selim III, the late 18th century sultan also known for his interest in music, spotlight the absence of studies devoted to the *rûznâme*s of Mahmûd I. In his dissertation (later published as a book) focusing on musical patronage during Selim III's and Mahmud II's reigns, Benlioğlu made use of *Letâif-i Vekâyi-i Enderûniye* of Hafız Hızır İlyas Ağa (d. 1864) for the reign of Mahmud II and the *rûznâme* of Selim III. The latter was kept by *sır kâtibi* Ahmed Efendi and allowed Benlioğlu to identify the musical elements in the courts of Mahmud II and Selim III, respectively (Benlioğlu 2017). Benlioğlu's other studies on Selim III's affiliation with *Mevlevî* order in the light of Sufi ceremonies (*âyin*) (Benlioğlu 2018) and his visits to Sufi lodges (Benlioğlu 2019) are based on the *rûznâme* of Selim III. Moreover, although not entirely devoted to music, Tülay Artan's studies of the *rûznâme*s of Mahmud I are one of the main sources of inspiration of this study. By making use of the *rûznâme*s, she analyzes the changing culture of entertainment on the shores of Bosphorus in the early 18th century, she pays special attention to the terms "contemplation" (*temâşâ*) and "amusement" (*tevakkuf*).[42]

---

[40] These examples are from the *rûznâme* of 1734.

[41] Some of these expressions: *fasl-ı mûsikî ile emrâr-ı vakt, bir iki saz ile ârâm, musiki fasıllarıyle eğlenilüp, fasl ve âğâze ile evkat-güzâr, hânendegân ve sâzendegân ile emrâr-ı vakt olunup, ba'zı saz ve âğâze ile eğlenilüp, istima'-ı saz ve ba'zı fasl ile eğlenilüp...*

[42] See: (Artan 1989; Artan 2019; Artan 2020).

1.6 Music of the early 18th century and "Locally Generated Modernity"

Before elaborating on music in the *rûznâme*s of Mahmud I, it would be useful to briefly look at early 18th century music and what has already been written in the present literature about the culture and style of this music in this period. Although the concept of "periodization" itself can be misleading and artificial most of the time, there are numerous attempts to periodize the history of Ottoman music. These attempts may shed light on where we locate the music of the early 18th century in the general picture of Ottoman music. For our purpose, it is not necessary to mention all these attempts,[43] but rather the most conspicuous ones. For instance, in his 1996 book, Walter Feldman, divided the history of Ottoman music into roughly five periods:

Table 1.1 Walter Feldman's Periodization of Ottoman Music (Feldman 1996, 36).

Date	Period
1350-1450	Late Medieval Era
1450-1580	Transitional Era
1580-1780	Early Modern Era
1780-1923	Modern Era
1923-…	"Turkish Classical Music"

[43] In his article, Hasan Baran Fırat discusses the periodization issue in Ottoman music studies, from a structuralist view, and debates on it in comparison with the periodization problems and suggestions in the larger historiography. For an expository review on the subject, see: (Fırat 2019).

According to this periodization, Feldman claimed that what is known as the music in the Ottoman lands, mainly in Istanbul, was under the dominance of Arab and mainly "Persianate" musical cultures until the 16th century from which there are few documentations left. As the Ottomans took the Herati court of the Timurid ruler Sultan Husayn Bayqara (r. 1470-1506) as a model for the royal patronage. Examining the *Baburnâme* in which the life of Sultan Bayqara also included, Feldman claims that in the late 15th and early 16th centuries (what he called as "Transitional Era"), court music in Istanbul continued the repertoires and style of Herat,[44] despite there are some differences between these two (Feldman 1996, 39-44). He asserts that much of the Ottoman musical culture in Istanbul created roughly between 1550 and 1750 (Feldman 1996, 20) belongs to what he terms as the "Early Modern Era" of music. It was during this time when a distinctly "Ottoman" style of music proliferated and what Feldman examined in his book. The later 16th and early 17th centuries constitute a time of transformation that lasted until the mid/late 18th century. Most of what we know about Ottoman music can be dated back to this period. Music before this era is largely based on scant data buttressed by speculation. In terms of style and structure, "the main areas of this musical change consisted of 1) musical genre 2) cyclical performance (*fasıl*) 3) primary and secondary or compound modal entities (*makâm/terkîb*) 4) codified melodic progression (*seyir*), modulation and the improvised *taksîm* 5) rhythmic cycle (*usûl*), tempo, melodic density 6) compositional style and 7) instrumentation" (Feldman 1996, 23).[45] According to Feldman, even though the beginning of this transformation was noticeable towards the end of the 16th century and there were important structural changes in the 17th century, but what constitutes a "great change" took place in the next century. This means that the beginning and end of the 18th century – from Cantemir's generation until the reign of Selim III – shows evident structural and stylistic changes in the course of Ottoman music (Feldman 1996, 24). Following the "Early Modern Era", Feldman called the period from the late 18th century until the Republican Era (officially initiated in 1923) as the "Modern Era". In this period, notation became prevalent which was also an outcome of the rise of printing activities and efforts to draw Ottoman music towards Western music. By 1923, Ottoman music was not "Ottoman" anymore since the regime and name of the state has changed. The musical culture inherited from the Ottomans in this period – what Feldman called "Turkish Classical Music" – was maintained to be produced in some way but was much affected by the ideological orientation of the time, which is a subject of another study.

---

[44] According to the data provided by *Baburnâme*, Feldman summarized the features of the music at Herati court, see: (Feldman 1996, 44).

[45] For a very brief but more explanatory description of the afore-mentioned stylistic change, see: (Feldman 2015, 98).

The study of Owen Wright, one of the most leading scholars in the musicological studies of the Near and Middle East, corresponds closely to Feldman's periodization (Wright 1992a). Wright wanted to capture a clearer picture between Ottoman music in the 17th (what he called "later Ottoman tradition") and the preceding centuries ("earlier court-music repertoire" or "antecedent tradition" he called). To do so, he compared the song-text collection (*güfte mecmu'ası*)[46] of Hafız Post[47] (d. 1694) with three anonymous and undated song-text collections of the 15th and 16th centuries. After examining these materials meticulously, he concluded that during the third quarter of the 16th century, the repertoire of the earlier court music had disappeared and the process of evolution into an indigenous Ottoman crystalized during the second half of the 17th century. He claims that with the exception of a few musical pieces from the early court music repertoire rather than just radical changes in formal, modal, and rhythmic structures in than pre-17th century music, early court music repertoire has vanished by that time. This means that "the basis of present-day classical music in Turkey can be traced back no further than the early 17th century" (Wright 1992a, 284-5). Apart from an almost total break with Persianate repertoires and genres, in terms of "sociological axis" Wright emphasizes the dissimilarity in the language of music and musicians between the collection of Hafız Post and antecedent collections that he analyzed in detail. This manifests the characteristic differences between these two traditions. In the *Hafız Post Mecmu'ası*, the great majority of the lyrics are in Ottoman Turkish, whereas in the other anthologies Persian or Arabic language predominates. Likewise, by looking at the composers' names documented in these sources with the help of different biographical sources (such as *tezkire*s) Wright found out that the great majority of the composers in the treatise of Hafız Post has "Turkish" origins, most of whom located in Istanbul. Also, some of these composers are from different cities of Anatolia such as Edirne, Bursa, Gelibolu, Diyarbakır as well as Salonica in the Balkans. In contrast, the names and *nisba*s (attributions) of the composers in the antecedent collections suggest that they were from different parts of Southwest Asia and North Africa, such as the cities of Egypt, Baghdad, and Tabriz (Wright 1992a, 16-19). Moreover, he adds that while the musicians in the earlier sources were professional musicians trained in the court and dependent on the patronage relations of the court, few of those mentioned in the *mecmu'a* of Hafız Post relied on the court to find patronage. In this respect, they cannot be regarded as professional musicians who were confined to the court, but they also participated in the process of music-making in the city (Wright 1992a,

[46]The genre of *güfte mecmuâsı* is poetic text collection comprises the texts of vocal pieces, their *makâm*s, *usûl*s, composers of the pieces, and sometimes names of poets.

[47]Hafız Post is a well-known composer, singer, and *tanbûr* player in the 17th century. Transcription of the *Hafız Post Mecmu'ası* into Latin has done by Nilgün Doğrusöz, see: (Doğrusöz 1993).

285).

In his more recent work, Feldman revisited his previous views on the periodization, and extended the scope of the "Early Modern Era" to the so-called “transformation” period. By looking at the differences between two foundational sources for the history of Ottoman music for the 17th and early-18th centuries, namely Ali Ufkî/Bobowski's (d. 1675?)[48] and Prince Dimitrie Cantemir's (d. 1723)[49] treatises, Feldman estimates that something must have changed between Ali Ufkî and Cantemir, between whom there is about half a century long interval (Feldman 2015). As the first treatise was written at beginning of the 17th century and another one at the end, Feldman thinks that the last third of the 17th century represents a stylistic break with the past which continued until the early 19th century. According to Feldman, Ali Ufkî's notational collection represents “a transitional stage between the decline of earlier, generally Persianate courtly repertoire, and the emergence of a distinctly Ottoman musical style between roughly 1670 and 1800" (Feldman 2015, 94). Although the second stage's basic technical and broader aesthetic features was based on earlier examples, Feldman thinks that the most rapid change in the history of Ottoman music appears in this interval, between 1670-1800 (Feldman 2015, 94). He claims that around the mid-1600s, when Ali Ufkî wrote his treatise, musical culture had a transitional character that creative musical ideas were inchoate form at that time. Yet, in the second half of the 17th century, music in Istanbul witnessed several shifts which solidified. A few included the integration of the vocal repertoire, originating in later 16th and early 17th century Iran, into the music of Istanbul as well as the development of new compositional principles (Feldman 2015, 138). This process appears to have completed by the turn of the 18th century. Cantemir's contemporary remark that "the art of music, almost forgot" (Cantemir 1734, 151), by referring to the music of a generation before him in the Ottoman capital that his teachers performed. Feldman calls this era, from the beginning to the last third of the 18th century, the “first classical age” of Ottoman music or a local musical “renaissance” (Feldman 2015, 138) in which “the new repertoire and performance practices had come into secure existence, and music was rather well supported” (Feldman 2015, 98). This era began through aristocratic Muslims and *Mevlevî* dervish musicians as well as the Ottoman court (Feldman, 2019, 175). This “local musical renaissance” was documented by Cantemir, the Mevlevî Osman Dede

[48] Ali Ufkî was a musician, translator and dragoman with Polish origin who came to Istanbul as a war captive and served as singer in the Ottoman Palace for about ten years. The musical treatise of Ali Ufkî was entitled *Mecmu'a-i Sâz ü Söz*. For the transliterated text of *Mecmu'a-i Sâz ü Söz*, see: (Cevher, 1995).

[49] Prince Dimitrie Cantemir was a Moldavian prince, musician and Ottoman historian who came to Istanbul as a hostage and stayed there for more than twenty years. Cantemir's music theory book entitled *Kitâbu İlmü'l-Mûsikî alâ Vechi'l-Hurûfât*. For the English transliteration of Cantemir's magnum opus, see: (Wright, 1992b), and for the Ottoman transliteration, see: (Tura, 2001). Also, for monographs on Cantemir and his treatise, see: (Popescu-Judetz 1999); and (Behar 2017b).

(d. 1730) and several Greek musicians and church cantors, such as Panagiotis Chalathzoglou (d. 1748), Kyrillos Marmarinos (d. 1756)[50] and Petros Peloponnesios (d. 1778)[51]. For our purpose, Feldman's summative remarks on the importance and characteristics of 18th-century music worth quoting:

> "By Cantemir's generation, the Ottoman court had become a great center of patronage for music, especially during the famous Tulip Period, ending in 1730. Most of the 18th century saw the continuation of this lively patronage for music, which indeed led to the most rapid and varied developments in the entire history of Ottoman music. We know of a great many composers, some of whom also wrote treatises in the Turkish, Armeno-Turkish, and Greek languages. Both the practice of, and the discourse about, music become far livelier than in the previous two centuries, and for the first time, both involved all of the urban communities in the major Ottoman cities, including the non-Muslims" (Feldman 1996, 126-7).

Feldman made use of relatively recent works in Ottoman studies to criticize the argument that modernization by the "West" in the Ottoman Empire took place between the age of Ahmed III and the Tanzimat era. He employed the preeminent historian Rifa'at Abou-El-Haj's term "locally generated modernity" (Abou-El-Haj 2005) to describe the music of the 18th century, referring to the internal drivers for this change (Feldman 2019b, 61). Ottoman efforts to approach Western music can be traced back to the end of the 18th century that is, to the reign of Selim III at the earliest (Behar 2010, 140). The best word to describe this "locally generated modernity" may be the concept of "fusion". This fusion is characterized by some indicators, such as the blurring the boundaries between sacred and secular styles of music, an increased non-Muslim participation in many areas of Ottoman life (Feldman 1996, 61). Moreover, this included deep interactions between Muslim (*Mevlevî* dervishes) and non-Muslim (mostly Greek elite) musicians (Feldman 2019b, 179).

Along with Wright and Feldman, Cem Behar is another noted contributor to the field of Ottoman music history. Behar also claims that the musical tradition of the Ottoman State can be traced back to the second half of the 16th century at the earliest. The period between 1550s and early 17th century constitutes a breaking point between medieval Arab and Persian (mostly Persian) musical traditions and the

---

[50] Eugenia Popescu-Judetz analyzes the texts of Chalathzoglu and Marmarinos comparatively in one of her books, see: (Popescu-Judetz 2000).

[51] A study on Petros and Post-Byzantine music manuscripts, see: (Kalaitzidis 2015).

formation of a unique Ottoman imperial synthesis (Behar 2015, 13).[52] In his book about Şeyhülislam Es'ad Efendi's biographical dictionary (*tezkire*), *Atrâbü'l-Âsâr*, Behar certifies Feldman's and Wright's claims of a new, indigenous, full-fledged musical culture peculiar to the Ottomans. Music in the Ottoman style (*tarz-ı Osmânî*) formed in the early 18th century. Es'ad Efendi and his contemporaries (like Hızır Ağa and Cantemir) was aware of this sharp contrast between "old" (*mütekaddimîn*) and "new" in theory and practice (Behar 2017a, 61-73). In this respect, Es'ad Efendi represents a break from the previous musical tradition, which manifested itself in the venues that music was produced. Musical genres, terminology, the status of musicians and their relationship with society, language, and in the main elements of musical expression (*makâm*s and *usûl*s) formed around this basis.

All these views say almost the same thing. In a nutshell, despite some slight differences, the prevailing argument in the current literature suggests that although there is continuity, numerous sources allow us to talk about a transformation in Ottoman musical culture. Even though the possible causes are understudied, it is evident that this change became apparent as early as the second half of the 16th and the early 17th centuries. By the early 18th century, this process had completed, and Ottoman music reached a distinctly characteristic stage. That is to say, by the reign of Mahmud I – whose reign is the focus of this study – the Ottoman musical tradition in the capital in particular had already evolved which was recognizably "Ottoman".

1.7 Thesis Outline

Based on the information on music provided by the *rûznâme*s of Mahmud I, this thesis devotes a chapter for each of the three main aspects: musicians, genres and instruments, and the venues where performances took place. The chapter following the introduction chapter, will analyze musicians' profiles in and around the Ottoman court. Although they are not generally mentioned by name, the names, or affiliations of a considerable number of individuals, who were directly or indirectly associated with music are also given. According to their socio-cultural and occupational backgrounds, these individuals will be classified in this chapter. By doing this, I aim to get a cross-sectional view of the musicians in Mahmud I's court.

[52] For a brief history of Ottoman music of which many components are discussed by Behar, see: (Behar 2015, 13-40), and a recent attempt by him intended to understand the possible underlying social and historical reasons of this change, see: (Behar 2020).

In the next chapter, I focus on the music in the *rûznâme*s. The purpose of the this chapter is twofold. On the one hand, it examines musical genres (also known as forms) that Mahmud I preferred. In this regard, as much as is possible, I assess Mahmud I's musical tastes. On the other hand, the chapter focuses on the instruments; the instruments of *mehterhâne* and of chamber music in particular. In this way, we can get an idea of the musical genres and the instruments that were popular in the first half of the 18th century around the palace. Furthermore, we will be able to test whether they parallel present literature.

The final chapter focuses on the venues where musical performances took place and that Mahmud I attended. According to either their location or owners, these places are examined in categories. This not only tells us about Mahmud I's preferred venues, but also gives an idea of his favorite places in summers and winters. Finally, I discuss the frequency of Mahmud I's *Mevlevî* lodge visits and the possibility of his being a *Mevlevî* follower.

2. MUSICIANS OF THE *RÛZNÂME*S

This chapter examines the musicians' profile around the palace and sultan based on the information provided by the *rûznâme*s of Mahmud I. In line with this purpose, I try to categorize the musicians identified in the *rûznâme*s according to their socio-cultural and occupational backgrounds (see: Table 2.2). Of course, it should be noted that these categories overlap. For instance, a person who specializes in a religious branch can also be a bureaucrat in the palace, or someone who has an artisanal origin can also be part of a Sufi network and maintain his music activities there. Therefore, this is a factor that makes the categorization difficult. Despite this difficulty, in order to be able to see the patterns, the most sensible classification possible will be made, and any overlapping of socio-cultural layers will be pointed out.

2.1 Musicians in the Palace Service

The first musician group that *rûznâme*s of Mahmud I referred to were officers in the palace service. Almost half of those associated with music directly or indirectly in the *rûznâme*s served in various positions in the Ottoman Palace. Several singers and instrumentalists registered in the court are said to have entertained Mahmud I. However, since most of their names and their instruments are unknown, in this chapter I instead focus on those who are described more fully.

2.1.1 Commissary (*kilâr*)

The first individual in the palace service affiliated with music is a member of Commissary (*kilâr*) – one of the chambers in the *Enderûn* – by the name of Ali. On 4 February 1731 (26 B 1143), Mahmud I performed the evening prayer in the *hırka-i*

şerîf section of the Topkapı Palace and listened to a Qur'ânic recitation by Ali Bey.[1] When the recitation was completed (*hatm-i şerîf*), a preacher (*hoca efendi*) named Üstazi-zâde Abdullah Efendi made the *duâ* (prayer of supplication). Mahmud I gifted a half purse of coins for Ali Bey and a full purse for Abdullah Efendi as a way of showing his appreciation.[2] Ali Bey can give us an idea about one of the musician profiles in the palace. Since he was reciting the Qur'ân, he must have a beautiful voice and *makâm*[3] knowledge to some degree, meaning that he must be engaged with music.[4] We do not know much about Abdullah Efendi other than he was a "*hoca*" (preacher), but he does not have to be related to music. The reason for letting him to make the *duâ* may only be because he was a respected person. Unlike Qur'ân recitation, there is no obligation as having a beautiful voice for making a prayer.

Ottoman rulers visited the *hırka-i şerîf* section of the palace on special days and holy nights. Besides, the *rûznâme*s reveal that Mahmud I visited the *hırka-i şerîf* section of the palace, that is the former Privy Chamber (*Has Oda*), after almost every divan (official affairs of state) meeting.[5] When the *divan* concluded, he performed the prayer, made his *duâ*, and left. Nevertheless, no detail has been given regarding the day in question whether it was a special one. It was neither the day of a *divan*, nor a Friday (for the *hutbe* prayer), an eid day or one of the five Islamic holy nights (*kandîl*). This was a random visit, possibly without any special occasion. At first glance, it may appear that this reference is not related to music directly; however, the statement that Ali Bey is from "Commissary" and most probably a *hâfız* (one who memorized the Qur'ân) gives us clues about his affiliation with music.

Another musician registered in the Commissary is a *muezzin* (the person who calls

---

[1] The evening of 26 Şaban (27 Şaban) is the night of *mi'râc* (Prophet Muhammad's ascension). Therefore, the *mi'râciyye*, which is customary to be read on this holy night, may have been read despite not being mentioned.

[2] *Hezâr-ahsenet ve sad-bârekallâh mâh-ı mezbûrun yirmi altıncı ahad gecesi salât-ı magribi Hırka-i Şerîfe odasında edâ ve ba'dehû kilâr-ı âmireden Ali Bey kullarının sab'a ile hatm-i şerîf tilâvetini istima' ve ba'de'l-hatm Üstâzî-zâde Abdullâh Efendi duâsı tamâmında bir kese hoca efendiye ve nısf kese sâhib-i hatm beye ihsân-ı hümâyûn oldu.* (Çınar 1974, 31).

[3] Makâm (mode) is the major organizing principle of Ottoman (and Near Eastern) music which "can be represented as a musical scale with particular set of compositional rules and practices" (Jackson 408)

[4] The following contemporary reference about Hâfız Mustafa Efendi's artfully reading of the Qur'ân, reveals the connection between reading the Qur'ân and having a beautiful voice is noteworthy: *Hâlâ İmâm-ı Evvel-i Sultânî Sarmısakcı-zâde Hâfız Mustafa Efendi mücevvid, hoş-elhân ve nağme-serây-ı andelîb-i gülşen-i Kur'ân olmak hasebiyle makâm-ı imâmetde mazhar-ı ikrâm* [...] (İzzî Efendi 2019, 520).

[5] The *hırka-i şerîf odası* (or *hırka-i saâdet dairesi*) is a place where the Prophet Mohammed's cloak (*hırka-i şerîf*) is preserved, located in the Chamber of the Holy Relicts (*Kutsal Emanetler*) inside the Privy Chamber (*Has Oda*). Doubtlessly, *hırka-i şerîf* was the most important item among Holy Relicts. Chamber of the Holy Relicts was one of the most important rooms of pray and ceremony since the time of Murad III (1574-1595). Accessions of sultans and princess marriages were held here, visiting this room before going to the campaigns was a tradition, and prayers made on various occasions and Qur'ân recitations on Friday nights took place here.

Muslims to prayer) named Ali. On 2 August 1734 (2 RA 1147), Sultan Mahmud I went to the canopy tent (*sâyebân*) pitched at Büyük Çamlıca Hill of Üsküdar. While having a good time with his boon companions (*musâhibân*), a man who is one of the halberdiers (*teberdârân*) of the Old Palace (*Saray-ı Atîk*) and *muezzin* of the chief harem eunuch (*dârü's-saâde ağası*)[6] went to the sultan and sung some pieces from *makâm segâh*. He also recited the mid-afternoon *ezân* (adhan). Mahmud I, pleased with Ali's performance, appointed him to the Commissary.[7]

These two references, indicating that both Alis were affiliated with Commissary, recall the musicians in the *Atrâbü'l-Âsâr* – a biographical dictionary of musicians from the early 18th century by Şeyhülislam Es'ad Efendi – who were also registered in the Commissary. For instance, Es'ad Efendi writes that the prominent musician Enfî Hasan Ağa (d. 1724) entered the Commissary at the beginning of Ahmed III's reign and was trained by music masters there.[8] Similarly, Kara İsmail Ağa (d. 1723/24), after receiving vocal training, was promoted to the highest level of *Enderûn* – which is the *Has Oda* (Privy Chamber), as one of the *muezzin*s of the sultan.[9] Another well-known composer of the time of Ahmed III, Ebûbekir Ağa (d. 1750?)[10], the *ser-hânende* (chief singer) and music teacher in the *Enderûn* was also registered in Commissary.[11] İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, in his leading article in which he examined the musical life in the Ottoman court based on payment documents, stated that a document dated 1137/1724 shows musicians named Tanbûrî Ahmed, Kânûnî Mehmed and Düdükçü (player of the *musikar*) Ali were registered in the Commissary.[12] Each were given thirty-three *kuruş*, forty coins (*akçe*). In another document dated 1731, Kânûnî Mehmed Çavuş who was on a salary in the Commis-

---

[6]The chief harem eunuch in question must be Hacı Beşir Ağa (d. 1746) who stayed at this position for twenty-nine years, between 1717 and 1746. For a monograph on him, see: (Hathaway 2014).

[7][...] *esnâ -yı mükâlemede teberdârân-ı sarây-ı 'atîkden dârü's-sa'âde ağâsı mü'ezzini 'Ali dârü's-sa'âde ağâsı ta'rîfiyle huzûr-ı hümâyûna getürdilüp mûsikîden bir fasl-ı segâh idüp hayli nâzik edâsı olup ve salût-ı 'asrda dahi eyledügi mü'ezzinligi pesendîde-i hümâyûn olmağla kilâr-ı Enderûn-ı hümâyûna çerâğ olundı* (DABOA.TS.MA.d.10732..., 7a).

[8][...] *evâ'il-i saltanat-ı 'âlî-hazret-i şehriyâr-ı gerdûn-haşmetde Enderûn-ı hümâyûn hânelerinden kilâre idhâl ile ney-şekker-i zebân-ı şehd-i sürûd-efşânı dimâğ-ı irfânına izâkâ-bahş-ı çâşni-i kand-ı elhân olmağla mevcûd olan esâtiz-i 'ilm-i musıkiden ahz-ı ma'lûmât ile hâiz-i kasabü's-sabak-ı kemâlât olup* [...] (Behar 2010, 240).

[9][...] *Henüz mâh-tâb-ı zât-ı ma'ârif-me'âbı müstefiz-i tâb-ı mihr-i şebâb iken devr-i merhûm Sultan Mustafa Hân'da nefes-i halâvet-resine binâen zümre-i teberdârân-ı hassaya çırağ ba'dehu Enderûn-ı Hümâyûnda hâne-i kilâra idhâl ile mürebba'-yı sadâ-yı lezzetpeymâsı şehd-i şirin-âsâ şeker-efzâ olmağın hâne-i hâssa tahsis ve anda hizmet-i te'zine me'zun olmuşdur* [...] (Behar 2010, 229).

[10]Harun Korkmaz noted that the date of death of Ebûbekir Ağa is not clear, the only thing that is known is that he died in 1750s (Korkmaz 2020a, 212). In the same article, Korkmaz introduced a *fasıl mecmu'a* compiled by Ebûbekir Ağa.

[11][...] *Serhengân-ı ma'arif-gerân-ı Enderûn-ı hümâyûndan hâne-i kilâr agayânından olup nitâk-ı zerrin-tâk-i sa'y-ı mezâkın meyân-beste-i cehd ü iz'ân ve hâle-gâh-ı ihtimâmda çevgân-ı gûşişin rübûde-kâr-ı 'ilm-i elhân itmeğin ser-ma'arif-perverî-i zîver-yâb-ı cîga-i istihsân olmuşdur* [...] (Behar 2010, 227).

[12]"*kiler odasına çırağ olan*"

sary, also given a large number of dresses and precious fabrics (Uzunçarşılı 1977, 94); and in the time of Mustafa III (r. 1757-1774), Tanbûrî Osman Ağa who was rewarded with clothes and money was from the Commissary (Uzunçarşılı 1977, 98). Apart from those, there are many other musicians whom we are not able to mention registered in the Commissary along with the Chambers of Treasury (*Hazine Odası*) or Expeditionary Force (*Seferli Odası*) of the *Enderûn*.

Kilâr was one of the seven departments of *Enderûn*[13] (in which the pages [*içoğlans*][14] were trained) where food and beverage materials of the palace were stored, as well as serving food to the sultan was the duty of this department. Before the 17th century, for the training of the talented pages of *Enderûn*, the Large and Small Chambers were used. In the 17th century, Murad IV (r. 1623-1640) allocated the Chamber of Expeditionary Force for this purpose. Until the opening of a music room, a *meşkhâne*, in the Chamber of Expeditionary Force around the 1630s, there was no particular place in the palace where pages could get musical training and musicians could practice (Necipoğlu 1991, 125). According to Ali Ufkî -Polish musician, translator and writer who lived at the Topkapı Palace in the 17th century, this room remained open all day long and instrument teachers came from outside of the palace to give lessons to the pages (Ali Ufkî 2013, 48).[15] Music teachers of the pages could be appointed from among the musicians registered in Commissary, Treasury, or Privy Chambers. They could also be brought from out of the palace and paid on a monthly basis (Uzunçarşılı 1977, 87). Although the Commissary became the center of music education for pages in the 17th century, why were so many musicians who were not of *devşirme* origin -such as Enfî Hasan Ağa, Kara İsmail Ağa, Ebûbekir Ağa[16] and possibly both of our musicians named Ali, registered, and put on a salary in the *Enderûn*, along with Treasury and Chamber of Expeditionary Force?

Walter Feldman explains this phenomenon through his theory of the "bureaucratization of music". In the 15th and 16th century, arts and crafts were the responsibility of pages who were trained by the palace. By the end of the 16th century, however, changes in this system became apparent, making room for what Feldman calls "opening up of the palace service to a wider spectrum of candidates" (Feldman

[13] These departments were hierarchically as following; Small Chamber (*Küçük Oda*), Large Chamber (*Büyük Oda*), Falconers Chamber (*Doğancı Odası*), Chamber of Expeditionary Force (*Seferli Odası*), Commissary Chamber (*Kilâr Odası*), Treasury Chamber (*Hazine Odası*) and Privy Chamber (*Has Oda*). The last four chambers were in the sultan's service.

[14] *İçoğlanı* is the person with Christian-origin (usually) who entered the palace at a young age as *devşirme* (recruitment) and was raised for various palace services.

[15] In his book about the life in the Topkapı Palace, Ali Ufkî shows the location of *meşkhâne* in the *Enderûn* and talks about its functioning, alongside the musical life in the court in detail, see: (Ali Ufkî 2013, 48-52).

[16] Esad Efendi writes that Enfî Hasan Ağa was born in İstanbul, Fındıklı; Kara İsmail Ağa was born in Edirne; and Ebûbekir Ağa was from Eyüp, İstanbul. (Behar 2010, 240, 229, 229)

1996, 55-57). He claims that by the early 17th century, individuals of free Muslim backgrounds (not of *devşirme* origin) were also welcomed into a system originally designed for pages. In this respect, free Muslim musicians like Enfî Hasan Ağa or Kara İsmail Ağa were admitted to several departments of the *Enderûn* with nominal jobs, and their salaries were channeled through these departments (Feldman 1996, 74). As Feldman claims, by the later 18th century there is fairly clear evidence that the Commissary and the Treasury contained a significant number of people who were mainly responsible for music-making and who might had only a formal relationship with their branch (Feldman 1996, 78). One of the most well-known beneficiaries of this new system was Evliyâ Çelebi. One of the nights of Ramazan in 1045/1636, during the special ceremonies held in Hagia Sophia Mosque Evliyâ – as a *hâfız* – recites Qur'ân and his beautiful voice causes Sultan Murad IV to summon him. In the meantime, Evliyâ found a chance to show-off his musical knowledge:

> "He asked me to recite something. 'My Padishah,' said I, 'of the seventy-two sciences; whether in Persian, Arabic, Turkish, Hebrew, Syriac or Greek; of the various musical forms, whether it be *türki, şarkı, varsağı, kâr, nakş, savt, zecel, 'amel, zikr, tasnifat, kavl* or *haznegir*; or else, of the various verse forms, whether it be *bahr-i tavil, kaside, terci'-i bend, terkib-i bend, mersiye, i'diye, mu'aşşar, müsemmen, müsebba', müseddes, muhammes, penc-beyt, gazel, kıt'a, müselles, müfred, ma'ni*, or *ilahi*;—whatever you wish, I shall recite.' [...] 'My emperor,' said I, 'of the various makams, shall I perform *yegah, dügah, segah, çargah, pençgah, şeşağaz, rast, ısfahan, nişaburek, nikriz, mahur, rehavi, 'ırak, hüseyni, neva, 'uşşak, saba*, or *muhayyer bazar*? Or else shall I perform *buselik* (which means 'Kissing') and *gerdaniyye* (which means 'Hugging'), and come to rest in the mode of *zengule* (meaning 'Rattle' or 'Penis') and *rast* (meaning 'Erect')?" (Dankoff 2006, 35,37).

He attracted Murad IV's attention with his beautiful voice, gained his appreciation, entered the Commissary, and was trained in music (and in several branches like calligraphy and *tajweed* or the knowledge and application of the rules of recitation of Qur'ân) in this department. It appears that he did not have any other profession other than music at the court. According to Feldman, before the 17th century, *içoğlan*s and Iranian captive musicians[17] (who were active participants of music-making in the palace earlier) were central in the musical life at the Ottoman court. By the beginning of the 17th century, however, this gave way to free Muslim musicians in the palace service, along with the members of the religious establishment (*ilmiye*) and scribal service (*kalemiye*), dervishes and artisans (Feldman 1996, 78).

[17] There were captives brought from both the East and the West, however, Feldman and Wright emphasize the dominance of Iranian captive musicians in the court.

Going back to our cases, considering the changing function of the Commissary, it is plausible to regard Ali Bey, who was possibly a *hâfız*, and the *muezzin* Ali as musicians in Mahmud I's palace. We do not know for sure that if the official positions they held were nominal, as Feldman claims. Nevertheless, especially in the *muezzin* Ali's appointment, it can be seen more clearly that his talent in music and pleasing good voice ensured his entrance into the Commissary. It may also have been his status as halberdier (*teberdâr*) could be his primary job. Regardless, it is obvious that he was a talented musician and caught Mahmud I's attention, leading to his appointment into the *Enderûn* through skill. In other words, because he was appointed due to his musical skills, it seems more likely that he was primarily a musician and/or a *muezzin*, which were closely associated.[18]

2.1.2 *Çavuşân*

Apart from a *hâfız* and a *muezzin* both affiliated with the Commissary, there are also other officers in the palace service mentioned in the *rûznâme*s who were directly or indirectly involved in music. Although we do not know what exactly their jobs were, the title "*çavuş*" reveals the palace connection. There are four or five *çavuşân* (sing. çavuş) in the *rûznâme*s whose names we know: Hüseyin Çavuş, two Said Çavuşes, Salih Çavuş and Bekir Çavuş. The first two, Hüseyin Çavuş and Said Çavuşes, are mentioned within the context of *temcîd* recitations[19] while others participated in the *Mevlevî* ceremonies (*âyin*). The important point here is that these musicians participated in these events with official positions in the palace service which are not directly related to their musicianships.

According to the *rûznâme*s, on 13 July 1734 (11 S 1147), after listening to the kettledrum (*nakkâre*), the chief *muezzin* (*muezzin-başı*) Hüseyin Çavuş and *girift-zen*[20] Said Çavuş, together with other singer *çavuşân*, recited the *temcîd* and sang hymns (*ilâhî*).[21] About two months later, again we see *temcîd* recitations between 7-8-9 September 1734 (8-9-10 R 1147), at Vâlide Sultan's farm. In the first of these three days, *mehterân-ı Bîrûn* exhilarated people by playing *nakkâre* all night long

[18] The relationship between being *muezzin* and secular vocalist and, the entrance of *muezzin*s into the court repertoire will be examined in 2.4 of this thesis.

[19] *Temcîd* is one of the forms/genres of religious music usually recited by *muezzin*s.

[20] *Girift* is a kind of reed flute (*ney*) but smaller than it, and *girift-zen* is who plays *girift*.

[21] *leyle-i isneynde hava güşâde ve dîller safâda olup siyâk-ı mezkûre üzere ba'de'l-işâ yine sâde nakkâre ile hisâr ve evc-i 'ırâkda sâat dörde dek 'azîm fasıllar eyleyüp sâmi'îne bâdî-i neşât ü şevk olup sâat altıda mü'ezzin-başı Hüseyin Çavuş ve girift-zen Sa'îd Çavuş hânende çavuşlarla temcîd eyleyüp ve girift ile ilahîler okunup safâ-yı hâtır-mülûkânelerine bâdî nice hâlât-ı müverrissetü'l-behce zuhûr kılınmagın zevk-yâb olundı* (DABOA.TS.MA.d.10732. . . , 4b).

and, Mahmud I enjoyed the performance of *temcîd* by *muezzin-başı* Hüseyin Çavuş together with *çavuşân-ı Enderûn*.[22] On the second night, no name has been given but it is only said that "enjoyed with listening to *temcîd* and *fasıl* of *mehter-hâne*".[23] On the third night (the night between second and third days), they amused listeners with *fasıl*s of *nakkâre* while contemplating the full moon. The following day entailed further performances of *fasıl*s of *nakkâre* accompanied by games like *cirid*. Finally, when night fell, the *muezzin-başı* (Hüseyin Çavuş) and several *çavuşân* performed the *temcîd* accompanied by the *girift* of dervish Said Çavuş.[24]

What we learn from these references is that *temcîd*, although generally performed in mosques and *tekke*s by *muezzin*s and dervishes, was recited by *çavuşân-ı Enderûn* led by Hüseyin Çavuş, the chief *muezzin* in the *Enderûn* in 1734. Other than being the chief *muezzin*, Hüseyin Çavuş's "*çavuş*" title also reveals his connection with the palace service, though what kind of duty he had other than being chief *muezzin* is unknown. His "*çavuş*" title might embody his *muezzin-başılık* position. They were accompanied by a dervish called *girift-zen* Said Çavuş. There is no reason not to think these two *girift-zen* Said Çavuşes are the same person. They are both *girift* players, *çavuş*es and accompanied the *temcîd* recitations in two months interval, but is there any possibility that *girift-zen* Said Çavuş was the chief-*neyzen* (*neyzen-başı*)?

On the 22nd of July in the same year (20 S 1147) Mahmud I went to the Gülşen-âbâd Waterfront Mansion, which was a part of the *Çırağan Yalısı* built by Damad İbrahim Paşa and located between Beşiktaş and Ortaköy districts. Following a short rest there, he went to an alcove (*şah-nişîn*) that looks onto the *semâhâne*,[25] where the *Mevlevî* dervishes perform the ritual ceremony. There, he witnessed the *semâ* in which *nedîm* (boon-companion) Bekir Çavuş, Salih Çavuş (one of the *ağa*s of *Enderûn*), *neyzen-başı* Said Çavuş and sheikh of Galata *Mevlevî* Lodge Abdülbâkî Dede (d. 1751) with his dervishes participated. Ultimately, they awarded with gold coins (*zer-i mahbûb*) by Mahmud I.[26]

---

[22] *selâse gicesi ba'de'l-'işâ mehterân-ı Bîrûn fasıl fasıl sabâha dek sâde nakkâre ile tarab-engîz-i hâlet olup mahall-i temcîdde mü'ezzin-başı Hüseyin Çavuş çavuşân-ı Enderûn ile temcîd eglemegin safâ-yâb olundı* (DABOA.TS.MA.d.10732..., 10b).

[23] *Çehârşenbe gicesi siyâk-ı mezkûr üzere temcîd ve mehter-hâne faslı ile safâ-yâb* [...] (DABOA.TS.MA.d.10732..., 10b).

[24] [...] *ba'dehû mahall-i temcîdde yine ... evvel mü'ezzin-başı ve çavuşlar ve dervîş Sa'îd Çavuş girift ile temcîd idüp istimâ'ıyla safâ-yâb olundı* (DABOA.TS.MA.d.10732..., 11a).

[25] *Semâhane* of Beşiktaş *Mevlevi* Lodge must be meant here, which was adjacent to the Beşiktaş/Çırağan Palace (built by Nevşehirli İbrâhim Paşa) and pulled down by Mahmud II. Today, at the place of Beşiktaş *Mevlevi* Lodge, Çırağan Palace is present. For more about Beşiktaş *Mevlevi* Lodge, see: (Ünver 1978); and (Tuğlacı 1990).

[26] *Çehârşenbede ba'de'z-zuhr Çırağan Yalısı ittisâlinde olan Gülşen-âbâd Yalısına teşrîf ve cüz'î ârâmdan sonra mukâbele mahalli dahi gelmekle şevketlü efendimiz semâ-hâneye nâır olan şeh-nişîne teşrîf idüp nüdemâdan Bekir Çavuş ve Enderûn ağalarından Sâlih Çavuşla ma'an âyin hân olup Sa'îd Çavuş neyzen-*

Whether the *neyzen-başı* Said Çavuş just mentioned-above is the same person as *girift-zen* dervîş Said Çavuş in the *temcîd* gatherings is an enigma. They may have been followers of the *Mevlevî* order simply because the training of the *ney* instrument -as well as *girift* as a member of *ney* family- was monopolized by *Mevlevî*s. Also, the titles of *neyzen-başı* and dervish hint to a *Mevlevî* connection. However, if they would be the same Said Çavuşes, I do not think that they would be called differently by the same scribe in such a short amount of time: on 13 July he was "*girift-zen* Said Çavuş", on 22 July "*neyzen-başı* Said Çavuş" and, about two months later, on 9 September he was "*girift-zen* dervish Said Çavuş" again. Even though they were not the same person, the chief *neyzen* and a *girift*-playing dervish were both paid by the palace due to their *çavuş* positions.[27]

We do not know much about Salih Çavuş other than his appointment to the *Enderûn* and possibly being a *Mevlevî* follower; yet, the name "Bekir Çavuş" brings a well-known composer to one's mind: Ebûbekir Ağa (d. 1750?). He was also known as Bekir Ağa or Bekir Çavuş, who was the chief singer (*ser-hânende*) in the *Enderûn* under the reigns of Ahmed III and Mahmud I. Though the name and date match with our Bekir Çavuş, there is no information regarding Ebûbekir Ağa's affiliation with the *Mevlevî* order. Also, our Bekir Çavuş is a *nedîm*, whereas Ebûbekir Ağa was the chief singer at the court. Although, Ebûbekir Ağa's presence in Mahmud I's court is something to be expected, since we do not know when his tenure as chief singer ended, he must be more than a *nedîm* at his time. In short, we cannot say whether Bekir Çavuş in the *rûznâme*s is the famous Ebubekir Ağa.

The *çavuşân*, who were high-ranking officers in the palace service, were in charge of various duties such as welcoming the envoys, serving as ambassadors, announcing the orders issued by sultan or grand vizier, enact execution decrees, message-carrying, and being the masters of ceremonies (*teşrifatçılık*).[28] The *çavuş* seems like someone who is assigned to various jobs as needed. It is not specified whether the *çavuşân* named in the *rûznâme* have such duties, they were only mentioned in the context of their affiliation with music. In his encyclopedic work on Turkish music, Yılmaz Öztuna writes that the title of *çavuş* was given to the sultan's aides (*yâver*) (Öztuna 1974, 46). If Öztuna's definition is correct to a certain degree, it means that they had

---

başılık mahallinde ve Galata Mevlevî-hâne şeyhi dervîşleriyle ma'an gelüp azîm velveleli mukâbele olmağın efendimiz dahi temâşâ eyleyüp tamâmında şuyûh [ve] *dervîşânı zer-i mahbûb ile mesrûr ve dilşâd buyurup* [...] (DABOA.TS.MA.d.10732..., 5b-6a).

[27] By looking at the history of Tayyarzâde Atâ, Ersu Pekin mentions a *Mevlevî* sheikh, *neyzen* and a *girift-zen musâhib* called Said Efendi, who participated the assemblies (sing. *meclîs*) of many Ottoman elites during the reign of Selim III (Pekin 2015, 44). It is a matter of curiosity whether the Said Efendi mentioned here is the Said Çavuş in the *rûznâme*.

[28] The *çavuşân* in the *divân-ı hümâyûn* (Imperial Council) are meant in this context, not those served as soldiers in the *Kapıkulu Ocağı* (Slaves of the Sublime Port), notably in the Janissary Corps.

proximity to the sultans and undertook duties like the *nüdemâ* or *musâhiban*,[29] who were in charge of entertaining and acquainting the sultans with their knowledge in different branches of art and science. The *çavuşân* mentioned in relation to music in the *rûznâme*s fit this definition perfectly. Indeed, out of the seventy-five composers whose status or profession were specified in the *Atrâbü'l-Âsâr*, fourteen people held an official position in the palace. Of those, seven were in positions directly or indirectly related to music while seven others did not (Behar 2010, 163). Based on the information provided by *Atrâbü'l-Âsâr*, Behar claims that most of the composers in the palace service were not in a position related to music. Among them, *çavuşân* constituted the majority along with the gardeners (*bostancılar*) and council clerks (*divan kâtipleri*) (Behar 2010, 180).

Besides, when looking at the sources giving information about musicians before the 18th century, such as Âşık Çelebi, Hafız Post, Evliyâ Çelebi and Ali Ufkî, we see that of the hundreds of musicians they mention, there are only two who bear the title of "*çavuş*."[30] Indeed, the *çavuş* musicians mentioned by Uzunçarşılı lived in the 18th century. These sources create the impression that the number of *çavuşân* affiliated with music increased noticeably in the 18th century, or, at least, became more visible.

There are also some references to the musicians registered in "*Bîrûn*," the outer courtyard of the Topkapı Palace as opposed to the inner courtyard, *Enderûn*. Almost all of these musicians are anonymous, referred to as *hânendegân ve sâzendegân-ı Bîrûn* (vocalists and instrumentalists registered in *Bîrûn*). The musicians both from *Enderûn* and *Bîrûn* sometimes sang together, as understood from the phrases like *sâzendegân ve hânendegân-ı Enderûn ve Bîrûn*.[31] Other than the anonymous ones, there is a reference to the musicians whom we know by name and, learned that they are registered in the *Bîrûn*. On 7 January 1743 (11 ZA 1155) in the Mahbûbiye Palace, two singers from *Bîrûn* ("*hânende-i Bîrûndan*"), namely Uşşâkî-zâde and his son, received the favor of the sultan for entertaining him with their vocal performances accompanied by some instruments.[32] As their names indicate, they must have been the son and grandson of a follower of *Uşşâkî* branch of *Halvetî* order. It is very likely that they were also affiliated with the same branch, but more

[29] Halil İnalcık uses these terms interchangeably and gives the necessary features for being a *musâhib-nedîm* as written in the *Qâbus-nâma*, one of the major works of mirror of princess literature, written in the 11th century (İnalcık 2010, 18).

[30] Among 179 musicians that Evliyâ cites by name, only two of them (*yonkarcı* Cafer Çavuş and *şeştârî* Hürrem Çavuş) bears the title "*çavuş*". (Evliyâ Çelebi 2003, 639, 641).

[31] E.g. in (Oral 1966, 47, 75, 152).

[32] [...] *hânende-i Bîrûndan Uşşâkî-zâde ve oğlu ba'zı sâza muvaffakat ile âğâze ve istima'ıyla eğlenilüb mezbûrân mazhâr-ı ihsân olub* [...] (Oral 1966, 157).

Table 2.1 The number of musicians and anonymous musician groups who are stated to be registered in the palace, to be outside of the palace and not stated any affiliation.

	1731	1734	1740-44	1744-47	1747-50
Enderûn & Bîrûn	1*	3+6*	18+3*	2	1
Taşra	1*		4	1*	3
Unknown			23	3	1

Notes: "*" is used to distinguish those who were named.

importantly, they were registered in the "*Bîrûn*".

The majority of the musicians mentioned so far by their personal names and titles, referring to various palace services derive from the 1734 *rûznâme*.[33] Compared with the number of musical entertainments they documented, the names of the musicians are rarely given in other *rûznâme*s. The singers (*hânendegân*) and instrumentalists (*sâzendegân*) who have official positions are mostly anonymous. Phrases like *hânendegân-ı Enderûn, hanendegân ve sâzendegân-ı Enderûn, hânendegân ve sâzendegân-ı hassa, çavuşân, çavuşân-ı Enderûn, serhengân* (used synonymously with *çavuşân*), *hânendegân-ı serhengân, nüdemâ, gılmanân-ı Enderûn, hanendegân ve sâzendegân-ı Bîrûn* which are used in musical contexts reveal palace-affiliated musicians. Records between 1740-44 contains the longest and richest records in general and in music in particular, mentioning the musical entertainments that Mahmud I attended. In this period, there are forty-five references in total that mention musical gatherings held by anonymous musicians. Although more than half of them do not specify any musicians, palace-affiliated or freelance, by name or occupation; but by employing the above-mentioned phrases, twenty-nine of the references in all the *rûznâme*s of Mahmud I refer to the anonymous singers and/or instrumentalists and gives the names of only ten musicians affiliated with the palace (see: Table 2.1).

[33] Only exceptions for this are the Ali Bey from *kilâr-ı âmire* in the 1731 *rûznâme* as mentioned, and *çukadar* (lackey) of İshak Ağa in the 1740-44 *rûznâme* (Oral 1966, 119). This İshak Ağa (d. 1763) possibly the one who served as customs steward (*gümrük emîni*), along with other duties, during the reign of Mahmud I.

2.2 Non-Courtly Musicians

2.2.1 *Taşra*

This section examines the musicians who were not registered in the palace service. In the *rûznâme*s, there are seven references regarding anonymous musicians. They were described with phrases like *taşra hanendegân ve sâzendegânı, taşra hânendesi, taşra neyzeni* and *taşradan hânendegân ve sâzendegân cem' ve ihzâr olunup...* which clearly refer to the musicians summoning from the city. Also, we know the names of two musicians who were supposed to be not affiliated with the palace. What is meant by the musicians of "*taşra*" (the outside, exterior) should be those not registered in the palace, rather than describing those coming from the provinces or cities other than Istanbul. Indeed, for breaking the relationship with the palace, the saying "*taşra çıkmak*" is used.

Seven references out of nine refer to the anonymous singers and instrumentalists, any detail about them has not been given. Although their names are not specified, the important thing for our purpose is that apart from the musicians who were members of the palace, those who live in the city were also participating in the musical entertainments of the sultan. It is known that many musicians occasionally came to the palace from the city to perform for or to present their works to the sultan. It would be misleading to assume that all the palace musicians, whom we discussed in detail in the previous section, entered the palace service at a young age and spent their entire lives there. As in the examples of Enfî Hasan Ağa and Ebûbekir Ağa, there were a number of freelance musicians who originally lived in the city and entered the palace for a certain period of time. It is also possible to see other examples of musicians moving between the palace and the city in Es'ad Efendi's *Atrâbü'l-Âsâr* (Behar 2010, 179-180). There are also many musicians who entered the palace service at a relatively young age and then left (*taşra çıkmak*), as evident in the case of Kara İsmail Ağa who spent the majority of his life and his entire musical life in the palace. In addition to the importance of the palace in music-making, mostly based on the composers and singers in the *Atrâbü'l-Âsâr*, Behar argues that by the 17th and 18th century the social foundations of music were now far beyond the palace. Names, occupations, and titles of those named by Es'ad Efendi, explicitly show that a very large portion of the city-dwellers was actively involved in music-making and performance in İstanbul. (Behar 2010, 22).

Throughout the *rûznâme*s, all references to musical performances by anonymous singers and instrumentalists were mentioned in the periods of 1740-44, and 1747-50.

In the *rûznâme*s of 1731, 1734 and between 1744-47, there are only two references to non-courtly musicians – Çiçekçi Salih Efendi and *Bursavî kemân-zen bir derviş*. Although the same individual kept all the records between 1740-50, there is not a single reference to the anonymous musicians between 1744-47.

In the *rûznâme* records between 1747-50, a reference to a violin player made one's think that he is coming from out of the palace. On 1 November 1746 (16 L 1159), a violinist dervish from Bursa came to the presence of Mahmud I in Mahbûbiye, played violin, then bestowed by the sultan.[34] The information that he was from Bursa, one of the major cities of the Ottoman realm, is important in terms of showing that the said dervish is from outside the palace and even outside of Istanbul.

2.2.2 Artisans

Musicians who were clearly outside of palace circles (such as *hânenede/sâzende-i taşra*), sometimes their forenames indicate an artisanal origin, and it would be plausible to include these artisans under the title of non-courtly musicians. The most noticeable case in the *rûznâme*s refers to a florist who is the only musician clearly articulated by his name. On the day of 23 February 1731 (15 Ş 1143), Mahmud I came to Gülşen-âbâd, and watched/contemplated (*temâşâ etmek*) the environment for a while. He then went to another waterfront mansion, Genç Mehmed Paşa Yalısı (named after the son of Damad İbrahim Paşa), which is nearby and part of the Çırağan Palace. During his rest at this place, a man named Çiçekçi Salih Efendi ("*Çiçekçi*" referring to his status as a florist), came to present Mahmud I his narcissus (*zerrîn*). Then subjected to the sultan's questions and found an opportunity to show his knowledge about his profession. In their conversation, Mahmud I learned that Çiçekçi Salih Efendi was also knowledgeable in the science of music (*ilm-i mûsikî*) and asked him to sing. After Salih Efendi's performance, he presented his gift to the sultan.[35]

In another interaction, we also have a son of a potter, named Çömlekçioğlu. According to the account, on 12 July 1745 (12 C 1158), when Mahmud I went to

---

[34] [...] *dîvânhâne-i Mahbûbiye'ye sâye-bahş ve Bursavî kemân-zen bir dervîş fasl-ı kemân ve hitâmında ihsân-ı hümâyûn ile mesrûrü'l- fevâ'id buyurdular* (Özcan 1965, 121).

[35] [...] *Gülşen-âbâd nâm yalıya mürûr ve etrâf u eknâfı temâşâ ve andan yek-digere mûsul tarîk-i fevkânî nihâyetinden veled-i merhûm Genç Mehmed Paşa yalısı dahî seyrân ve selâmlığında vâki' kasr-ı kebîrde bir mikdâr istirâhat hâlinde Çiçekçi Sâlih Efendi nâm pîr-i rûşen-zamir tabla ile zerrîn 'arz itmegin emr-i şerîfleriyle huzûr-ı hümâyûnlarına duhûle murahhas ve şukûfehâ-yı mezbûre esâmî ve nevâdirînden ba'zı mertebe suâl ve cevâbı müteâkib mezbûrun fenn-i şukûfelerinden gayrı 'ilm-i mûsikîden behre ve haberi olduğu samiazer[?]-i âlîleri olmağla ruhsat-ı âğâze ile itmâm-ı faslı tamâmdan sonra hediye-i şükûfe-i zerrîn-i pîr atâyâ-yı zerrîn-i padişâh-ı âlem-gîr ile hüsn ü mukâbele siyâkında yine Gülşen-âbâd'a avdet* [...] (Çınar 1974, 34).

the Neşâd-âbâd Waterfront Mansion (built by Nevşehirli Damad İbrahim Paşa in 1726-27) he listened to a singer called Çömlekçioğlu until mid-afternoon.[36] Since Çömlekçioğlu's full name has not been given and there is not a famous musician with this name at that time, nothing is known about his identity other than the information given here. There was a Çömlekçioğlu Receb Çelebi (d.1692), one of the most famous composers and singers of the 17th century, who was also a potter and served as chief singer in the palace, but he was not alive in 1745. Bedros (or Bedros Ağa), an Armenian composer, is also known as Çömlekçioğlu, but since he lived in the late 18th and early 19th century (1785-1840), it is also not possible that he was the one in the *rûznâme*s.

Apart from those musicians whose professions are clearly stated, it is very likely that there should be other musicians with artisanal backgrounds. In the *Atrâbü'l-Âsâr*, there is an artisan group of *fasıl* composers consisting of six people, among which there are bookbinders (*mücellitler*), potters (*çömlekçiler*), stonemasons (*taşçılar*), silk sellers (*kazzâzlar*) and goldsmiths (*kuyumcular*), whose number is very close to the number of the palace musicians (Behar 2010, 173). In other words, the musicians coming from the city for musical performances to the sultan were one of the prominent groups of musicians, as much as those enrolled in the palace service. By the middle of the 17th century the most accomplished musicians of artisanal origin were able to become singers and musicians at the Ottoman court, and some of them received pensions and appointments in one of the bureaucracies (Feldman 1996, 63). Although we do not know whether Çiçekçi Salih Efendi and Çömlekçioğlu were awarded by an official position or a steady income, their performance at the court and award for this, show that artisans with musical talent were one of the groups of musicians which have prominent roles in music-making in the palace. It should also be noted that there is no such a sharp distinction between the musicians of the palace and the artisans. They could be both at the same time. For example, Çömlekçi-zâde Receb Çelebi (d. 1692), was an artisan in his youth (a potter) and became the chief singer when he entered the palace service.

2.3 Sufi Musicians

Throughout the *rûznâme*s, Sufi networks are another group involved in music. In particular, the *Mevlevî* network is heavily represented in this dynamic. Despite

[36] [...] N*eşâd-âbâd'a şeref-bahş ve hânende Çömlekçi-oğlu fasl ve edâ-yı 'asra dek eğlenilüb fülk-nişîn-i mu'âvedet oldular* (Özcan 1965, 56).

records telling us that Mahmud I was observing *Mevlevî* ceremonies,[37] the names of participating musicians in these ceremonies are rarely mentioned, leaving the question of their mystical leanings open. At least half of the few Sufi musicians mentioned are affiliated with the *Mevlevî* order, for whom music is an indispensable part of their culture.

2.3.1 *Mevlevî* Musicians

Before going into detail on the *Mevlevî* musicians in the *rûznâme*s, it would be useful to briefly talk about the relationship of *Mevlevî*s and *Mevlevî* lodges with music. Inspired by the whirling of its eponymous founder Mevlânâ Celâleddin Rûmî in the 13th century as a reflection of his ecstasy (Özcan 2004), the *Mevlevî* ceremony (*semâ*) was organized and developed in the following centuries and turned into a ceremony with certain rituals around the 17th century. The music performed in their ceremony, called *âyin* or *âyin-i şerîf*, is the most complex and longest form of Ottoman music and is accompanied by dervishes whirling in a certain order. Altogether, it is like a concert planned down to the last detail and, in contrast to other *tarîka*s, is open to participation from those who may not be disciples.[38]

In the early 17th century, *Mevlevî* lodges became central for music education and transmission of music (Behar 2015, 22). It would not be untrue to say that their lodges functioned as conservatories. As music became a social and religious ritual for the *Mevlevî*s, dervish lodges became epicenters for training, development, and the transmission of music outside of the palace school. *Mevlevî* lodges not only diffused their own or other religious music, but also Ottoman secular[39] music was transferred via (Feldman 1996, 98-99). Especially during the late 18th and 19th centuries, as they diffused the entire Ottoman repertoire to many musicians – including non-Muslims.

The most prominent composers of Ottoman music,[40] who composed several works of religious and secular music, were also followers of the *Mevlevî* order. Half of the sheikhs, dervishes or *zâkir*s belonging to a Sufi order in the *Atrâbü'l-Âsâr*, were connected to the *Mevlevî* community (Behar 2010, 189). Evliyâ Çelebi tells us that

---

[37] *temâşâ-yı semâ-yı dervîşân* or *istima'-ı semâ-yı dervîşân*.

[38] For a study that deals with the *Mevlevî* order in several aspects, see: (Gölpınarlı, 1983).

[39] What is meant by "secular" here is that the fasıl music with worldly lyrics and not performed in the religious institutions like mosques or *tekke*s.

[40] Such as Buhûrîzâde Mustafa Itrî (d. 1711) and İsmail Dede Efendi (a.k.a. Derviş İsmail) (d.1846).

the great majority of the most well-known *ney* (reed flute) players were *Mevlevî* (Evliyâ Çelebi 2006, 343). One of the few musical notation systems before the 19th century,[41] invented by Nâyî Osman Dede (d.1729), who was the chief-*neyzen* and Galata *Mevlevî* Lodge sheikh. At the end of the 17th century, *Mevlevî* musicians became as important as the palace musicians in the Ottoman court. For example, the *ney* (reed flute) became the second most important instrument of the palace orchestra after the *tanbûr* (Feldman 2014, 640).

It is possible to trace this *Mevlevî* musician in the Mahmud I's court via *rûznâme*s. Three *ney* players, whose names are mentioned in the *rûznâme*s, indicate that some have *Mevlevî* affiliations. Two of them have already been mentioned as palace musicians: *girift-zen* Said Çavuş and *neyzen-başı* Said Çavuş. *Neyzen-başı* Said Çavuş, in particular, occupied a crucial position in the *Mevlevî* lodge. The duty of *neyzen-başı* was not only to conduct the music band (*mutrib*), consisting of several instruments during the *semâ*, but also to train students who want to play *ney*. Since the training of this instrument was particularly well regarded in *Mevlevî* lodges, anyone who learned the *ney* may well have been associated with *Mevlevî* lodges in one way or another. On the other hand, it would be misleading to suppose that the musicians who assume the duties of chief-*neyzen* (*ser-nâyî/neyzen-başı*) or chief *kudûm*[42] player (*ser-kudûmî*) in *Mevlevî* lodges were *Mevlevî* followers. For example, one *neyzen-başı* of the Galata *Mevlevi* Lodge, Nakşî Ak Molla Ömer Efendi (d. 1777), was not a *Mevlevi*, but, as his name suggests, a Naqshî follower (Mete 2018, 170). Even if *neyzen-başı* Said Çavuş (and *girift-zen* Said Çavuş) was not a *Mevlevî* follower, he was nevertheless associated with *Mevlevî* lodges. He may have been possibly trained in or spent his time at a lodge. Other than both Said Çavuşes, another *ney* player's name is given in the *rûznâme*s: Tâ'ib-zâde. The 18th-century sources I consulted, such as several song-text collections and *Atrâbü'l-Âsâr*, do not mention of him. In the early 18th century, there was a *muderris* (religious scholar, professor) and *kadı* (judge) named Osman-zâde Ahmed Tâib (d. 1724) who presented various works and poetry to Ahmed III. It may be possible that Tâ'ib-zâde (literally "the son of Tâ'ib") was his son, but we do not have enough information to confirm this probability.

The only person in the *rûznâme*s who was certainly a *Mevlevî* was the sheikh of Galata *Mevlevi* Lodge, Sırrı Abdülbâki Dede (d. 1751). He was the son of Nâyi Osman Dede (d. 1729), sheikh of the same lodge for thirty-two years before him, who was a great composer, *ney*-player, and the inventor of an original notation

[41] Those invented by Ali Ufkî Bey, Demetrius Cantemir, Abdülbâki Nâsır Dede.

[42] A small double drum.

system. Abdülbâki Dede replaced his father in 1729 until the end of his life in 1752. Like his father, Abdülbâki Efendi was something of a musician, for he composed a *peşrev* in *makâm rast*, which survives today. In the *rûznâme*s, Abdülbâki Dede is summoned by Mahmud I six times to the palace – four to commemorate the *miraç* (ascension) nights, suggesting Abdülbâki Dede was present at most *mi'râç* nights between 1741 to 1747.[43]

Other than *neyzen*s and a sheikh, there is mention of a dervish violinist from Bursa – as mentioned above – who performed for and received a reward from Mahmud I.[44] Not in the palace service, the dervish nevertheless highlights the regard for which musical Sufis were held. It is possible this dervish was a member of any Sufi order, including *Mevlevî*.

2.3.2 Musicians from Other Sunnî Orders

Apart from *Mevlevî*s, there are also references to musicians from other Sunni networks. One such is Çiçekçi Salih Efendi, one of the above-mentioned musicians with artisanal background. Çiçekçi Salih Efendi was most likely a *Halvetî* dervish. There is no detailed information about his identity in the *rûznâme*s, but it seems that he was not a celebrated musician who made a name for himself. However, in the cemetery (*hazîre*) of the dervish lodge of *Nasûhîyye* branch of *Halvetîyye-Şabaniye* order located in Üsküdar, a tombstone belonging to a dervish by the name of "Çiçekçibaşı Salih Efendi" who died in 1157/1744 (Mermutlu 2009, 660) makes us think that this individual is our Çiçekçi Salih Efendi. Furthermore, Mehmed Nasûhî Efendi (d. 1718), the founder of the *Nasûhîyye* branch, took one of his disciples and a celebrated musician, Burnaz/Enfî Hasan Ağa (d. 1724), to visit the sick boy. This boy was of special value to him, as the boy's father, Çiçekçi Salih Efendi, was Mehmed Nasûhî Efendi's disciple (Tatçı 2004, 98).

As in the *Mevlevî* order, music has also a central position for *Halvetî-Nasuhî* followers. Nasûhî Efendi also had close connections with people at the Galata *Mevlevi* Lodge, making him a connecting piece to *Mevlevî*'s widespread influence over the musical community. One of the indicators of this connection through a story of the writing and composition of *mi'râciyye*, which is a musical form inspired by the ascension (*mi'râç*) of the Prophet Muhammad. In the story, during one of the Islamic holy nights (*kandîl*) in the Nasûhî Lodge in Üsküdar, Nasûhî Efendi asked Nâyî Os-

[43] Respectively; 20 S 1734 (22 July 1734), 26 B 1154 (7 October 1741), 9 Ş 1154 (20 October 1741), 26 B 1155 (27 September 1742), 26 B 1159 (14 August 1746), 26 B 1160 (3 August 1747).

[44] See: footnote 34 of this chapter.

man Dede (d.1729), the sheikh of the Galata *Mevlevî* Lodge, to write and compose a *mi'râciyye*.[45] It was to be recited with a melody, such as *mevlîd* to be recited on the anniversary of the birth of the Prophet Muhammad. Osman Dede composed a *mi'râciyye* in seven chapters, which is the only extant melodic composition of this genre today. The lyrics of the Arabic section (*tevşîh*) reciting at the beginning written by Nasûhî Efendi. The first performance of Osman Dede's composition took place in the Nasûhî Lodge. Another indicator of Nasûhî Efendi's affinity with the Galata *Mevlevi* Lodge is about Fasih Ahmed Dede (d. 1699), who was a *hücre-nişîn* (a 1001-day trainee) at the Lodge.[46] To illustrate, it is documented that Nasûhî Efendi crossed the Bosphorus, from Galata to Üsküdar, by boat on a stormy day to meet with Fasih Dede, after a dream he had. Also, he was the one who washed Fasih Dede's dead body when he died and compensated the funeral costs. That's to say, everything that has been stating so far supports the argument that Çiçekçi Salih Efendi in the *rûznâme*s who sang to Mahmud I is possibly a disciple in the Nasûhî Lodge, and possibly he was later promoted and get the title of "*Çiçekçi-başı*" (the head of florists), as written on the afore-mentioned tombstone.

As far as it is understood from the expression in the *rûznâme*s, Çiçekçi Salih Efendi had no official connection to the palace. It appears that he was not a member of the palace with a position, whom Mahmud I saw regularly. If Çiçekçi Salih Efendi had been a court musician, he would have been designated as *hânende-i Enderûn*, *nedîm*, *musâhib* or *çavuş*, as it was for those in the Commissary. How did Salih Efendi get to perform for the sultan if he was an outsider? He might have been invited at the recommendation of someone from the court or with palace connections and someone who was in the same milieu with Salih Efendi, at the same time.

In terms of music, there were some mutual permeabilities between the Ottoman court and *Halvetiyye* order, as in some of other Sufi orders, most notably the *Mevleviyye*. When we look at the *Âtrâbü'l-Âsâr*, among seventeen musicians who bear titles which indicated attachment to a Sufi order, such as sheikh, dervish, and *zâkir*, two were affiliated with the *Halvetî* order (Behar 2010, 189).[47] One of them was Enfî Hasan Ağa (d. 1724), who became famous during the time of Ahmed III, served in the *kilâr-ı hassa* for about ten years (since 1715), and achieved the highest musical position at the court. Enfî Hasan Ağa was also a *Halvetî* dervish.[48] The other

[45] According to another rumor, Osman Dede composed this piece after seeing Nasûhî Efendi in his dream in which Nasûhî Efendi told him the lyrics (Ak 2009, 136).

[46] *Hücre-nişîn* is someone who takes the education program (*çile*) in *Mevlevî* order for 1001 days.

[47] As expected, among seventeen Sufi musicians in the *Atrâbü'l-Âsâr*, those from *Mevlevî* order is highest in number, with eight people.

[48] Enfî Hasan Ağa penned a book deals with the saints and Sufis of Istanbul, especially those in the Üsküdar

Halvetî dervish that Es'ad Efendi mentions is Kara İsmail Ağa (d. 1723/24). Kara İsmail Ağa who spent his entire musical life in the palace, entered the palace service at a young age and served in various positions from apprenticeship in the halberdier corps (*baltacılar zümresi*) to being one of the *muezzin*s of the sultan (Behar 2010, 173-176, 229). Based on the figures of which palace musicians who were followers of the *Halvetî* order, Çiçekçi Salih Efendi's invitation to Mahmud I's presence seems related to the tightly-knit *Halvetî-Nasûhî* network – of which he was a disciple.

2.4 "Mosque Singers"

Another group of individuals who were involved in music in the *rûznâme*s are the ones described as *muezzin*s, *muezzin-başı*s (chief *muezzin*s) and *na'thân*s, who recite the poetic praises of the Prophet Muhammad. All of these titles were associated with the lower *ulemâ*, along with *imâm*s (prayer leaders), *hâfız*s, *vâiz*s and *hatip*s (preachers). Feldman grouped them as "mosque singers," as they were usually in the mosques, but he also uses this term in the synonym for *muezzin*s.[49] Hence, *muezzin*s fall under the category of "mosque singers". That's why I also prefer to call all of these people but especially *muezzins* as "mosque singers".

The *muezzin* had a spiritually essential task in reciting the *ezân* (adhan), which informed Muslims about prayer times. Their voices were chosen in part for their beauty, but, equally important, was their competence in their musical knowledge. To be able to sing artfully, they had to know *usûl* and *makâm*, the basic rules of modal music. This knowledge determined where they would sing. Every mosque has at least one *muezzin*. Grand mosques (sing. *selâtin camii*) which are built by the sultan, or his wife or children, like Süleymaniye Mosque, had more than one *muezzin*. For instance, twenty-four *muezzin*s are registered in the endowment deed of Süleymaniye Mosque (Şahin 2015, 67).[50] In such mosques, there was a chief *muezzin* (*ser-muezzin/muezzin-başı*) in charge of organizing the other *muezzin*s. Just as in the Grand Mosques, there were chief *muezzin*s in the Ottoman palace as well. The *muezzin* of the sultan was also called as chief *muezzin* (*ser-müezzin-i şehriyarî* or *ser-müezzin-i Hazret-i Padişahî*) (Öztuna 1974, 55). The chief *muezzin*s in the *rûznâme*s of Mahmud I must be sultan's *muezzin*, not those who served in

---

in the 16th-18th centuries, also contains information about his own life, see: (Enfî Hasan Hulûs Halvetî 2007).

[49]Cem Behar called them as "*küçük din adamları*" meaning clergy from lower rank (Behar 2010, 163).

[50]The author gives no date.

the Grand Mosques.

According to Feldman, musical practice among the higher and lower '*ulemâ*, and members of the scribal service (*kalemiye*) grew in the late 16th century – at the same time as a distinctly Ottoman musical tradition formed. While higher '*ulemâ* concealed their musical abilities (such as Es'ad Efendi, who was a *şeyhü'l-islâm*), lower '*ulemâ* (like *muezzin*s) had no such worries as they shared their interests. More importantly, by the middle of the 17th century, talented musicians could enter the palace service not only for religious performances but also as the performers of so-called "secular" vocal performances. The court's openness to outsiders coincided with the decline of musicians of *devşirme* origin. During the 17th century, the *muezzin*s in the palace were also performers in the vocal *fasıl* ensemble (Feldman 1996, 80-84). For the majority of Ottoman musicians, who did not rely on music to make a living, the highest-paid "professional" musicians performing the courtly repertoire were the *muezzin*s (Feldman 1996, 47).[51] Additionally, they could compose both in the secular and religious musical forms. This is what Feldman once called "blurring the boundaries between sacred and secular styles of music" (Feldman 1996, 61). To illustrate, Ser-müezzin Çârşeb Mustafa Ağa (d. after 1730), Tosun-zâde Abdullâh Ağa (d. 1715), Kara İsmail Ağa (d. 1723/24), Tab'î Mustafa Efendi (d. 1770?) were both *muezzin*s and *fasıl* singers (*fasıl hânendesi*) or chief singers (*ser-hânende*) at the court. Benlioğlu's study on court musicians in the 19th century, identified eighty-one musicians in total during the reigns of Selim III and Mahmud II. Eleven of these musicians were from the lower '*ulemâ* class. The vast majority of them, including Şakir Ağa (d. 1840), İsmail Dede Efendi (d. 1846) and Ser-müezzin Rifat Bey (d. 1888), were *muezzin*s of the sultan (Benlioğlu 2017, 135-137). This shows that almost ten percent of the musicians in the palace during the 19th century were *muezzin*s, which is a considerable amount.

In the *rûznâme*s, "mosque singers" are mentioned in various times and in various occasions. While their names were never mentioned in the 1731 *rûznâme*, the chief *muezzin*, named Hüseyin Çavuş, was mentioned three different times in 1734.[52] His mentions were due to his note-worthy performance during *temcîd* gatherings. He was singing *temcîd* with other singer *çavuşân* of *Enderûn* (described by *çavuşlar*, *hânanede çavuşlar* or *çavuşân-ı Enderûn*) and usually accompanied by *giriftzen/neyzen* Said Çavuş.[53] *Muezzin*s also sung the *mi'râciyye* composed by Nâyî Osman Dede.

---

[51] The issue of what the concept of "professional musician" means in Ottoman context and especially in Istanbul has been discussed by some scholars so far, but a conclusion has not been reached yet (Pekin 2013, 55).

[52] 11 S, 8 and 10 R of 1147 (respectively 13 July, 7 and 9 September 1734).

[53] Hüseyin Çavuş and Said Çavuş were already mentioned in the context of courtly musicians, in the first

On the night of 26 September 1742 (26 B 1155), the sheikh of Galata *Mevlevî* Lodge – Osman-zâde Sırrı Abdülbâki Dede – with the *muezzin-başı*[54] and *serhengân* with dervish appearance (*serhengân-ı zıyy-ı dervişân*) came to the Mahbûbiye and recited *mi'râciyye* – as was the custom. Another night of *mi'râc*, on 5 September 1744 (27 B 1157), Mahmud I went to the Beşiktaş Palace to listen to the *mi'râciyye* by the same group of people. There was a slight change that time; instead of *serhengân*, there were several *muezzin*s. Nevertheless, they were once again rewarded.

Another reference on mosque singers is about *na'thân*s and reciters of *mevlîd*/*mevlûd* (*mevlûdci*/*mevlûdhân*), which is mentioned in the *rûznâme* of 1734. During the birthday celebrations for the Prophet (*mevlîd*) on 12 August 1734 (12 RA 1147), Mahmud I came to the palace in Beşiktaş in the evening. He listened to the *na't* (*na't-ı nebevî*) recited by the *na'thân* of Hagia Sophia Mosque and the recitation of the *mevlîd* (*mevlîdü'n-nebî*). Each part (*bahir*) was recited by a different person – namely Çaylak-zâde, Sûmî-zâde and Altı-zâde Çırağı Efendi who was said to be the preacher (*hatîb*) of Ebû Eyyüb Mosque. After the ceremony, these four people were rewarded with twenty *kuruş* each.[55] Among those *mevlîdhân*s, Çaylak-zâde must be Çâlâk-zâde Şeyh Mustafa (d. 1757), who was the son of the *Halvetî* sheikh Çâlâk Ahmed Dede (d. 1711). Çâlâk-zâde later became the sheikh of the *Halvetî* lodge in Cağaloğlu. He was a celebrated *zâkir*, *mevlîdhân* – and a prolific composer of several religious forms (Ergun 2017, 182-3). Saadet Nüzhet Ergun noted sixty-seven pieces composed by Çâlâk-zâde in various forms of religios music (Ergun 2010, 357-381).

If we only look at these four references on the recitations of *temcîd, mi'râciyye, na't* and *mevlîd*, we see that mosque singers did not go beyond religious music . *Muezzin*s sang *temcîd* and *mi'râciyye*, *na'thân*s *na't* and *mevlîdhân*s *mevlîd*. On 2 August 1734, however, a *muezzin* of the chief harem eunuch, named Ali, came to Mahmud I's presence, and recited the *ezân*, made a *fasıl* in *makâm segah* and was acclaimed by the sultan.[56] This reference may be the only one in the entire *rûznâme* of such detail, describing in which *makâm muezzin* Ali sang and what kind of manner he had as a singer (*hayli nazik edâsı...*). Ali's case seems to confirm Feldman's claim that *muezzin*s are also competent in secular vocal *fasıl* repertoire in the palace. Still, one reference would not be sufficient to suggest this was true of all *muezzin*s (or mosque singers in general) in the palace service in that period.

---

part of this chapter.

[54]Whoever he was at this position in that year, his name is not given.

[55][...] *Ayasofiyye na't-hânı hâfız efendi na't-ı nebevî kırâ'at eyleyüp hitâmında mevlûdü'n-nebî 'aleyhü's-selâmın ol fıkrasın Çaylâk-zâde ikinci fıkrasın Sûmî-zâde üçünci fıkrasın Ebû Eyyüb Câmi'nin hatîbi Altı-zâde Çırağı Efendi kırâ'at eyleyüp* [...] (DABOA.TS.MA.d..., 8a).

[56]See: footnote 7 of this chapter.

The *rûznâme*s do not give us enough information to verify this.

2.5 Non-Muslims

There are only two references on non-Muslim musicians. The first of these is Şivelioğlu, known as Şivelioğlu Kemâni Yorgi (Corci) or Yorgaki Efendi. He was a Greek composer of *fasıl* music and a very talented instrumentalist. He is said to have introduced the *viola d'amore* (*sinekemânı*) to the Ottomans and a "source of pride" for the Ottoman court, by a contemporary diplomat, Charles Fonton (Behar 2017a, 168). About ten of his compositions are known today. We can learn from the *rûznâme*s that Şivelioğlu was the lackey (*çukadar*) of İshak Ağa, who was the treasurer of customs (*gümrükçü*). In the *rûznâme*s, he is referred to as a singer rather than as an instrumentalist. On 26 June 1742 (22 R 1155),[57] 27 March and 18 April 1743 (1 and 23 S of 1156), he sang (*âğâze*) to Mahmud I. It is noted that in two of these performances, he sang *türkü*, which is a folkloric genre in Ottoman music. Although the language of the *rûznâme*s is not very detailed, the word *âğâze* in this account indicates a vocal performance. We can assume that he sang rather than played any instrument, and that he was good at singing *türkü*, but not *şarkı*. Also, since his name was mentioned thrice, he is supposed to be one of the prominent musicians at Mahmud I's court. It is also possible that he came in other times but was not recorded.

Another reference to a non-Muslim musician is dated 14 March 1742 (7 M 1155). The entry is about a non-Muslim Greek singer who was a fur merchant and gave a vocal performance to the sultan (*kürkçü keferesinden bir hânende*). Although his name has not been given, it is very likely that this individual was Zaharya – one of the most celebrated composers of Ottoman music – since they have so much in common.[58] Zaharya was a very talented vocalist in the Fener Rûm Orthodox Church

[57] In the transliterated text that I use (Oral 1966) the first reference to Şivelioğlu does not given. Selman Benlioğlu, who retransliterated the *rûznâme*s of Mahmud I but not publish yet, states by personal communication that on 22 R 1155, Şivelioğlu sang "*türkmânî türkü*" in Neşâd-âbâd Waterfront Mansion. (*Yirmi ikinci yevm-i İsneyn'de Neşâd-âbâd'a teşrîf ve Türkmânî türkü âgâze ider Gümrükcü'nün çukadarı ve Şîveli-oğlu dimekle ma'rûf bir kefere ba'zı âgâze ve istima'ıyla imrâr-ı vakt olunup ba'de-edâ-yı asr filikaya süvâr olup mu'âvedet buyurdular*). I thank Selman Soydemir to share the correct version of this reference, with me.

[58] Not much is known about Zaharya. Until recently, there was even uncertainty about when he lived (İnal 1958, LV). Öztuna says that Zaharya sang in the presence of Ahmed III and Mahmud I, and became famous in the time of Ahmed III (Öztuna 1969, 399). Brandl claims that he was "the chief musician" under these two sultans (Olley 2017, 179). He is not mentioned in Uzunçarşılı's article on the palace salaries of musicians (Uzunçarşılı 1977).

(*kilise mugannîsi*), where he was a *tanbûr* player with a unique musical style.[59] He was also said to have tutored *Mevlevî* musicians. What we know about Zaharya is no more than these rumors, which are not based on strong evidence. Even the exact date of his death is unknown, but it is estimated that he died around 1740.[60] Since some of his works are documented as "Mîr Cemil" in some sources, there is an unspecified assumption that he may have converted to Islam in his later years (Öztuna 1969, 399). According to *rûznâme*s, he was still alive in 1742. So, the *terminus post quem* of Zaharya's date of death is 1742, in the light of our current knowledge. The term "*kefere*" (plural of *kâfir*, meaning infidel) shows that he still had not converted to Islam at that year but was still summoned to perform for Mahmud I.

Apart from these two non-Muslim musicians, the *rûznâme*s also mention a group of new converts including players (*bâziçe-bâz*), singers, and instrumentalists – but their names are not given.[61] Other than those few references, *rûznâme*s do not mention any other non-Muslim musicians at Mahmud I's court. Yet, there are also other non-Muslim musicians known to be acquainted with Mahmud I. For example, an Armenian *tanbûr* player, Tanbûrî Küçük Artin (Harutin), who was assigned to join the delegation sent to Nadir Shah (King of Iran), was Mahmud I's court singer. Also, a Rabbi named Moshe Faro (Haham Musi), a composer and an accomplished *tanbûr* player, was a leading musician during the reign of Mahmud I. In his collections of secular music, Petros Peloponnesios (d. 1778) (also known as Petraki or Tyriaki in Ottoman sources) identified several non-Muslim composers including Cantemir, Zaharya (Hânende Zacharis), Tanbûri Haham Musi (Moshe) and Kemânî Yorgi. He also refers some other composers who are likely to be non-Muslims but not known from other sources, namely Papas, Usta Yesefin, Antoninin, Tanburi Atrizin (or Arizouni), Peligracoğlu, Ciohacoğlu, Hocanmasisin (Kalaitzidis 2015, 143). Apart from them, we have two theoretical treatises from the first half of the 18th century written by two Greek Orthodox theorists who are Panayiotes Chalathzoglou (d. 1748) and his student Kyrillos Marmarinos (d. 1760), along with Küçük Artin's musical treatise.[62] All these individuals lived in the 18th century and most of them were contemporaries of Mahmud I, but just two of them were mentioned in the

[59] İbnülemîn cites Nuri Şeyda's article on Zaharya published in *İkdâm* newspaper on 26 July 1898. Nuri Şeyda states that Zaharya was a priest at Fener Rum Orthodox Church, but no other source confirms his statement. (İnal 1958, 305).

[60] (Ezgi 1933, 46) and (Öztuna 1969, 399).

[61] (13 ZA 1154 / 20 January 1742) *On üçüncü yevm-i sebtte Topkapusu halvet olunub ba'zı hânende sâzende ve bâziçe-i bâz mühtedî nev-müslim dahî getirilüb leyl-i ahadda mahall-i mezbûrda ârâm olunub kesb-i safâ olundu.* (Oral 1966, 91).

[62] For a study on Phanariot Greek musicians in the Ottoman in the 18th century, see: (Plemmenos, 2002).

*rûznâme*s of Mahmud I.

Jacob Olley claims that musical life amongst the Greek Orthodox and Armenian millets revolved primarily around the institution of the Church – especially for vocal music. He adds that "the visibility of non-Muslims at the Ottoman court increased during the 19th century" (Olley 2017, 179-80). Famous non-Muslim musicians[63] who established relations with the palace through performing at the musical gatherings or of teaching music in the palace all lived in the 19th century. Similarly, roughly twelve percent of the musicians of Selim III and Mahmud II era were non-Muslims (Benlioğlu 2017, 135-137). Olley has also argued that while they played a greater role during the mid to late 19th century, looking at the sources from the 19th century, such as the anthology of Hâşim Bey and manuscript collections of Hamparsum, non-Muslims remain statistically underrepresented (Olley 2017, 181). This may be also valid for the *rûznâme*s of Mahmud I. Even Evliyâ Çelebi mentions several Greek and Jewish musicians in the mid-17th century.[64] The *rûznâme*s, as an official source, fails to mention their names. It is possible to assume that although they were minority in musical sphere, non-Muslim musicians were less represented than they really were, especially in the more official sources.

Furthermore, instances of non-Muslim and Muslim musicians coming together for the purpose of training or music-making are not uncommon in the Ottoman realm. "Since the 17th century the *Mevlevî* dervishes had become the teachers to many of the Armenian, Greek, and Jewish musicians in Istanbul and Edirne" (Feldman 2019b, 179). For instance, Rauf Yekta Bey, the musician and musicologist in the early 20th century, stated that Zaharya spent most of his time in the *Mevlevî* lodges and other Sufi lodges. In this way, he was able to recite various religious musical forms such as *âyin, ilâhi, durak, na't* and *ezân* (Paçacı-Tunçay 2013). It is known that another Greek contemporary of Zaharya, Petros Peloponnesios (d. 1778), was a Greek cantor and composer who went to the Galata *Mevlevî* Lodge on a regular basis. There he learned how to play the *ney*, established close relationships with dervishes. When he died, dervishes wanted to bury him with his *ney* (Erol 2016). In the 19th century, the two most talented students of İsmail Dede Efendi were Armenian Hamparsum Limonciyan and Nikoğos Ağa. In a nutshell, *Mevlevî* lodges bridged Muslim and non-Muslim musicians. There were also some cases where non-Muslims taught Muslims. For example, Selim III's *tanbûr* instructor was a Jewish

[63] Such as Tanbûrî İzak (d. 1814), Hamparsum Limonciyan (d. 1839), Bedros Çömlekçiyan (d. 1840) Oskiyam (d. 1870?), Kemânî Amâ Corci (d. 1805?).

[64] Such as Urum Angeli (*dâirezen, tanburcu*), Ermeni Avınç (*tanburcu*), Ermeni Aydın (*dâirezen*), Ermeni Haçatur (*dâirezen*), Yahudi Pıtıkoğlu (*dâirezen*), Yahudi Yanko (*miskali*). (Evliyâ Çelebi 2006, 343). Also, for a study on the comparative list of hundreds of musicians whose names are mentioned by Evliyâ Çelebi, see: (Pekin 2012).

musician Isaak Romano, known as Tanbûrî İzak (d. 1814). İzak, as well as a Moldavian violin player Kemâni Miron were teachers in the *Enderûn*.

These intercommunal relationships are also reflected in several paintings. An engraving from 1756 by Alexander Russell (1715? -1768) showing a concert given by a Syrian band in Ottoman Aleppo, includes five performers wearing different kinds of attire and head-dresses, which denoted their sects. According to Russell's own description, there is a Turk (reads Muslim) playing the *daff* (tambourine), a Christian playing the *tanbûr*, a dervish playing the *ney*, a Christian of a middle rank playing Arab fiddle (*rebab*), and lastly a man beating small drums with his hands (Russell, 1756, 95). So, we have a group of musicians from Aleppo, two of whom are known to be Turkish/Muslim, and two of them Christians. Also, painting of a concert in the British Embassy in Istanbul from 1779 shows a similar picture. In this painting, there are twelve musicians in the scene: a Muslim playing the *tanbûr*, two *Mevlevî* musicians playing the *ney*. The three singers playing the tambourine at the same time are evidently Muslims, but the rest – wearing black hats – are all non-Muslims. The players of violin, ney, rebab, and *santûr* are Greeks. The *tanbûr* player is possibly a Jew, because of the turban wrapped around his hat. Suffice it to say, this band is composed of six Muslim and six non-Muslim musicians making music altogether. Both visuals display the intercommunal relations at the Ottoman in the context of music.[65]

2.6 Others

2.6.1 Women

Another group of musicians who were underrepresented are women. In fact, there is not a single reference to a female musician in the *rûznâme*s. Undoubtedly, they were not as visible as male musicians, but we know female musicians (concubines/*câriye*) were an important part of music at the Ottoman court. Just as male musicians were trained in *Enderûn*, talented female concubines in the palace service were encouraged to take private music lessons in the harem. Teachers could either come to the palace on certain days of the week or for the instruments which are hard to learn or take a long time, training could be given in teachers' homes (Uzunçarşılı 1977, 87). Uzunçarşılı details the salaries of concubines' music teachers. In the *harem*, there

[65] Panagiotis Poulos examines the spaces of musical interaction amongst the various communities in Ottoman İstanbul, especially focusing the 19th century, see: (Poulos 2019).

was even a musical ensemble composed of female musicians. They were frequently depicted in the Ottoman miniature paintings and paintings of European travelers by the 16th century as instrumentalists, dancers, or singers, who entertained themselves as well as the sultan and/or his wife. Female instrumentalists playing in a garden in the album of Ahmed I (the early 17th century), Gemminger and Mueller's dancing ladies and musicians in the *harem* (mid-17th century), female musicians at the feast of Vâlide Sultan organized in honor of Madame Girardin (wife of the French ambassador) (late 17th century), female instrumentalists of Levnî (late 18th century) are just a few examples.

There were certainly many women as composers, singers, or instrumentalists in the Ottoman court, but very few of their names have been recorded or survived today. Dilhayat, about whom very little is known, was the most celebrated female composer of Ottoman music. Claims that she lived during the times of Selim III and Mahmud II are dubious as her name appears in almost all the song-text collections (*güfte mecmu'aları*) written since the middle of the 18th century (Korkmaz 2020b, 271). Talip Mert, who studied Dilhayat's *tereke* (estate records)[66] in 1999, determined that she died in 1740 (Mert 1999, 70). Uzunçarşılı wrote that Mahmud I raised several musically talented concubines in his palace, and he provided some of the first lines of the lyrics of these concubines' compositions (Uzunçarşılı 1977, 87). By looking at the song-text collections, Harun Korkmaz has found out that one of these compositions belonged to Dilhayat. This suggests that she was one of Mahmud I's musician concubines (Korkmaz 2020b, 271). If this is the case, the missing parts of the *rûznâme*s, especially those covering the years between 1734-40, promise to provide clues that would help to trace her in archival documentation.

2.6.2 Unknowns

There are several names in the *rûznâme*s of Mahmud I mentioned in the context of music that we are not able to recognize and thus categorize because any detail has not been given about them and we cannot find clues. These include a violinist Kemânî İbrâhim,[67] and a vocalist Çorbacı-zâde.[68] Other than that, Kemânî İbrahim must

[66] A document containing a list of all the movable property left behind by a deceased person.

[67] [10 Z 1154/16 February 1742] [...] *Kasr-ı İncülü'ye sâye-endâz-ı iclâl [...] İbrâhim nâmında kemânî ba'zı sâza muvaffakât ile ikrâm idüb istima' ile eğlenildi* (Oral 1966, 98).

[68] (4 ZA 1155/31 December 1742) [...] *Kasr-ı Bahâriye'ye teşrîf-i iclâl* [...] *Çorbacı-zâde dimekle ma'rûf bir hânende pîşgâh-ı meymenet-mu'tâdda ba'zı âğâze-i beste ve istima'* [...] (Oral 1966, 159). [...] *Topkapu'da vâki' Şevkiye'ye teşrîf ve Çorbacı-zâde dimekle meşhûr* [?] *bir hânende huzûr-ı feyz-bahşâlarında ba'zı sâza muvaffak[ât] ile âğâze ve istima'ıyla eğlenilüb mehûr* [?]*-ı ihsân u erkanlar ile mesrûru'l-fu'âd* [...] (Oral 1966, 164). Selman Soydemir, who will publish the re-translation of the *rûznâme* soon, states that it is

be an ordinary violin player because we do not know any celebrated violin player by this name. Finally, Çorbacı-zâde, as his full name is not given, we do not know for sure who he was, whether he was a son of a company commander of Janissary corps[69] or the son of a soup maker/seller. Öztuna mentions a composer and singer named Çorbacı-zâde Mustafa Efendi, who died possibly around 1755 (Öztuna 1969, 48). This man might be the Çorbacı-zâde in the *rûznâme*s. Nevertheless, I cannot see anyone with this name in the *Atrâbü'l-Âsâr*, in which Öztuna gives reference as his source of information for this individual. In short, it is possible, but not certain, that our Çorbacı-zâde might be Öztuna's Çorbacı-zâde Mustafa Efendi.

2.7 The Conclusion of the Chapter

To summarize, when we look at the individuals directly or indirectly associated with the music in the Mahmud I's *rûznâme*s from a bird's eye, we see a colorful picture. Although there are underrepresented or even not represented groups, many musicians coming from various backgrounds and various professions were mentioned – some of them by name. This microcosm of musicians in Ottoman music showcased Ottoman society: officers, artisans, mosque singers, Sufis, and non-Muslims. For most of these individuals, music-making may not be the main source of income, because they had different titles other than *hânende* or *sâzende*. Although almost half of them held various positions in the court, they were not called/titled as musicians. Furthermore, the names of these musicians show a certain pattern, even though it is hard to say that the *rûznâme*s represent every group perfectly: the vast majority of them (with two exceptions who were Yorgi and Zaharya) are Muslims. This picture ties in well with what Owen Wright wrote in 1992. When he was comparing a mid-17th century source with those written in the 15th and 16th century, he saw the domination of musicians of Muslim background in the 17th century who were partly amateurs; on the contrary to the musicians of "antecedent tradition," who were from different parts of the Middle Eastern region (mostly Persians) and professional musicians trained in the court and dependent on the patronage of the court. All in all, the musicians in Mahmud I's palace who received salaries either on a regular basis or on occasions, are one of the clear signs of Mahmud I's musical patronage, very likely inherited from his predecessor, Ahmed III.

---

originally written as "Şorbacı-zâde" but it must be Çorbacı-zâde. (18 Z 1155/13 February 1743).

[69]For "Çorbacı" in millitary, see: (Özcan, 1993).

Table 2.2 Occupational Categories of Musicians.

	Palace service	non-Courtly	Artisan	Mosque Singers	Sufi	non-Muslim
Ali Bey (*kilâr-ı âmireden*)	X			X(?)		
Ali (*dârüssaade ağası müezzini*)	X			X		
Çiçekçi Salih Efendi			X		X	
Kemânî İbrahim						
Tâ'ib-zâde (*neyzen*)					X(?)	
Çorbacı-zâde (*hânende*)						
Uşşâkî-zâde ve oğlu (*hânende-i Bîrûndan*)	X					
Şiveli-oğlu (*İshak Ağa'nın çukadarı*)	X					X
Çömlekçi-oğlu			X(?)			
Bursavî kemân-zen bir derviş		X(?)			X	
***Kürkçü keferesinden bir hanende* (Zaharya)**			X			X
Said Çavuş (*girift-zen*)	X				X(?)	
Said Çavuş, (*neyzen-başı*)	X				X	
Bekir Çavuş (*nüdemâdan*)	X					
Salih Çavuş (*Enderûn ağalarından*)	X					
Hüseyin Çavuş (*müezzin-başı*)	X			X		
Ali Ağa (*müezzin-başı*)	X			X		
Abdülbâki Dede (*Galata Mevlevi şeyhi*)					X	
Çaylak-zâde/Çâlâk-zâde (*mevlûdcu*)				X		
Sûmî-zâde (*mevlûdcu*)				X		
Altı-zâde Çırağı Efendi (*mevlûdcu*)				X		

Notes: Unsure ones are indicated with "?".

3. 1. THE MUSIC OF *RÛZNÂME*S

In the previous chapter, I delineated the profile of the musicians at the Ottoman court in the early 18th century based on the *rûznâme*s of Mahmud I. The present chapter examines the music itself through the musical genres and instruments in the same account.

3.1 Musical Genres

3.1.1 *Mehter/Mehterhâne*

Similar to chamber music in Western music being performed by orchestras in small-size, Ottoman music was performed by an ensemble of small number of performers. The main exception to this comparison is that *mehter* refers to the Ottoman military band (also known as *mehterhâne, tablhâne,* or *tabl u 'alem*). It is one of the most (in)famous symbols of glory and power of the Ottoman state. The *mehter* ensemble consists of percussion and wind instruments, including the *zurna* (shawm), *boru* (trumpet), *tabl* (double-headed drum), *zil* (cymbal), and *nakkâre* and *kös* (smaller and bigger kettledrums). When exactly the *mehterhâne* was established is an enigma. Although there were military bands in the old Turkic and Islamic states, the earliest documents that mention terms *mehter* and *mehterhâne* are found in the 16th century. In the next two centuries, this institution was given special attention by musically inclined sultans (Özcan 2003, 545-546). As an inseparable component of the Ottoman military, the *mehterhâne* was abolished with the Janissary army in 1826. In tracing its institutional life before its abolishment, the most important written source on *mehterhâne* is the *Seyahatnâme* of Evliyâ Çelebi since he writes about different types of *mehter*s and various occasions in which *mehter*s played. Moreover, Ali Ufkî in the mid-17th century and Cantemir in the early 18th century included several references to *mehter* music in their collections.

In terms of function, it is possible to divide *mehterhâne* into two groups: official and unofficial mehters. Evliyâ referred to official *mehter*s as "*âl-i Osman mehterhânesi*" or "*tabl-ı Osmânî*". By referring to the concepts of official and unofficial, he sometimes uses *mehter-i Enderûn* and *mehter-i Bîrûn*. In contemporary scholarship, Feldman uses official and unofficial *mehter*s to emphasize this dichotomy (Feldman 1996). The official *mehter* was paid by the sultan, so it can be regarded as the most professional musician group in Ottoman music. The most well-known duty of the official *mehter* was to boost the morale of the Ottoman soldiers during the campaigns while disturbing enemies with loud and thundering sounds. In peaceful times, they regularly performed in the presence of the sultan, accompanied him in processions (*alay*) and announced the absolute power of the sultan with their songs and prayers. They were in charge of performing on several formal occasions, such as sultan' enthronements, sword-wielding ceremonies, welcoming ceremonies for ambassadors,[1] and banquets honoring princes (Popescu-Judetz 2007, 61). Among the daily duties of the official *mehter* is to play *nevbet* – playing rhythm with percussions, especially with drum (*davul*) – every day after prayer times (mostly after the afternoon and morning prayers) from towers of the city. They also greeted the sultan every afternoon with prayers (*duâ*). It should be noted that *mehter*s were performed in a highly ritualized manner, in which every detail was predetermined, not unlike a theater show.

Although the one belonging to the sultan is the most magnificent, he was not the only one who has a *mehter* ensemble under his command. High-ranking officers were also entitled their own *mehter*s; equally, the higher their rank, the greater the number of musicians their *mehter* had. Evliyâ speaks of layers (*kat*) which indicate the numbers of each instrument and thus show the magnitude of a *mehter* ensemble. As he writes about an eight-layer *mehter*, for example, he meant that there are eight *nakkâre*, eight *zurna*, eight *kös*, etc. in that certain *mehter* ensemble. Depending on the status of the officer, these layers would range from three to twelve. Sultan's *mehter* would generally be in nine layers except during war, when these numbers were doubled (Popescu-Judetz 2007, 66).

Unofficial *mehter*s, by contrast, did not get regular payments from the sultan. They were designated for outdoor dance and celebratory music, and performed in public and private festivities like weddings.[2] They were attached to the *mehter* chief

[1] For the *mehterhâne*s played during the passage of al-Hac Ahmed Ağa, who was appointed as the Iranian ambassador, from Üsküdar, see: (İzzî Efendi 2019, 368).

[2] Salomon Schweigger (d. 1622), a German traveler and embassy preacher who had been in Istanbul between 1578 and 1581, provides an illustration of a *mehter* at a wedding (Schweigger 2004, 207). Also, despite his dislike, his travel book contains the oldest notated and published piece of Ottoman music which is a *mehter* (*mehter havası*) (Schweigger 2004, 209).

(mehter-başı) (Evliyâ Çelebi 2003, 624-5).[3] When large ensembles are needed, they joined the official *mehter* ensemble (Sanal 1964, 5). Apart from those, we know very little about unofficial *mehter*s. At the first glance, it is difficult to distinguish between official and unofficial *mehter*s, as writers like Evliyâ generally used the term *mehter* more comprehensively, usually without describing. Neither Evliyâ nor the *Surnâme-i Vehbî*,[4] in which there are many scenes of various kinds of entertainments like *cirit* and *güreş* (wrestle) accompanied by *mehter* ensembles, tell whether the *mehter*s they refer to are official or unofficial. Sanlıkol claims that since this distinction emerged as a result of the terminological dichotomy between official (state) and unofficial (entertainment), there must have been some differences between both in terms of repertoire and instrumentation (Sanlıkol 2011, 49). Analyzing 17th-century miniatures, Feldman claims that urban unofficial *mehter*s used instruments such as the *musikâr/miskal* (panpipe), the *dâire* (tambourine), the *çalpara* (castanets), and even the *santur* – in addition to *zurna* (shawm) (Feldman 1996, 61,65,66). These instruments are not often used in the standard (official) *mehter*s probably because they do not produce sounds loud enough for grand festivals. In the *Surnâme-i Vehbî*, there are many passages and illustrations in which the *mehter* is accompanied by male and female dancers (sing. *rakkas* and *çengî*). This is an impossible combination for official *mehter*s (Sanlıkol 2011,49). Therefore, it appears that these kinds of *mehter* ensembles are unofficial.

In connection with this, their repertoire will also differ from the official *mehter*s, as they would perform different types of music for different purposes and in different settings. The unofficial *mehter* repertoire, called *nevbet* or *fasıl*, focused on *peşrev* and *semâ'î*, as well as improvised *taksîm* (Feldman 2012, 3). The repertoire of the *mehter* expanded during the 18th century to incorporate instrumental adaptations of the classical vocal forms such as *beste, nakş, semâ'î*. They also included several folk tunes like *ezgi, türkü* and *kalenderî* (Feldman 2012, 3). In the 16th century, European observers such as Schweigger and Nicholas Nicholay thought that *mehter* music was too loud and unesthetic. In the 18th century, people like Madam Montagu, Toderini and M. Guer argued that *mehter* was, contrary to what earlier writers had claimed, rather pleasant and harmonious (Aksoy 2003, 48, 88). Furthermore, Toderini expressed his appreciation in describing *mehter* music as extraordinary and wonderful (Toderini 2018, 145). In addition to the changing political conditions from the 16th to the 18th centuries, that the *mehter* incorporated instrumental adaptations of several classical and folk genres mentioned above in the 18th century

[3] Evliyâ named this group as *kârhâne-i mehterân-i Yedikulle* (Evliyâ Çelebi 2006, 336).

[4] *Surnâme-i Vehbî* is an illustrated account of Sultan Ahmed III's four sons' circumcision festival written in 1720 by Seyyid Vehbî Efendi (d. 1736) and illustrated by Levnî (d. 1732) and his assistants.

may have helped change these views. This expansion of the repertoire of *mehter* may be related to unofficial *mehter*s being more active in the urban entertainments in this period, allowing them to expand their cultural reach.

Mahmud I's *rûznâme*s contains several references to the performances of official and unofficial mehters. While most of the *mehter*s in these references are called *mehter-i Bîrûn* and *taşra mehterhanesi*, some of them were just called *mehter* or *mehterhâne*. However, there are also some cases where they were used interchangeably.

In some references, *mehter*s are mentioned in official occasions despite some of them not specified as to whether they are official *mehter*s or not. For instances, during the processions organized for several occasions such as Mahmud I's sword-wielding ceremony (*taklîd-i seyf*), while Mahmud I was on his way to Palaces of Davud Paşa and Sa'dâbâd or Sepetçiler Kiosk, while Saliha Sultan – the mother of Mahmud I – was on her way to Vâlide Sultan Farm, during the welcoming ceremony of Ottoman navy returning from the Mediterranean Sea *mehter*s accompanied.[5] Moreover, a *mehterân-ı Birûn* showed up in sport competition (*cirit*) that took place at Vâlide Sultan Farm on 9 September 1734 (10 R 1147). The next day, on Friday, 10 September, (11 R 1147), when Mahmud I was giving gifts to his subjects the *mehterhâne-i Birûn* accompanied him again. The main purpose of these *mehter*s was for official ceremonies. If the *mehterhâne* accompanied the sultan, it was to announce his or his mother's travels from one place to another. They also symbolized critical developments for the state, which was an important part of the representation of glory and power of the state and the sultan.

There are also references about unofficial *mehter*s who undertook the duties of official *mehter*s, such as accompanying the sultans during their travels or at various games and races. While Saliha Sultan was making a trip to and from Göksu on horseback, (11 July 1734/9 Safer 1147), or on her way to Sa'dâbâd (6 September 1734/7 R 1147), the *taşra mehterhânesi* played *fasıl*s while accompanying her entourage.

In addition to these official *mehter*s or to those unofficial *mehter*s who performed official duties, there are also references in the *rûznâme*s about *taşra mehterhânesi* who took part in various musical entertainments but not in official ceremonies. On July 12 (10 S 1147), *taşra mehterhânesi* played until midnight under gloomy skies in a tent, which people having fun with. On the night of August 8 (8 R 1147) of the same year, *fasıl*s were performed at night by the *mehterân-i Birûn* before a *temcîd* was recited. On September 8 (9 R 1147) *mehterhâne* performed again, together with *temcîd*. Although it is not stated whether they were official or unofficial *mehter*s, it

[5]Respectively (23 RA 1143 / 6 October 1730), (10 C 1143 / 21 December 1730), (5 B 1154 / 16 September 1741), (9 M 1160 / 21 January 1747), (7 R 1147 / 6 September 1734), (6 C 1147 / 3 November 1734).

would not be unreasonable to assume that they were unofficial.

To put it briefly, while some *mehter*s are described with different terms such as *Bîrûn* and *taşra*, looking at the context of their performances makes it difficult to say which or when there are two separate *mehter*s as official and unofficial, and to distinguish one from another. Except for a few, these references are mostly mentioned in the *rûznâme* of 1734. All the references to the unofficial *mehter*s are found only in this *rûznâme* text. Other texts covering the rest of the years refer only to *mehter* in general terms. What can be assumed, however, according the *rûznâme* of 1734, is that *mehter* performances increased in the summer months while there is almost no mention of the other months. There are also other references in which the *mehter* is not even mentioned. Instead, these references mention the *nakkâre*, one of the most important instruments of the *mehter* ensemble, which accompanied the sultans during daily entertainment and traveling. These references are discussed in the *nakkâre* section.

3.1.2 *Türkü/Türkî*

Türkî is the only genre that is clearly stated in the *rûznâme*s that Mahmud I listened to apart from some religious genres. *Türkî* as a folkloric genre, is a general term used for vocal metrical songs with Turkish lyrics on various religious or worldly themes. Unless their names are referenced in the lyrics, the *âşık* (poet) of its lyrics are mostly forgotten. Their compositions are shaped by the collective contribution of performers over time (Şenel 2012).

In the *rûznâme*s, there are five references over a five-day timespan to the listening of *türkî*s, to be more specific "*türkmen-i türkü*s". These performances took place at Neşâd-âbâd Palace on 26 June 1742, in the mansion of İshak Ağa on 28 June given by İshak Ağa's lackey (*çuhadar*), in Kuleli Garden on 1 July and in Topkapı Palace on 4 July.[6] As it is understood from the fact that he repeatedly invited musicians to the palace and listened to *türkmen-i türkî*s, he must have liked this genre. I could not come across the term *türkmen-i türkî* in other sources I have looked at. Evliyâ mentions several types of *türkî* and uses this word for the folk songs of different communities living in Ottoman lands, such as *Rum türküleri, Ermenice türküler, Arnavutça türküler, Şirvânî yayla türküsü* (Evliyâ Çelebi 2003). *Türkmen-i türkî* must have indicated an Anatolian rural style. Çârşeb Mustafa Ağa, the chief *muezzin* in the palace, was noted for his *Türkmen* style in instrumental playing by

[6]Respectively 22 R 1155, 24 R, 27 R1155 and 1 CA 1155.

Es'ad Efendi.[7] Presumably, he was playing the *çöğür* or the *tanbura*, which were highly regarded among non-classical lutes for folk songs (Feldman 1996, 173).

Nine months later, on 27 March 1743 (1 S 1156), when Mahmud I was in the Sepetçiler Kiosk in Sarayburnu, Şivelioğlu Kemânî Yorgaki Efendi, who was mentioned before, sang "*gevherî türküler*" together with other non-Muslims, which amused Mahmud I.[8] A few days later, on 18 April 1743 (23 S 1156), Şivelioğlu came to the palace and sang again, but no information was given about the content of this performance. *Gevherî türküler* may well refer to the *türkî*s whose lyrics were composed from the poems of the poet Gevherî. Gevherî was a folk poet who flourished during the second half of the 17th and first half of the 18th centuries. Çârşeb Mustafa Ağa included lyrics of many *türkî* in his song-text collection, some of which written by poets like Köroğlu, Gevherî and Türkmen Ali (Uslu 2009, 202). Similarly, genres such as *Hasanoğlı türküsü* and *Abdî Şâh türküsü*, which Âşık Çelebi mentioned in his biographical dictionary in the last third of the 16th century (Pekin 2012), must have taken their names from their *âşık*s (poets).

Our information about *türkî* is mostly based on those provided by Ali Ufkî and Evliyâ Çelebi. In two manuscript song collections of Ali Ufkî from the mid-17th century (*Mecmu'a-i Sâz ü Söz* and untitled [*Turc 292*]), around one hundred fifty pieces out of the more than five hundred pieces in various genres he notated were composed in folkloric genres including *türkü, varsağı* and *hava* (air) (Behar 2016, 60). In the *Mecmu'a-i Sâz ü Söz*, there are more than ninety *türkî* notes, which constitutes the oldest notated evidence of *türkî* melodies (Cevher 1995). Even Ali Ufkî himself composed nine *türkî*s (Cevher 1995, 12-13). Ali Ufkî who stayed in Topkapı Palace for almost twenty years, notated numerous examples of folk music forms that he heard in and around the palace of Murad IV (r. 1623-1640) and Sultan İbrahim (r. 1640-1648). Particularly in the court of Murad IV, *türkî* had an important place. Several *âşık*s around Murad IV show the importance given to the tradition of *âşıklık* in the Ottoman palace (Güray 2019, 332-336).[9] If Murad IV would have a *rûznâme*, we would probably find many references to *türkî*s that he listened to.

Feldman argues that Evliyâ's and Ali Ufkî's positions about folkloric genres contrast with Es'ad Efendi and Cantemir who lived half a century later than they and were not interested in such "non-classical" genres, thus almost never mentioned them.

---

[7] [...] v*âdi-i Türkmânî üzere sâzendeliği dahi var idi* (Behar 2010, 236).

[8] [...] *Şiveli-oğlu [ve] sâ'ir kefere ba'zı Gevherî türküler âğâze ve istima'ıyla eğlenilüb* [...] (Oral 1966, 172)

[9] Cenk Güray gives the names of those *âşık*s in the court of Murad IV who were supposedly Jannisaries (Güray 2019, 332-336).

While Evliyâ and Ali Ufkî were professional court musicians and close witnesses of courtly repertoire, Es'ad Efendi and Cantemir were aristocratic amateurs. Since the musicians in the palace were obliged to entertain the sultan with various genres of dance, erotic and other "light" music, music in the Ottoman court was not restricted to "classical" courtly genres (Feldman 1996, 69). Although we only know one genre that can be regarded as non-classical that Mahmud I listened to, apart from several religious ones, it still gives us an inkling of the musical diversity in the court of Mahmud I.

Apart from *türkî*, most of the music whose genres are specified in the *rûznâme*s are in the other forms of religious music, such as mosque music and Sufi music, if to make such a division. While mentioning forms such as *temcîd, ilâhi, mevlîd* and *mirâciyye* with mosque music usually sung by muezzins, Mahmud I also listened to *na't* and *âyin* mystical music several times, which are performed in *Mevlevî* lodges. Nevertheless, forms of *na't, ilâhi* and *mirâciyye* can be sung both in mosques and *tekke*s. Since these two categories have commonalities, such a distinction will not be applied here.

3.1.3 *Temcîd*

Temcîd, meaning "honoring and exalting", is a genre for praying and invocations made to Allah. It was recited in the minarets by *muezzin*s. *Temcîd* became associated with three Islamic holy months: the first two of which (Receb and Şaban) a *temcîd* was recited after the night prayer (*isha*). During Ramazan, it was recited after the meal eaten before starting to fast (*sahur*). Apart from three holy months, it was also recited in some other blessed nights like *kandîl*s. *Temcîd* is a pre-composed work but having no *usûl* (rhythmic cycle). It was primarily sung solo, but the *muezzin*'s choir would also intervene at certain points (Feldman 1992, 194). It is composed of several parts of praising to Allah, *kalimat at-tawhîd* (unification of the oneness of God), salutations to the Prophet, an invocation (*münacât*) verse in Turkish, and some short verses read in between (Şahin 2015, 67). Although it was under the category of mosque music, it was also performed in Sufi lodges.

In the *rûznâme*s, we see that *temcîd* was performed several times on 13 July (11 S 1147) and 7-8-9 September (8-9-10 R 1147) in the year 1734.[10] As said before, *temcîd* was performed during the three holy months or on blessed nights. However, none of these performances mentioned in the *rûznâme*s were made within one of

[10] In connection with the performers, these *temcîd* performances were already mentioned in the previous chapter.

these three months, and it appears that it was not a special day such as feasts or *kandîl*s. It is noted that only the 11th of Safer is the beginning of the month of July (*ibtidâ'-ı mâh-ı temmûz*). Chronicles of the period equally do not mention special occasions on these days either (Kayar 2020, 613-771). Furthermore, even though *temcîd* was a vocal genre and sung by *muezzin*s without instruments, in two of these performances here, it was accompanied by the *ney* and the *girift* which is also a member of *ney* family. It may have been done this way because it was performed in front of the sultan, a place other than a mosque or a lodge, at Vâlide Sultan's Farm. But of course, these are no more than speculations.

3.1.4 *İlâhî*

İlâhî (hymn) is the general name of the poems composed in religio-mystical themes. It is composed with a rhythmic cycle and its lyrics are mostly in Turkish. Depending on its subject, *ilâhî* can be sung in different places and for different occasions. It would not be correct to categorize *ilâhî* either as mosque music or Sufi music, because it is a genre that can be sung both in mosques and Sufi lodges. The only distinction worth mentioning is that while *tekke ilâhî*s could sometimes be sung accompanied by instruments, mosque *ilâhî*s were performed entirely orally without instruments.

In the *rûznâme*s, *ilâhi* was only mentioned once. On the day of 13 July (11 S 1147) when the temcîd was performed, as mentioned just above, *ilâhi*s accompanied by *girift* were also sung at the same gathering.

3.1.5 *Mevlîd*

Mevlîd or *mevlîd-i şerîf*, which literally means birth, is the name of the ceremonies held on the birth anniversary of the Prophet Muhammad in 12 Rebi'ü'l-evvel. Although other genres were also performed in these ceremonies, *mevlîd*, the ceremony's name, has its own distinct genre. Usually, Süleyman Çelebi's (d. 1409) *mesnevî* – called *Vesîletü'n-necât* (Path to Salvation), which is the most known *mevlîd* text written in Turkish – is recited with an improvised melody without any rhythmic cycles. The term *mevlîd* ceremony, which was held in one of the grand mosques after the so-called *mevlîd* procession (*mevlîd alayı*) was attended by the sultan, eventually encompassed a wider sense over time and included all the ceremonies held in either the Ottoman palace or mosques on the twelfth day of the month in question.

All the days of *mevlîd* celebrations in the *rûznâme*s of Mahmud I corresponding to

between 1154/1741 and 1162/1749 are mentioned. Almost all of them were performed in the same way. On the night between 11 and 12 Rebi'ü'l-evvel, after the sermon given by the sheikh of Hagia Sophia Mosque, the *mevlîd* was recited at places like Mahbûbiye and Topkapı Palaces. The next day (on 12 Rebi'ü'l-evvel), Mahmud I went to the Sultan Ahmed Mosque with a procession (*alay-ı muhteşem*) for the *mevlîd* ceremony. After listening to *mevlîd* recitations and to the letter brought from the sherif of Mecca, various gifts were given to those who attended the ceremony and recited the *mevlîd*. The *mevlîd* almost always happened in exactly the same way for about ten years with only minor changes, such as location. For example, in 1734 the *mevlîd* took place at Beşiktaş Palace instead of Sultan Ahmed Mosque. Although in his book published in 1788-89, Swedish ambassador and writer with Armenian origin Mouradgea D'Ohsson (1740-1807), gives an engraving of a *mevlîd* ceremony held in the Sultan Ahmed Mosque; going to the Sultan Ahmed Mosque with a procession in the day of *mevlîd* during the reign of Mahmud I may became a custom sometime between 1734 and 1740, and it seems to be continued the times ahead. Furthermore, details about who came to the ceremony, the reciters, etc. were documented more in 1734 than in any of the *mevlîd* records kept between 1740-50.[11]

3.1.6 *Mi'râciyye*

Mi'râciyye, as another religious genre mentioned in the *rûznâme*s, was recited on another Islamic holy night, on 27th of the month of Receb. It describes the ascension of Prophet. It is also one of the pre-composed genres which lacked a fixed rhythmic cycle (*usûl*). It composed of six parts (*bahir*) each were composed in different *makâm*s. It would not be correct to include this genre only in the category of mosque music too, as it was mostly sung in the various Sufi lodges. Even its composer, Nâyî Osman Dede (d.1729), was a *Mevlevî* sheikh.[12] The term *mi'râciyye* refers only to the compositions of Osman Dede, as it is considered by later musicians a masterpiece (Feldman 1992, 196).

In the *rûznâme*s, *mi'râciyye* were sung (*kıra'at-ı mi'râciyye*) almost every year for nine years, between 1740 and 1749, except for a few times (1743 and 1748). Although these ceremonies sometimes took place in the *Mevlevî* lodge in Beşiktaş, they were also held in different locations such as the palaces of Mahbûbiye, Sepetçiler or Beylerbeyi. Abdülbâki Dede, the sheikh of the Galata *Mevlevî* Lodge at that time, was invited with his dervishes most of the time.

[11] See: footnote 55 of the previous chapter

[12] For the composition story of *mi'râciyye*, see: page 36-37 of this thesis.

3.1.7 *Na't*

The *na't* or *na't-ı şerîf* is an improvised or composed chanting of poems (*medhiye*) related to the love of the Prophet. It has also no fixed *usûl*. The *na't* were solo performances both in *tekke*s and mosques. Although several pieces in *na't* form were composed, only one of them is sung today: "*na't-ı Mevlânâ*". The composition is by Buhûrîzâde Mustafa Itrî (d. 1712), a court musician associated with *Mevlevî* order, in *makâm rast* with Persian lyrics written by Mevlânâ Celâleddin Rûmî. Itrî's *na't* is one of the most crucial parts of the *Mevlevî* ceremony (*âyin*), which is sung as an opening piece at all *âyin*s regardless of which *makâm* they are composed in.

There is only a reference in the *rûznâme*s in which a *na't* is recited. On 12 August 1734 (12 RA 1147), the night of the *mevlîd*, the *na'thân* (*na't* reciter) of the Hagia Sophia Mosque recited "*na't-ı nebevî*" and at the end of the ceremony, before the *mevlîd* recitation, twenty *kuruş* was given to him together with the *mevlîd* reciters. Whether *na't-ı nebevî* refers to a piece other than Itrî's *na't* is not known. Since the term nebevî is about the prophet, it is quite possible that Itrî's *na't-ı Mevlânâ* shared the same popularity as he was already-famous composer in 1734 and that any mention of a *na't* refers to his composition.

3.1.8 *Âyin*

One of the most frequently mentioned musical forms in the *rûznâme*s is the *Mevlevî âyin* or *âyin-i şerîf*. *Âyin* is the most complex and the longest musical form in Ottoman music, composed to be sung during the *Mevlevî* ceremony (*semâ*) which is a *zikr* (remembrance) of the *Mevlevî* order. It consists of four pre-composed vocal sections (*selâm*), accompanied by various instruments – notably *ney* (reed flute) – as well as an instrumental prelude (*peşrev*) and improvisations (*taksîm*) and rhythmless chants (*na't*). Singing the *niyaz ilâhisi* (suppliance chant) at the end is optional.[13] Although some of the *âyin*s were composed in the same *makâm* from beginning to end, there are also others that begin and end in different *makâm*s. The lyrics of *âyin*s were selected from Mevlânâ Celâleddîn Rûmî's works like the *Mesnevî*, *Dîvân-ı Kebîr* and *Rubâ'iyyât*, along with poems of his son, Sultan Veled, and some *Mevlevî* poets. The earliest known *Mevlevî âyin* dates back to the mid-17th century composed by Kösek Derviş Mustafa Dede (d. 1684). Prior to that there are also three *âyin*s known collectively as "ancient compositions" (*beste-i kadîmler*), whose composers are unknown (Feldman 1992, 189).

[13] For detailed information on the performance of *semâ* and *âyin*, see: (Özcan, 2004).

Although the term "*âyin*" is not generally mentioned in the *rûznâme*s, as it is the music of the *Mevlevî* ceremony, there are references to *Mevlevî* ceremonies that Mahmud I attended. There are several references in the *rûznâme*s that Mahmud I participated in the *Mevlevî* ceremonies, almost all the periods covered by the *rûznâme*s, except 1731 which coincided with politically unstable times. It can be said that Mahmud I regularly attended these ceremonies. Generally, he visited two or three times within two or three months then did not visit for the rest of the year, unless it was not recorded. While there are no references to visits during the winter months, all the references coincided with the summer months without exception, especially in the months of July and August.

3.2 Instruments

As briefly mentioned in the introduction part of this thesis, one of the areas of the musical change in Ottoman music between 1600-1700 were instruments. Although the *rûznâme*s of Mahmud I mention instrumentalists (*sâzendegân*), instrumental fasıls that Mahmud I listened to (*fasl-ı saz istima'ı, bazı saz ve âğâze ile eğlenilüp*), and vocal pieces accompanied by instruments (*bazı saz muvafakatiyle*), little is said about the instruments themselves.

Toderini, who joined the Venetian ambassador's entourage and lived in Istanbul between 1781-86, divides musical instruments he saw in Istanbul into two basic categories. One category consists of instruments such as the *Zurnà* (shawm), *Kabà Zurnà* (law shawm), *Borù* (trumpet), *Zil* (cymbal), *Daul* (*davul*, drum), *Tombelek o Naarà* and *Kios* (*kös*, kettledrums), which Toderini calls "*Mehterhane*, that is, war instruments" (*Mechter Hanè, Stromenti Musici Militari*) (Toderini, 238). The other group includes the *Keman* (violin), *Ajaklì Keman* (footed violin), *Sinè Keman* (breast violin), *Rebab, Tambur, Nèi* (ney), *ghirif* (girift), *Evvi ancora il Nèi Ottavino* (?), *Mescal* (*miskal*, panpipe), *Santur* (dulcimer), *Canun* and *Dairè* (tambourine). Toderini named this category "Instruments of Chamber music" (*Musici Stromenti da camera*) (Toderini 1787, 236-239). Here, I group instruments mentioned in the *rûznâme*s according to Toderini's categorization.

3.2.1 Instruments of *Mehterhâne*

The most frequently mentioned instrument in the *rûznâme*s of Mahmud I is the *nakkâre*, which was an integral part of the *mehter* ensemble. It is one of the three drums in the *mehter* ensemble, consisting of two small bowl-like drums beaten with hands or two wooden sticks (*zahme* or *tokmak*). The one who plays it called *nakkâre-zen*. Apart from its usage in war, the *nakkâre* is regarded as one of the most prominent instruments for open-air entertainment, festivals, and wedding ceremonies. Together with some of the instruments of the official *mehter* ensemble like *zurna, def* and *tabl*, it might also accompany dancers with the instruments of "chamber orchestra" such as *santur, rebâb,* and *miskal* (Pekin 2018, 464). In a festival book commissioned by Ahmed III for the circumcision of his four sons in 1720, there are several scenes that depict *nakkâre* accompanying dancers. *Nakkâre-zen*s could play *nakkâre* while sitting in the various ceremonies. On occasions like processions, where they had to move, they tied their instruments in front of the saddles if they were on horses, or bind it to their waists with a belt if they were on foot. In Van Mour's painting of a Ottoman wedding (between circa 1720 and 1737), we see a man with a *nakkâre* strapped to his back and a *nakkâre-zen* who beats with sticks while walking in front of three *ney*-players.

In the *rûznâme*s, the *nakkâre* appears in similar kinds of scenes. While Mahmud I watched games, races, or competitions such as *cirit* and *tombak*, he listened to fasıls of the *nakkâre*. Likewise, in ordinary recreational gatherings or while Mahmud I was contemplating the passers-by the sea (*güzerânları temâşâ*) *nakkâre*s accompanied. In addition, while Mahmud I and his mother, Saliha Sultan, traveled from one place to another, *nakkâre*s accompanied to announce their passing to people. Thus, we see the *nakkâre* also in the functions of unofficial *mehter*s. It appears that the *nakkâre* had a kind of special place from other *mehter* instruments. While no stand-alone *fasıl*s are organized for any other instrument, there are many references in the *rûznâme*s to the *fasıl*s in which the *nakkâre* is played alone. For example, where expressions such as "*sade zurna faslı*" or "*sade kös faslı*" are never used, "*sade nakkâre faslı* or *nakkâre-i sâde*" (meaning "only the *nakkâre*...") became a recurring pattern throughout the *rûznâme*s. It should also be noted that with few exceptions, all references to those *nakkâre fasıl*s are mentioned in the *rûznâme* of 1734.

There are two references when a *nakkâre* was accompanied by the *zurna* and *tabl* – both members of the *mehter* ensemble. It was once during the game of *cirit* and

once in a procession ceremony in which the Iranian ambassador attended.[14] The *zurna* is a woodwind instrument which has a powerful sound and is usually played outdoors. The *tabl* (or *davul*), double-headed drums, is one of the kettledrums in the *mehter*, played with two mallets which make both a deep bass sound and a thin treble sound. There is also a reference which shows the *tabl* and *kös* were played together. The *kös/kûs* is another percussion instrument in the *mehter* ensemble, which is much larger and sounds much louder compared with the medium-sized *nakkâre*. It was taken on campaigns and played on official occasions (Feldman 2012, 3). It is mentioned that on 6 October 1730 (23 RA 1143), the *tabl* and *kös* were played together with the *mehterhâne* during the procession of Mahmud I's sword-wielding ceremony on the way to Eyyüb Mosque, which took place after he acceded to the throne.

3.2.2 Instruments of "Chamber Music"

The most important instrument in the *rûznâme*s of Mahmud I, that could be in a "chamber orchestra"[15] is the *ney* or *nây*. The *ney*, a rim-blown flute made of the reed is one of the most ancient instruments and an indispensable member of the *Mevlevî* ceremony (*semâ*) and regarded sacred for *Mevlevî*s. As the teaching of this instrument was monopolized by the *Mevlevî* lodges, it is generally identified with the *Mevlevî* order. More than half of the *ney*-players that Evliyâ named were affiliated with *Mevlevîyye* (Evliyâ Çelebi 2003, 638). With the rise of *Mevlevî* musicians in the 18th century, it probably gained greater importance among wind instruments such as the *miskal* (Behar 2019, 35). By the 17th century, the *ney* underwent a technical development in the Ottoman realm which distinguishes it from former *ney*s. While the Arab *nay* and the Persian *ney* do not use a mouthpiece, the Ottoman *ney* added one, called *baş-pâre*, and was made of bone or ox horn, which provides a smoother, stronger, and brighter sound.

Most of the references to the *ney* or *ney*-players in the *rûznâme*s are in the context of *Mevlevî* ceremonies.[16] Apart from the performances in the *Mevlevî* lodges, *Mevlevî neyzen*s also played at weddings, coffee houses, "concerts" and took part in perfor-

---

[14](17 Ş 1154/ 28 October 1741) *gulâm-ı nakkâre-zen ile zurna fasl u temâşâsıyla evkât-güzâr* [...] (Oral 1966, 77-78); (9 M 1160 / 21 January 1747) *darb-ı Mehter-hâne'ye ruhsat-ı hümâyûn olmağla darb-ı tabl u nakkâre iderek bün-i kasrdan müretteb alay-ı muhteşem ile zehâb* [...] (Bayrak 1972, 2).

[15]As Ersu Pekin conveys, the term of "chamber music" (*musici di camera*) was first used by Ali Ufkî in the mid-17th century (Pekin 2018, 464). Toderini also employed this term to describe to music that he heard in Istanbul.

[16]30 June 1734 (28 M 1147), 22 July 1734 (20 S 1147), 7 July 1745 (7 C 1158).

mances of different genres of music throughout in Istanbul (Pekin 2015, 43). This can be seen in the *rûznâme*s as well. On 7 August 1742 (5 C 1155) in the Neşâd-âbâd Pavilion, one of the *ney*-players coming from the city (*taşra neyzenlerinden bir neyzen*) played a secular *fasıl* with the *ney*, in company with other instruments.[17]

The *girift* is also one of the instruments mentioned in the *rûznâme*s.[18] It is one of the twelve kinds of *ney* mentioned by Evliyâ (Evliyâ Çelebi 2003, 626). In the *rûznâme*s, it is only used as an accompanying instrument in *temcîd* recitations, unlike the *ney*, not in the context of *Mevlevî* ceremonies.

Another instrument that *rûznâme*s mentioned in the context of *semâ* ritual is *kudûm*.[19] *Kudûm* is a small double drum beaten with sticks played in the *Mevlevî* lodges, also known as *nakkâre*. Evliyâ gives the names of some *nakkâre-zen*s in the section entitled "the players of *kudûm*" (*kudûm sâzendeleri*). This makes one think that these two instruments are the same, with perhaps some small differences, but called by different names in different contexts (Evliyâ Çelebi 2003, 638). The *tanbûr*, a long-necked lute having six strings (three pairs) played with a tortoiseshell plectrum, another of the chamber music instruments mentioned in the *rûznâme*s. Although there were other stringed instruments in similar forms, the *tanbûr* can be defined as a distinctly Ottoman variety, with its very long neck and hemispherical body. By the end of the 17th century, the *tanbûr* became a fixture in *fasıl* ensembles. It also displaced every other member of the lute family such as – notably – *ûd, şeşhâne* and *şeştâr* (Feldman 1996, 142). In the very first paragraph of his theory of music book, Cantemir expresses the prominence of the *tanbûr* among other instruments around 1700, as follows:

> "The instrument called *tanbûr* is the most perfect and complete of all instruments which we know or have seen because it performs completely and without fault all the sounds and melodies which appear by means of the breath of man".[20]

Cantemir also puts a drawing of a *tanbûr* at the end of the theory section of his book

---

[17] *Neşâd-âbâd'a teşrîf ve pîşgâh-ı şevket-meâbda bâzîçe-i satranç ve taşra neyzenlerinden bir neyzen ve ba'zı sâz muvaffakâtiyle fasl u istima'ıyla evkât-güzâr* [...] (Oral 1966, 126).

[18] 13 July 1734 (11 S 1147) and 9 September 1734 (10 R 1147).

[19] (30 June 1734/ 28 M 1147) *kasr-ı Mînâ'da ârâm-ı cüz'iyeden sonra civârında olan mevlevî-hânenin yevm-i mukâbelesi olmağla mahall-i şehriyârîye teşrîf olunup devr-i felek-âsâ dervîşân tarî-i Mevleviyye'nin semâ'î* [?] *ve nâyı kudûmün (âheng-i tarab-engîzin) istimâ'ıyla zevk-yâb olunup* [...] (DABOA.TS.MA.d...„ 3a).

[20] "*Bizim bildiğimiz yahut gördüğümüz sazlardan cümlesinden kâmil ve tamam tanbur dedikleri sazdır, öyle ki benî-âdem'in nefesinden zuhur eden sadâ ve nağmeyi bi't-tamam ve bilâ kusur icra eder.*" (Behar 2017b, 51). English translation belongs to Walter Feldman (Feldman 1996, 143).

and shows the places of pitches (*perde*) of Ottoman music on its neck. Furthermore, all 18th-century writers such as Cantemir, Toderini, Hızır Ağa, Fonton, Kevserî, and Blainville mention and provide an illustration of the *tanbûr* in their works. Ersu Pekin claims that the *tanbûr* was the symbolic beginning of the characteristic "classicization" path of Ottoman music (Pekin 2015, 51). Similarly, for Feldman, it points to technical improvements and radical changes in music styles (Feldman 2015, 99).[21] Despite being an important instrument in the following century, the *rûznâme*s only mention the *tanbûr* once. It is recorded that a sergeant (*serheng*) of the grand vizier, who is very skilled in playing the *tanbûr*, was summoned. As requested, he performed *fasıl*s and was eventually rewarded with gold coins (*zer-i mahbûb*) (18 Z 1153 / 6 March 1741). The reason for this rarity may be that the *fasıl*s that Mahmud I attended were mentioned without much detail and *tanbûr* was the chief instrument of *fasıl* music, yet it was also sometimes used for religious or *Mevlevî* music.

Another stringed (and bowed) instrument in the *rûznâme*s is the *kemân* (violin), which is mentioned twice. These references are about two violinists, one, named İbrahim (19 Z 1154/ 25 February 1742), and the other, only known as having come from Bursa and being a dervish (16 L 1159/1 November 1746). On each occasion, they entertained the sultan by playing this stringed instrument. But which *kemân* was that? Throughout the 18th century, there are two kinds of violin (*kemân*) in Ottoman ensembles: *kemânçe* (*kemân*) or *ayaklı kemân* (footed *kemân*), and the *viola d'amore* or *sinekemânı* (brest *kemân*). The former, made of the shell of the coconut, was the only bowed instrument in Ottoman music since before the 16th century and extending to the mid-18th century (Feldman 1996,128). Yet, by the mid-18th century, the *kemânçe* was gradually replaced by the European violin, the *viola d'amore*. Fonton writes in 1751 that *viola d'amore* was first introduced to the "Orientals" by Yorgi (Şivelioğlu). He stresses that no one plays this instrument better than Şivelioğlu, adding, "since the European violin is not very popular in the Orient – except in taverns – we can assume that this instrument will disappear after Yorgi. A different violin, which they call *kemân* that does not resemble ours, is much more popular" (Behar 2017a, 168). Hızır Ağa gives a drawing of the more traditional *kemân* (*kemânçe*) in 1793, by saying just "*kemân*". It appears more likely that the violins mentioned in the *rûznâme*s are not the *viola d'amore*, which had just become known in the 1740s, but rather the *kemânçe*.

The last instrument that the *rûznâme*s of Mahmud I mentioned is the *erganun*. Made in various sizes but usually rather large, the *erganun* was usually situated

[21] For a detailed analysis on *tanbûr*, see: (Feldman 1996, 142-153).

in churches. On 19 March 1741 (1 M 1154) the grand vizier brought a "strange instrument" (*sâz-ı 'âcibe*), called *erganun*, from Europe to be played for Mahmud I.[22] It is not mentioned whether the sultan liked it or not. Even as one of the instruments in Hızır Ağa's treatise, is unfamiliar to the Ottoman musical world (Pekin 2020, 50). He writes that it consists of twenty-four pipes and is played by two people while one pressing the keys while the other is blowing. He says that its voice is loud enough to be heard even at a distance of half an hour. Pekin claims that Hızır Ağa's *erganun* may have been an organ that traveled from the East to the West, and then came back to Istanbul in the 18th century, or it could have been played in a Catholic church in Istanbul at that time (Pekin 2020, 265). It is written in the *rûznâme*s that the *erganun* was brought from Europe. As Mahmud I's interest in music was known, this instrument may have been brought as a gift maybe because it was thought that he would find it interesting.[23]

3.3 The Conclusion of the Chapter

To conclude, it is remarkable that almost all the genres that Mahmud I listened to are the genres of religious music. He rarely missed blessed nights like *mi'râç* and *mevlîd*. There is no record in the *rûznâme* of Selim III who was another musically inclined sultan known for his involvement in the *Mevlevî* order, for example, celebrated such holy nights (Benlioğlu 2017, 230-244). Especially in the example of the *temcîd*, these forms were commonplace not only on Islamic holy nights but also on other, "ordinary" nights. Another remarkable issue is that there is no mention of the forms of fasıl repertoires in the *rûznâme*s. In the 18th century, Cantemir talks about three types of fasıl: instrumental (*sâzende faslı*), vocal (*hânende faslı*) and joint instrumental-vocal (*hânende ve sâzende müşterek faslı*). While *taksim, peşrev* and *saz semai* are performed in the instrumental *fasıl*, vocal forms such as *gazel, beste, nakş* (*ağır semai*), *kâr* and *yürük semai* were performed in the vocal *fasıl*. All these forms are performed in a certain order in the joint instrumental and vocal *fasıl* (Kantemiroğlu 2001). None of these forms of *fasıl* repertoires are mentioned in the *rûznâme*s of Mahmud I.

Concerning the instruments, although *rûznâme*s does not provide much data about the instruments of the time, this much information nevertheless supports the exist-

[22] *kefere-i frengden vürûd iden erganon ismi ile müsemmâ bir sâz-ı 'acîbe irsâl idüb şevketlü efendimiz dahî Oda-i Bağdâd'a teşrîf ve sâz-ı mezbûr ile fasl olunub* [...] (Oral 1966, 36).

[23] We learn from chronicler Silahdâr that during the Ottoman-Polish War in 1672 (1083) Ottomans were already familiar with this instrument (Türkal 2012, 624).

ing literature on instruments of the first half of the 18th century. The references concerning the *ney* and *tanbûr*, the performances of violinists, a catchy reference to the *erganun*, as well as the prominence of the *nakkâre* among other *mehter* instruments inform us about the repertoire of instruments in the Mahmud I's court and in the early 18th century, along with Mahmud I's music taste.

4. THE VENUES OF MUSIC

In the previous chapters, I surveyed musicians, and musical genres, as well as the instruments based on the data provided by *rûznâme*s of Mahmud I. This chapter, by contrast, examines the venues where Mahmud I participated in musical entertainments. These places will be divided into six categories according to their location or the owner. For example, those located in the Rumelian and Asian shores of Bosphorus, Golden Horn, Topkapı Palace, the vicinity of Istanbul, or those belonging to dignitaries (pl. *ricâl*, deriving from the Arabic meaning "men").

4.1 Topkapı Waterfront Palace

The Topkapı Palace located at the tip of the peninsula, which has several kiosks in its walls, is the primary location that hosted Mahmud I's musical entertainments. Most references do not specify the specific building where entertainment occurred at the Topkapı Palace (see: Table 4.2) What we know about them is that numerous musical performances took place in the imperial palace. Furthermore, as Topkapı was the sultan and his family's winter residence, almost all performances here took place during the winter months.

Mahbûbiye Palace in Sarayburnu, at the very tip of the peninsula, was built during the reign of Mahmud I. With a dozen and a half of references, "the new palace" is presumably the most preferred place by Mahmud I for musical gatherings throughout the whole *rûznâmes*. While there is a dramatic increase in Mahmud I's visits to Mahbûbiye in the years of 1742 (8) and 1746 (6), there is not a single reference to there in the years of 1747, 1748, and 1749.[1]

Apart from Mahbûbiye, several kiosks or palaces within the borders of Topkapı

[1] For a study on Mahbûbîye, see: (Esin, 2009) and a description of this newly-built palace by a contemporary source, see: (İzzî Efendi 2019, 418-420).

Palace namely Şevkiye, İncili, Soğukçeşme, Sepetçiler, Orta-köşk[2] and Yalı-köşkü were also mentioned in the *rûznâme*s regarding the musical gatherings of the sultan. However, the references given to them are too few, compared to Mahbûbiye.

4.2 Bosphorus

Throughout the 18th century, the imperial seat gradually moved/relocated from Topkapı to the waterfront on the Bosphorus. Although not as much as Topkapı, there are quite a few references to musical performances at palatial settings on the Rumelian and the Anatolian shores of the Bosphorus in the *rûznâme*s. Artan makes an analogy to "the theatre of life on the Bosphorus" in reference to the Rumelian coast, which witnessed a set of ceremonial and ritualistic festivities (Artan 1989).

4.2.1 The Rumelian Shore

Among the buildings located in both shores of Bosphorus, the Beşiktaş Waterfront Palace takes center stage in the *rûznâme*s, denoting where most of Mahmud I's musical gatherings took place. The first building in the district of Beşiktaş is called Beşiktaş Palace. Dated to the time of Ahmed I (r. 1603-1617), the Palace grew by erecting several kiosks and palaces in a similar manner to Topkapı Palace (Artan 1989, 353). It was designed for summer visits during the reigns of Ahmed III and, his successor, Mahmud I. Since the last days of Ahmed III's reign, Beşiktaş had already become the foremost imperial summer palace – to the point where the court of Topkapı moved in summers (*göç* or *göç-i hümâyûn* [imperial migration]).

According to the *rûznâme*s, Beşiktaş Palace and the waterfront mansion (*yalı*) or palace of Çırağan,[3] the Gülşen-âbâd Kiosk (adjacent to the Çırağan Palace),[4] and the *Mevlevî* lodge inside of this palace, were where Mahmud I attended musical gatherings until 1745. Except those which took place in the *Mevlevî* lodge, Mahmud I went to these places not only in spring and summer but also in winter months, despite being known as summer palaces. Other than these, the *Mevlevî* lodge located

[2] Orta-köşk may be one of the mansions in Topkapı, as can be understand from several expressions such as "Orta-köşk, which is situated in Topkapı" (*Topkapu'da vâki' Orta-köşk*). I thank Selman Soydemir for informing me about Orta-Köşk.

[3] Built by the son-in-law of Ahmed III and the grand vizier Damad İbrahim Paşa (d. 1730).

[4] *Çırağan Yalısı ittisâlinde olan Gülşen-âbâd Yalısı'na teşrîf* [...] (DABOA.TS.MA.d...„ 5b).

in this palace deserves special inquiry, as it may reveal the extent of Mahmud I's *Mevlevî* inclinations.

One of the buildings of the Beşiktaş Palace is the *Mevlevî* lodge, which stood next to Çırağan. There are several references in the *rûznâme*s to the *Mevlevî* ceremonies that Mahmud I watched/listened to. A great number of the recorded ceremonies took place in the *Mevlevî* lodge located in the Beşiktaş Palace, whereas another three did not (see: Table 4.1). It is not documented in the *rûznâme*s whether Mahmud I went to one of the other nearby *Mevlevî* lodges active at the time in Galata, Yenikapı or Kasımpaşa. Undoubtedly, we cannot expect that the *rûznâme*s, which reports short notes about each day, to record all of Mahmud I's visits to *Mevlevî* lodges. It is also very possible that there are unrecorded ones. These details do not tell us much about the content of those ceremonies, such as repertoire and performers. Nevertheless, we cannot ignore the fact that it does provide quite rich data about those visits, which I think reveal Mahmud I's affiliations with the *Mevlevîyye*.

We can see that Mahmud I attended *Mevlevî* ceremonies at least a few times a year in 1734 and in between 1741 and 1748. There are no such records between 1730-31 and 1748-50. Looking at the timing of these ceremonies that Mahmud I attended, we can see that the months of July and August (Cemaziye'l-ahir according to the Islamic calendar) are the most numerous. A little less than half of those visits took place during this month. One explanation for the increased frequency of *Mevlevî* ceremonies in the month of Cemaziye'l-ahir in the *rûznâme*s, regarding those ritual ceremonies, might be due to it commemorating the death of the eponymous founder of the *Mevlevî* order, Mevlânâ (d. 5 C 672). That's why the activities may have increased during this month. Other than that, the months before and after Cemaziye'l-ahir (Cemaziye'l-evvel and Receb) follows with respectively five and seven references. The common point of these three Islamic months is that they coincide with summer, when the weather is nice. We cannot see such visits in winter. All his visits to the *Mevlevî* lodge took place in June, July, August, September, and rarely October.

Baha Tanman states that *Mevlevî* lodges in Istanbul were located outside of the dense settlement areas, intended as excursion spots (*mesîre*). The *Mevlevî* lodge in Galata was built in a hunting ground, the lodge in Yenikapı was located in a garden, Kasımpaşa *Mevlevî* Lodge was on a slope of a valley covered with flower gardens and orchards. The Üsküdar Lodge was built in an area with garden mansions and the Bahâriye Lodge was established among the mansions on the shores of Bahâriye in Eyüp. These secluded spaces were later taken over by the city's populace, especially in the first quarter of the 20th century (Tanman 1994, 178-179). Beşiktaş *Mevlevî*

Lodge that Mahmud I visited regularly was also built in between waterfront palaces on the shores of the Çırağan. His visits to this place coincided with the summer months may be that it was also built as excursion spot. Said differently, this place may allow Mahmud I to relax and contemplate due to their location, which is more convenient in the summer months.

There is a certain order to the days on which these ceremonies take place. Abdülbâki Gölpınarlı states that before Selim III, there were no specific days and hours dedicated to those ceremonies. Instead, he says, they were organized whenever the dervishes felt ecstasy, excitement, love, and enthusiasm. Selim III, who was a *Mevlevî* follower, went to the lodges whenever he wanted to. The sultan's arrival frequently forced the *mukâbele* (*semâ*, the *Mevlevî* ritual) to be organized. Over time, *Mevlevî* elders became uncomfortable with the sultan's arrival acting as a conduit to the *semâ*, rather than necessarily representing the love and enthusiasm they felt. Thereafter, they decided to hold those ceremonies once or twice a week in each lodge of Istanbul. In the five *Mevlevî* lodges in Istanbul, certain days were determined as the day of *mukâbele*.[5] Yet, *Mevlevî* ceremonies could also be organized on some other days upon special occasions like the month of Ramazan, holy nights, or religious festivals (Gölpınarlı 1963, 99-100).

After Selim III, Wednesday became the day of *mukâbele* of the Beşiktaş *Mevlevî* Lodge, whereas prior there is little certainty as to a regular practice. The *rûznâme*s of Mahmud I does not provide such a messy picture regarding the days of *mukâbele*, which concentrates on Wednesdays and Thursdays. Almost half of the references of Mahmud I's *Mevlevî* lodge visits took place on Wednesdays, with Thursday having fewer. Other than these two days, there are also a couple of references to Tuesdays, Fridays, and Saturdays. Although it is said that before the time of Selim III the days of *mukâbele* were not fixed, according to the *rûznâme*s of Mahmud I, it seems that there was a sort of stable picture during the time of Mahmud I.

Among the references to the *Mevlevî* ceremonies that Mahmud I attended, two of them stand out particularly. On 7 and 20 October in 1741 (26 B and 9 Ş 1154), the sheikh of Galata *Mevlevî* Lodge, Abdülbâki Dede, came to Topkapı Palace with his two dervishes. The sultan gifted them dervish clothings (*libâs-ı dervişân*). The first day was the night of *m'râç* but it is not written whether these dervishes performed a *semâ*. However, the other day Mahmud I watched the *semâ* they performed. The arrival of the dervishes to the palace is quite noteworthy as it shows the *Mevlevî* ceremony was not only for worship and *zikr*, but also it had

[5]The schedule was as follows; Friday: Kulekapısı (Galata), Saturday: Üsküdar, Sunday: Kasımpaşa, Monday: Yenikapı (Mevlevihane kapısı), Tuesday: Kulekapısı, Wednesday: Beşiktaş (Later Bahâriye in Eyüp), Thursday: Yenikapı (Gölpınarlı 1963, 100).

functioned as a visual demonstration. This brings one's mind the summoning of whirling dervishes to various events today, such as weddings and circumcisions, for entertainment purposes.

We do not know for sure whether Mahmud I was a follower of a Sufi order. His frequent visits to the Beşiktaş *Mevlevî* Lodge and summoning dervishes to the Topkapı Palace make one think that he was a *Mevlevî*. Similarly, while in the *rûznâme* of Selim III records the sultan's numerous visits to the *Mevlevî* lodges between 1791-1806 were identified (Benlioğlu 2019, 345-347), the thirty-two incidents in Mahmud I's *rûznâme*s, covering six years less than Selim III's, seems to strengthen this possibility. As understood from the rest of the *rûznâme*s that Mahmud I was closely interested in music, which may be related to his *Mevlevî* identity if it was the case. Mahmud I's artistic disposition and his interest in music may have brought him closer to the *Mevlevî* order and thus *Mevlevî* lodges, one of the most important music centers of the time.[6]

[6]In his monograph of Mahmud I, Uğur Kurtaran states that although Mahmud I was quite pious, there is no record regarding his affiliation with any Sufi order, but he also had a fondness for all major Sufi orders like the other sultans before him (Kurtaran 2014, 47). Efgan Uzun who introduced the *rûznâme* of 1734, agrees with Kurtaran. He also thinks that there is no information about Mahmud I's Sufi affiliations in this piece of *rûznâme*, although Mahmud I was not completely ignorant to Sufism, so which *tarîqa* he belongs to is not clear (Uzun 2013, 698). Tülay Artan, in her recently published article, notes that Mahmud I's frequent visits to the *Mevlevî* lodges, probably in a certain routine, point out his *Mevlevî* identity, adding that this issue awaits the further investigation of his *rûznâme*s (Artan 2020, 102).

Table 4.1 The Days and Places of the *Mevlevî* Ceremonies that Mahmud I Attended.

A.H.	C.E.	Days	Place
28 M 1147	30 June 1734	Wednesday	Çırağan
20 S 1147	22 July 1734	Thursday	Çırağan
21 R 1154	6 July 1741	Thursday	Çırağan
28 R 1154	13 July 1741	Thursday	Çırağan
27 CA 1154	10 August 1741	Thursday	Çırağan
11 C 1154	24 August 1741	Thursday	Neşâd-âbâd
26 B 1154	7 October 1741	Saturday	Topkapı
9 Ş 1154	20 October 1741	Friday	Mahbûbiye
22 CA 1155	25 July 1742	Wednesday	Çırağan
7 C 1155	9 August 1742	Thursday	Çırağan
11 CA 1156	3 July 1743	Wednesday	Çırağan
16 C 1156	7 August 1743	Wednesday	Çırağan
23 C 1156	14 August 1743	Wednesday	Çırağan
8 B 1156	28 August 1743	Wednesday	Çırağan
12 C 1157	23 July 1744	Thursday	Çırağan
11 B 1157	20 August 1744	Thursday	Çırağan
25 B 1157	3 September 1744	Thursday	Çırağan
8 CA 1158	8 June 1745	Tuesday	Çırağan
29 CA 1158	29 June 1745	Tuesday	Çırağan
7 C 1158	7 July 1745	Wednesday	Çırağan
28 C 1158	28 July 1745	Wednesday	Çırağan
20 B 1158	18 August 1745	Wednesday	Çırağan
10 C 1159	30 June 1746	Thursday	Çırağan
24 C 1159	14 July 1746	Thursday	Çırağan
20 Ş 1159	7 September 1746	Wednesday	Çırağan
26 C 1160	5 July 1747	Wednesday	Çırağan
11 B 1160	19 July 1747	Wednesday	Çırağan
23 Ş 1160	30 August 1747	Wednesday	Çırağan
8 N 1160	13 September 1147	Wednesday	Çırağan
22 C 1161	19 June 1748	Wednesday	Çırağan
14 B 1161	10 July 1748	Wednesday	Çırağan
3 ZA 1162	15 October 1749	Wednesday	Çırağan

Other than the buildings in Beşiktaş Palace, one of the Mahmud I's frequent destinations for musical entertainment in the Rumelian side of Bosphorus was the waterfront mansion of Neşâd-âbâd at Defterdar landing, in Ortaköy. Neşâd-âbâd was built during the time of Ahmed III by Damad İbrahim Paşa and changed hands among the female members of the imperial family during the 18th century (Artan 1989, 366). According to the *rûznâme*s, Mahmud I went to Neşâd-âbâd as often as he went to Beşiktaş Palace to spend time with the music. This is where the previously mentioned Çömlekçi-oğlu came to perform the *Türkmânî türkî*s. Moreover, one of the ritual ceremonies of the *Mevlevî* dervishes that Mahmud I watched took place in Neşâd-âbâd.[7] All the references to this place in the *rûznâme*s are in summer months, (namely June, July, and August) which indicates that it was a summer palace during the reign of sultan in question. The last reference of the venue of music in the Rumelian coast is Taksim, from where water from a reservoir was distributed to various parts of the city. No details are given about this place except to say that Mahmud I came to Taksim district (*Mahall-i Taksim*) in the mid-afternoon and enjoyed with *fasl u âğâze*.[8]

4.2.2 The Asian Shore

The other coast of the Bosphorus was also preferred by Mahmud I. Palaces or kiosks on the Asian shore such as Büyük Çamlıca, Beylerbeyi, Kuleli, Şeref-âbâd (in Üsküdar), along with the gardens of Sultaniye (between Paşabahçe and Beykoz) and Yemişçi (in Beylerbeyi) are mentioned in the rûznâmes. Nevertheless, the waterfront mansion in Göksu, located at the entrance of the Göksu River, was perhaps the most frequent of musical performances that Mahmud I attended, notably in the summers of 1734, 1741, and 1742.

These performances were sometimes witness unusual and so-called "picturesque" scenes. For instance, there is a reference to a morbidly overweight man who is very good at swimming and singing while swimming in the Göksu River, who was rewarded for his show.[9] That man was not the only one singing in the water. Some musicians (*serhengân*) gathered in a boat in front of the kiosk at Göksu

---

[7] (11 C 1154/24 August 1741) *Neşâd-âbâd'a teşrîf ve revzeneden dervîşânın devr ü semâlarını müşâhede* [...] (Oral 1966, 65).

[8] (14 CA 1155/18 July 1742) *vakt-i 'asrda mahall-i Taksîm'e teşrîf ve ba'dehû ba'zı sâz ve âğâze ile eğlenilüb* [...] (Oral 1966, 123).

[9] (28 R 1155/2 July 1742) *Yirmi sekizinci yevm-i ahadde Göksu'ya teşrîf ve bir semiz kimesne fenn-i sibâhatte mahâreti olmağla deryâda ba'zı beste âğâze idüb mazhar-ı ihsân oldu.* (Oral 1966, 120).

sang songs to the audience in the kiosk under the full moon (Artan 2020, 129).[10] Considering that the light from the full moon must have been quite effective in an era where there was no electricity, it is not difficult to imagine this picturesque scene. About one month later, the musicians entertained listeners in the kiosk with their music. But this time they were accompanied by dwarves, who must have been part of the show.[11] "Singers, mutes and dwarves performing on water more probably constituted a novelty, at least for the court of Mahmud I (Artan 2019, 31).

4.3 Golden Horn

Artan writes in 1989 that "in Sultan Mahmud's reign the pleasure palaces were shifted from the Golden Horn and Kağıthane to Bosphorus" (Artan 1989, 54). She also claims in 2020 that while Ahmed III preferred Sa'd-âbâd Palace[12] because it was an isolated place, Mahmud I's choice was Göksu (Artan 2020, 127). Artan adds that, although not totally abandoned, Sa'd-âbâd and other palaces and gardens on the shores of Golden Horn fell out of favor during the reign of Mahmud I. Their reduced popularity, even considering their recent restorations completed after 1730, restored during the reign of Mustafa III (r. 1757-1774) (Artan 2020, 142).

Although Bosphorus (especially courtly settings at Göksu and Beşiktaş) was the most popular place for Mahmud I after Topkapı, there were numerous musical performances that took place notably in the Palaces of Sa'd-âbâd and Bahâriye,[13] along with in the gardens of Karaağaç[14] and Tersâne,[15] both gained importance during the reign of Ahmed III (see: Table 4.2). These highlight that the district of Golden Horn was the third most mentioned of Mahmud I's musical gatherings after Topkapı and Bosphorus. We can see that Mahmud I attended performances in Sa'd-âbâd (15) and in Bahâriye (10) several times from 1740 onwards. No specific time or season seems to have been preferred for the visits to Golden Horn. Although Mahmud

---

[10](4 CA 1154/18 July 1741) *Göksu'ya teveccüh ve leb-i deryâda vâki' kasra sâye-endâz-ı iclâl* [...] *pîşgâh-ı kasrda derûn-ı zevrakda serhengân fasl u âğâze idüb eğlenildi* (Oral 1966, 59-60).

[11](2 C 1154/15 August 1741) *Göksu'ya şeref-bahş-ı iclâl* [...] *serhengân [ve] cüceyân zevraka süvâr ve pîşgâh-ı kasrda fasl-ı sâz ba'dehû nisâr-ı zer olunub* [...] (Oral 1966, 64).

[12]For a comprehensive study on Sa'd-âbâd, see: (Eldem 1977).

[13]For more information on Bahâriye Mansion, see: (Artan, 1993).

[14]For more information on the garden and waterfront mansion in Karaağaç, see: (Artan, 1994).

[15]For a study on Tersâne Garden as an entertainment place in the 17th and 18th centuries, see: (Ertürk, 2013).

I and his retinue visited these places and participated in musical entertainments mostly in spring, we can see them in winter months as well.

4.4 The Vicinity of Istanbul

Looking at the musical entertainments that took place in the vicinity of Istanbul, few locations attract our attention which are *Kasr-ı Vidoz*, *Vâlide Sultan Çiftliği* (The Farm of Queen Mother), *Alibey* or *Alibeyköy Çiftliği* (The Farm of Ali Bey), and *Vezir Bahçesi* (The Garden of Vizier) (see: Table 4.2).

Among those locations, the farm belonging to Saliha Sultan was the most frequented place in the vicinity of Istanbul that Mahmud I had visited. Saliha Sultan's (the Queen Mother) farm in Alibeyköy was referred to as *Vâlide Sultan Çiftliği* and *Alibey/Alibeyköy Çiftliği*. The multiple references given to this place either called *Vâlide Sultan Çiftliği* or *Alibey/Alibeyköy Çiftliği*. Putting aside that these visits coincided with spring months, there is not much detailed information about the contents of these musical entertainments. The *rûznâme*s does not say who the performers were or what kind of music they performed. Other than Saliha Sultan's farm, a reference to *Kasr-ı Vidoz* is worth mentioning. There is not much information in the chronicles about this location other than being in the vicinity of the Davud Paşa Palace (Artan 2020, 124). The *rûznâme*s mentions that on 1 February 1741, singers gathered in a boat (or boats) in the pool at *Kasr-ı Vidoz* while people watched from the palace, listening to their songs.[16] Together with the musicians in Göksu River singing from the boat, this reference shows that the performances in which the musicians in the boats came in front of the palaces and sang to those who were in the palaces were not infrequent during the reign of Mahmud I.

4.5 Dignitary Palaces and Gardens

Finally, let us look at the palaces and gardens which are mentioned in the context of musical entertainments, the owners of which were the state dignitaries, who appear to be interested in music. These are namely *Mahall-i Halîfe-i Kozbekciyan* (the place

[16] [...] *Kasr-ı Vidoz'a teşrîf ve havuzda olan zevraka nev-be-nev hânende-i serhengân vaz' ve fasl u âğâze ile kesb-i safâ* [...] (Oral 1966, 28). The word Oral wrote as "Kotuz" is Vidoz or Fidoz. I thank Selman Soydemir for informing me.

of the *kozbekci*)[17] , *Sadr-ı A'zâm Sarayı*, *Kasr-ı Mehmed Paşa*, *İshak Ağa Yalısı*, *Ağa Bahçesi*, the palace prepared for Numan Paşa,[18] the Bostancıbaşı's pavilion[19] located in a diary,[20] and the pavilion newly built by the chief harem eunuch in Cedid Ağa garden.[21] As Artan claims, while the number of palaces belonging to dignitaries visited by Mahmud I increased gradually between 1740-50, the musical activity carried by the sultan and his retinue from Rumelia to Asian shores of the Bosphorus reached elite households (Artan 2020, 131). This indicates the fact that the patronage of arts and artists was no longer under the monopoly of the sultan, but high-ranking bureaucrats were also able to become patrons. This displays the broadening base of patronage. Although we cannot locate all the places mentioned by the *rûznâme*s, it is quite possible that most of them (like İshak Ağa's mansion) were on the shores of Bosphorus.

Within half a dozen references, it is clear that Mahmud I visited the grand vizier(s)'s palace for musical entertainments most frequently in this group.[22] It is not surprising considering that the state official the sultan saw the most and spent the most time with was the grand vizier. However, it seems difficult to pinpoint a specific location, as there were sixteen grand viziers who served during Mahmud I's twenty-four-year-long reign.[23]

The second most mentioned place is *Kasr-ı Mehmed Paşa.* Possibly belonging to a grand vizier but the actual owner remains unidentified. Despite this building (it

---

[17] *Kozbekci* is one of the servants in the chief harem eunuch's office.

[18] [...] *Âhar* [Ahır?] *kapı kurbunda vâki' Nu'mân Paşa kullarına akd olunan sultan sarayına teşrîf* (Bayrak 1972, 59). I do not know who Numan Paşa in question was, but the commander-in-chief (*ser-asker*) of Bender (a city in Moldova) during the Ottoman-Russian War in 1738-1739 who had the same name (Kurtaran 2015, 597).

[19] *Bostancı-başı* is the head of the Bostancı Ocağı, who is responsible for the security of the Bosphorus and the nearby islands. These individuals also performed duties such as using the helm of sultan's boat and discharging death warrants of those who were ordered to be killed.

[20] (8 CA 1160/ 18 May 1747) [...] *bostâncı-başı ağanın mandıra ta'bîr olunan mahalde ziyâfeti olmağla şevketlü efendimiz esb-i gerdûn [ile] mesîre-süvâr ve gül-geşt-i deşt ederek ta'dâd-ı ganem olunan mahalde vâki' kasrda bir mikdâr ârâm ve ta'dâd-ı ganemi müşâhede ve mahall-i mezbûr kurbunda âmâde olunan sâyebâna sâye-bahş ve temâşâ-yı musâri'ûn ve bâzîçe-i kol ve istima'-ı fasl ile eğlenilüb* [...] Selman Soydemir states by personal communication that although it is certain that the dairy in question is on the Asian side of Istanbul, it may be around Kadıköy-Haydarpaşa or Bostancı districts. It was where state-owned sheeps are raised by the incumbent of *bostancı-başı.* Here, from time to time, *bostanc-ıbaşı* gives a feast in honor of the sultan on the occasion of the sheep counting.

[21] [...] *Cedid Ağa bahçesinde darü's-sa'âde ağa kullarınun müceddeden binâ eyledüği kasra teşrîf ve fasl ile eğlenüp* [...] (Özcan 1965, 124).

[22] Chronicler İzzî Efendi, a contemporary source, also mentions about the musical entertainments of the sultan that took place at the palace of the grand vizier on 1 October 1745 (6 L 1158) and 13 Ocak 1747 (6 M 1160) (İzzî Efendi 2019, 125, 336).

[23] In the *rûznâme*s, when the palaces of grand viziers are mentioned in the context of Mahmud I's musical entertainments, those who were in this seat at those times (in other words, the grand viziers whose palaces Mahmud I had visited) are as follows: Nişancı Hacı Ahmed Paşa (d. 1753), Hekimoğlu Ali Paşa (d. 1757), Seyyid Hasan Paşa (d. 1748) and Boynueğri Seyyid Abdullah Paşa (d. 1761).

was also referred to as *Sancak Köşkü* and was part of Davud Paşa Palace) being a venue for stately banquets at the end of the 17th century, its construction date remains unknown (Artan 2019, 29). There is generally no detailed information about musical performances that took place in *Kasr-ı Mehmed Paşa*. The *rûznâme*s mostly discuss the performing musicians anonymously, of which Mahmud I and his retinue enjoying the music (*fasl u âğâze ile eğlenilüp*). But some cases show the contrary. The performance of Çiçekçi Salih Efendi (23 February 1731/15 Ş 1143), for instance, who was mentioned in the second chapter of this thesis, took place at the *Kasr-ı Mehmed Paşa*.[24]

Another venue that is mentioned several times throughout the *rûznâme*s in the context of musical entertainments is İshak Ağa's mansion, located in *Hünkar İskelesi*, Beykoz. İshak Ağa, who was the treasurer of customs (*gümrükçü*) during the reign of Mahmud I, also built a garden and a public fountain in the same place. That's why the "*Ağa Bahçesi*" mentioned in the *rûznâme*s is possibly the one built by İshak Ağa. There are half a dozen references to the musical performances that took place in either İshak Ağa's mansion or his garden. Most of these references are from *rûznâme* of 1742 and coincide with spring or summer months.[25]

4.6 The Conclusion of the Chapter

In addition to all these, Sultan Ahmed Mosque, which is not included in one of these categories, should also be mentioned as venue of Mahmud I's musical performances, visiting wherein the *mevlîd* ceremonies must be a kind of a ritual during Mahmud I's reign. When we look at the general picture based on these almost eleven-year-long records of Mahmud I, we can see a variety of different venues of the musical entertainments that he had attended. They demonstrate how mobile Mahmud I was in contrast with his predecessor, Ahmed III. When Ahmed III, who was reputed for his thalassophobia, wanted to move away from Topkapı Palace, he first preferred the Tersâne and Karaağaç gardens on the shores of the Golden Horn. He also preferred Sa'd-âbâd, which was a secluded place far from the coastline (Artan 2020, 106).

---

[24] In the *rûznâme* of 1731, "*Genç Mehmed Paşa Yalısı*" is written (Çınar 1974, 34), rather than *Kasr-ı Mehmed Paşa*, but it is possible that these two venues are the same.

[25] One of these references are worth to mention in terms of revealing the location of this place, the title of İshak Ağa and musical performances there: (24 R 1155/28 June 1742) *Hünkar İskelesi olmağla ma'rûf mahalle karîb sahil-sarây-ı Gümrükçü'ye şeref-bahş ve ba'dehû edâ-yı zuhûr esbe süvâr ve İshak Ağa'nın hânesinde vâki' kasr-ı mürtefi'a teşrîf ve gılmanân-ı Enderûn'a ruhsat-dâd-ı bâziçe-i tomak ve istima'-ı hânendegân ve sâzendegân-ı Enderûn ile evkât-güzâr ve ba'dehû edâ-yı 'asr tenâvül-i ta'am ve İshak Ağa'nın çukadarı Tür[km]an-i Türkî âğâze idüb* [...] (Oral 1966, 119).

In addition to Topkapı Palace and the Golden Horn, Mahmud I and his retinue frequently participated in the musical entertainments held at the venues located on the shores of Bosphorus, particularly those in the palaces of Beşiktaş, Neşâd-âbâd, and Göksu. While visits to the shores of Bosphorus related to the musical gatherings were very little beforehand, there is a noticeable augmentation especially in the years 1741 and 1742. This must be the outcome of the increasing settlement on both shores of Bosphorus during the 18th century by both the Ottoman dynasty and wealthy *İstanbullu* seeking an escape from problems in the city.[26]

[26]The possible reasons and the process of this increasing settlement of Bosphorus, see: (Artan 1989); and (Hamadeh 2004).

Table 4.2 Distribution of the Places Mentioned in the *Rûznâme*s by Years.

	1143/1731	1147/1734	1153/1740	1154/1741
Topkapı Palace			M, 3(L), 2(ZA), 2(Z)	2(M), S, L, ZA, Z
Mahbûbiye				B
İncili				Z
Şevkiye				
Sepetçiler				
Yalı-köşkü				
Soğukçeşme				
Orta-köşk				
The Rumelian Shore of Bosphorus				
Beşiktaş/Çırağan		RA		RA, ZA
Gülşen-âbâd	Ş			
Neşâd-âbâd		RA		R, CA,
Mahall-i Taksim				
The Asian Shore of Bosphorus				
Büyük Çamlıca		RA		
Beylerbeyi				S
Kuleli				
Şeref-âbâd				
Göksu		3(S)		R, CA, C
Sultaniye Bahçesi		S		
Yemişçi Bahçesi				
Golden Horn				
Bahâriye			L,	Ş, ZA
Sa'dâbâd			2(ZA)	M, RA, 2(B)
Karaağaç Bahçesi				CA
Tersane Bahçesi				C
The Vicinity of Istanbul				
Kasr-ı Vidoz/Vidos			ZA	
Valide Sultan Çiftliği		3(R)		RA
Alibey/Alibeyköy Çiftliği				2(Z)
Vezir Bahçesi				
Dignitary Palaces and Gardens				
"Nu'mân Paşa kullarına akd olunan sultan sarayı"				
Mahall-i Halîfe-i Kozbekciyan			CA, 2(Z)	
Sadr-ı Azam Sarayı			L,	Ş, L
Kasr-ı Mehmed Paşa	Ş			S, L, Z
İshak Ağa Kasrı				
Ağa Bahçesi				
"Cedid Ağa bahçesinde darü's-saade ağasının müceddeden binâ eylediği kasır"				
"Bostancıbaşı ağanın mandıra ta'bîr olunan mahalde vaki' kasrı"				

Notes: The letters represent the abbreviation of the Hijri months. The numbers next to the letters (eg "3(Z)") show the number of visits in the specified month.

1155/1742	1156/1743	1157/1744	1158/1745	1159/1746	1160/1747	1161/1748	1162/1749
M, CA, L	2(M), 2(ZA)		L, Z	M, S, RA, R	B		Z
M, B, 3(L), ZA, 2(Z)	Z	RA, L	M, L	RA, 2(L), 2(ZA), Z			
				RA			
Z			R	L			
	S						
							L
		RA					
					R		
M	S, RA	RA, B					
R, C		2(B)	C				
CA							
R							
R							
R, CA			CA				
R, CA							
S, R,		RA					
RA, ZA		RA		RA, R	M, R		
2(RA), C	S, B	S, RA	RA		Z		
RA	ZA						
ZA		2(S)					
	S, R, B	S, R					
							M
L		L			L		
		L					
2(RA), C			CA	Ş			
RA				S			
				2(ZA)			

5. CONCLUSION

The main objective of this thesis, which is limited to a short period of time, had been to determine whether the *rûznâme* genre, in general, and the *rûznâme*s of Mahmud I, in partihapterular, can be sources for the study of Ottoman music history. If so, how can they contribute to this field of study, and what kind of musical data can they provide? When I look at the *rûznâme*s of Mahmud I – which documented more than eleven years of his reign day by day – from this perspective, I answer the first question affirmatively without any hesitation. Frankly speaking, the *rûznâme*s of Mahmud I told me more about music than I expected when began my research. Along the way, I realized that other than musical treatises, the *rûznâme*s could also provide data on music and be useful for writing the history of Ottoman music. I do not suggest that this study comprises the entirety of Mahmud I's reign or all 18th-century music. Yet, it is clear that they shed light on Mahmud I's music preferences and music in the first half of the 18th century. For researchers who study on 18th-century Ottoman music or Mahmud I's reign specifically, it is a remarkable source that should not be ignored.

When we take a step back and look at the musical performances documented in Mahmud I's *rûznâme*s, we see the following picture: With few exceptions, almost no musical entertainment recorded in the *rûznâme*s covering first year of Mahmud I's accession (from 1730 to 31), which was dominated by a rebellion. Although it covers a short period of time, the *rûznâme* of 1734, in which a four and a half months-long period is documented, we see a considerable increase in the number of musical performances organized. Yet, the dramatic augmentation in the frequency of musical performances took place between 1740-44. These five years (most notably between 1741-2) recorded many performances with Mahmud I's participation. It is difficult to say for sure whether this was the scribe's choice or because Mahmud I was more involved in these kinds of entertainments during this period. Evidently, however, during this period a rise is in question. In the five years between 1745-49, however, we see this trend gradually decreases. Musical performances recorded in this period,

especially in the last two years, were fewer than the number of fingers on a given hand. Although the same *sır kâtibi* (who was Kadı Ömer Ağa) kept the *rûznâme* between 1740-1750, there is a noticeable difference of content between the first and last half of the decade. The only exception to this is the *Mevlevî* ritual ceremonies. While in the second half musical performances of so-called "secular" music (fasıls) decreased, it is difficult to say whether this is also valid for the *Mevlevî* ceremonies since it appears Mahmud I's visitations remained steady in these two halves.

Furthermore, these performances took place mostly during the daytime. If Mahmud I was to visit palaces located on the shores of Bosphorus or the Golden Horn, for example, he often returned to Topkapı Palace before sunset. Moonlit nights, or nights of *kandîl*s, appear to be the only exception to this as they were nights when the sultan and his retinue partied until morning. Although these were more frequent in summer and spring, they were often held even in winter. With the exception of Ramazan, records were kept concerning the sultan's musical gatherings held at any time of the year.[1]

In the first chapter that follows the introduction chapter, I categorized musicians mentioned by name according to their socio-cultural and occupational backgrounds (see: Table 1.1). This categorization displays a colorful scene of musicians with various backgrounds including officers, artisans, mosque singers, Sufis, and non-Muslims. This stage exhibits that Mahmud I was a ruler who enjoyed patronizing musicians, as his predecessor did. Although Mahmud I had new rituals and tastes of his own, I think it would be plausible to view his reign as a continuation of Ahmed III's in terms of cultural growth and patronage of arts. For example, a significant portion of the musicians in Mahmud I's court were inherited from Ahmed III's time on the throne, despite all of them are not mentioned in the *rûznâmes*.[2] Relatedly, it would not be wrong to assume that there is a direct correlation between patronizing musicians and the development of music production. Ibn Sina, the great 10/11th-century polymath, one reflected that "art and science will migrate if not appreciated". Mahmud I's role as a patron must be one of the contributing reasons behind Walter Feldman's statement that "in the 18th-century, new and amazing things were happening" (Feldman 2019a, 52:17).

Following chapter explores musical instruments and genres. By examining each closely, I was able to make firm distinctions between religious genres, such as *temcîd*, *mevlîd*, *mi'râciyye*, and *na't*. It is apparent that Mahmud I preferred these genres.

[1] Except for a *Mevlevî* ceremony on 8 N 1160/13 September 1147, there is not a single reference to musical entertainments of Mahmud I that was held in this month.

[2] For musicians of the reign of Ahmed III based on the biographical dictionaries of Sâlim, Safâyî, and Şeyhî Mehmed Efendi's *Vakâyiü'l-Fuzalâ*, see: (Karabaşoğlu, 2011).

Although the secular fasıls are frequently mentioned throughout the *rûznâme*s, no details are given regarding their contents. Additionally, it seems that Mahmud I enjoyed listening to *türkî*, a folkloric genre, on several occasions. Although instruments are rarely mentioned in the *rûznâme*s, instruments such as the *ney*, *tanbûr* or violin gives an insight into the instrument repertoire of this period, which parallels the present literature.

In the final chapter, I presented a comprehensive table to be able to see when and where these entertainments took place. This table tells me that Mahmud I attended a variety of different venues for musical entertainment. While the Topkapı Palace and Golden Horn were not neglected, we see that Bosphorus was becoming an entertainment hotspot during Mahmud I's reign. The most frequently mentioned places of his musical entertainments were the newly built Mahbûbiye and the newly restored Sa'd-âbâd (the symbolic place during the reign of Ahmed III). However, there are a great number of references to Göksu and Neşâd-âbâd, which are located on the Asian and Rumelian shores of the Bosphorus. The *rûznâme*s also reveal the extent of Mahmud I's *Mevlevî* inclinations. Visits to *Mevlevî* lodges throughout the *rûznâme*s (except 1731), or the invitation of dervishes to the palace to be performed, supports the possibility that Mahmud I was a *Mevlevî* disciple.

Although this study refrains from generalizing to the whole of 18th century music, and Feldman speaks about the whole 18th-century music while saying that "the new and amazing things were happening", I can say that I also have seen many references that excite me in terms of the music of this short period in question. The fact that a non-Muslim – who made a name for himself as an instrument player – came to Mahmud I's palace more than once and sang *türkî*s, that *temcîd* – a form of religious music sung only in three Islamic holy months, especially in Ramazan – was also sung other than these specific times. There were also the *mehterhâne*s' too much involvement in daily activities, that the coming of *Mevlevî* dervishes to the palace to perform their ritual ceremony, that the variety of venues where the musical entertainments held (especially on the shores of the Bosphorus) are just a few of them.

This study not only aimed to shed light on overlooked sultan Mahmud I's relationship with music, and the music in the early 18th century, but also to highlight the importance of the *rûznâme* genre as a source for data for the historical research on Ottoman music. Undoubtedly, various missing points have been disregarded by this preliminary attempt which is limited to a certain time frame. For example, a comparative study of the *rûznâme*s of Mahmud I and other *rûznâme*s has writ-

ten throughout the 18th century[3] would provide a more comprehensive perspective about the music of the 18th century. Likewise, learning more about the authors of the *rûznâme*s of Mahmud I, which I am not able to, might explain the differences between the texts to find out what they preferred to write or not. Lastly, although we have *rûznâme*s covering a significant period of Mahmud I's reign, the *rûznâme* texts of more than half of his reign are lost today. If they could be included, this thesis would have been more all-inclusive. At any rate, if this study contributes or inspires any future studies, it means that it has achieved its primary goal.

[3]Such as the *rûznâme*s of Mustafa III (r. 1754-1774), Abdülhamid I (r. 1774-1789) and Selim III (r. 1789-1807).

ARCHIVAL SOURCES

DABOA.TS.MA.d.10732. 18 M 1147 / 20 June 1734-09 C 1147 / 6 November 1734.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abou-El-Haj, Rifa'at Ali. 2005. *Formation of the Modern State: The Ottoman Empire, Sixteenth to Eighteenth Centuries*, Second Edition. Syracuse University Press.

Ahıskalı, Recep. 2016. *Bir Kâtibin Kaleminden İstanbul'un 12 Yılı (1754-1766).* İstanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi.

Ak, Ahmed Şahin. 2009. *Türk Din Mûsikîsi: Câmi ve Tekke Mûsikîsi.* Ankara: Akçağ.

Aksoy, Bülent. 2003. *Avrupalı Gezginlerin Gözüyle Osmanlılarda Musiki.* İstanbul: Pan Yayıncılık.

Aktepe, M. Münir. 1958. *Patrona İsyanı (1730).* Istanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi.

Artan, Tülay. 1989. "Architecture as a Theatre of Life: Profile of the Eighteenth Century Bosphorus." PhD diss., Massachusetts Insitute of Technology.

Artan, Tülay. 1993. "Bahariye Kasrı." In *Dünden Bugüne Istanbul Ansiklopedisi.* Vol. 1 Istanbul p. 537.

Artan, Tülay. 1994. "Karaağaç Sahilsarayı ve Bahçesi." In *Dünden Bugüne Istanbul Ansiklopedisi.* Vol. 4 Istanbul p. 439.

Artan, Tülay. 2019. "Contemplation or Amusement? The Light Shed by Ruznames on an Ottoman Spectacle of 1740-1750.", In *Entertainment Among Ottomans*, ed. Ebru Boyar, and Kate Fleet. Leiden: Brill pp. 22-42.

Artan, Tülay. 2020. "I. Mahmud Saltanatında Boğaziçi Eğlenceleri: Temâşâ, Tefekkür, Tevakkuf ve 'Şehr-i Sefa'." In *Gölgelenen Sultan, Unutulan Yıllar: I. Mahmud ve Dönemi (1730-1754)*, ed. Hatice Aynur. Vol.1 Istanbul: Dergâh Yayınları pp. 92-159.

Aynur, Hatice., and Şen, F. Meliha. 2019. "Hıfzî Ağa'nın (ö. 1173/1759-60) I. Mahmûd İçin Yazılan Şiirler Mecmûası (TSMK-Revan 1977) Üzerine." In *Akademik Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi*, 3 (4): 39-73.

Babinger, Franz. 2004. *Müteferrika ve Osmanlı Matbaası*, trans. Nedret Kuran-Burçoğlu. Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.

Bayrak, Kamuran. 1972. “Kadı Ömer Efendi. Rûznâme-i Sultan Mahmud Han-ı Evvel (1160-1163 / 1747-1750).” Graduation thesis. Istanbul Üniversitesi.

Behar, Cem. 2010. *Şeyhülislâm’ın müziği: 18. yüzyılda Osmanlı/Türk musıkisi ve Şeyhülislâm Es’ad Efendi’nin Atrabü’l-Âsâr’ı*. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları

Behar, Cem. 2015. *Osmanlı/Türk Musikisinin Kısa Tarihi*. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Behar, Cem. 2016. *Saklı Mecmua: Ali Ufkî’nin Bibliothèque Nationale de France’taki [Turc 292] Yazması*. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Behar, Cem. 2017a. *Musikiden Müziğe*. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Behar, Cem. 2017b. *Kan Dolaşımı, Ameliyat ve Musıkî Makamları: Kantemiroğlu (1673-1723) ve Edvâr’ının sıra dışı müzikal serüveni*. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Behar, Cem. 2017c. Review of *Kevseri Mecmuası: 18. Yüzyıl Saz Müziği Külliyatı (CD ilâveli)*, by Mehmet Uğur Ekinci. In *The Journal of Ottoman Studies* (49): 435-491. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/760083

Behar, Cem. 2020. *Orada bir musiki var uzakta. . . .* Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Benlioğlu, Selman. 2017. “Osmanlı Sarayında Mûsikinin Himâyesi: III. Selim ve II. Mahmud Dönemi.” PhD diss., Marmara Üniversitesi.

Benlioğlu, Selman. 2018. “Sarayda Düzenlenen Tarikat Ayinleri Işığında III. Selim’in Tekke Müziğiyle ilişkisi.” In *Sakarya Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 20(37): 1-20.

Benlioğlu, Selman. 2019. “Ruznameye göre III. Selim’in Mevlevihane ve Mukabele Ziyaretleri.” In *Şehvar Beşiroğlu’ya Armağan*, ed. Namık Sinan Turan, Şeyma Ersoy Çak. Istanbul: Pan Yayıncılık pp. 341-352.

Bobovius, Albertus [Ali Ufkî]. 2013. *Saray-ı Enderun: Topkapı Sarayı’nda Yaşam*, trans. Türkis Noyan. Istanbul: Kitap Yayınevi.

Cantemir, Demetrius. 1734. *Historia Incrementorum atque Decrementorum Aulae Othmanicae (The History of the Growth and Decay of the Ottoman Empire)*, trans. Nicholas Tindal. Vol. 1 London: Printed for James, John and Paul Knapton.

Çelebi, Evliyâ. 2006. *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi: Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi Bağdat 304 Numaralı Yazmanın Transkripsiyonu-Dizini*, prep. Robert Dankoff, Seyit Ali Kahraman, Yücel Dağlı. 1. Kitap. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Cevher, M. Hakan. 1995. “Ali Ufki ve Haza Mecmua-i Saz ü Söz. Transkripsiyon ve İnceleme.” PhD diss., Ege Üniversitesi.

Çınar, Şükran. 1974. “Patrona Halil İsyanı’na ve I. Mahmud Devrine Ait Bir Tarihçe.” Graduation thesis. Istanbul Üniversitesi.

Dankoff, Robert. 2006. *An Ottoman Mentality: The World of Evliya Çelebi*. Leiden: Brill.

Doğan, Kaan. 2021. *Sır Kâtibi Ahmet Ağa- Sultan I. Mahmud'un Günlüğü*. Istanbul: Libra Kitap.

Doğrusöz, Nilgün. 1993. "Hâfız Post Güfte Mecmuası (Türkçe Gûfteler)." Master's thesis. Istanbul Teknik Üniversitesi.

Ekinci, Mehmet Uğur. 2012. "The Kevserî Mecmûası Unveiled: Exploring an Eighteenth-Century Collection of Ottoman Music." In J*ournal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 22(2): 199-225.

Ekinci, Mehmet Uğur. 2016. *Kevseri Mecmuası: 18. Yüzyıl Saz Müziği Külliyatı*. İstanbul: Pan Yayıncılık.

Eldem, Sedad Hakkı. 1977. *Sa'dabad*. Istanbul: Kültür Bakanlığı.

Emel, Esin. 2009. "le 'mahbubiye', un palais ottoman "alla franca"". In *IJBF Online*. Berlin, Boston: K. G. Saur.

Ergun, Saadet Nüzhet. 2017. *Türk Musikisi Antolojisi*. Istanbul: Vadi Yayınları.

Erimtan, Can. 2008. *Ottoman Looking West: The Origins of the Tulip Age and its Development in Modern Turkey*. London and New York: I.B. Tauris.

Erol, Merih. "18. Yüzyıl Rum Ortodoks Müziğinin Altın Çağıydı." Interview by Vartan Estukyan. AGOS. April 03, 2016. Accessed July 01, 2021. http://www.agos.com.tr/tr/yazi/14588/18-yuzyil-rum-ortodoks-muziginin-altin-cagiydi.

Ertürk, Volkan. 2013. "XVII. ve XVIII. Yüzyıllarda Osmanlı Sultanlarının Bir Eğlenme ve Dinlenme Mekânı Olarak Tersane Bahçesi." In *Journal of History School* (15): 91-125.

Erünsal, İsmail E. 2008. *Ottoman libraries: a survey of the history, development and organization of Ottoman foundation libraries*, ed. Cemal Kafadar, Gönül Alpay Tekin. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations.

Erünsal, İsmail E. 2020. "I. Mahmûd Devri Kütüphaneleri." In *Gölgelenen Sultan, Unutulan Yıllar: I. Mahmud ve Dönemi (1730-1754)*, ed. Hatice Aynur. Vol.1 Istanbul: Dergâh Yayınları pp. 284-207.

Ezgi, Suphi. 1933. *Nazarî-Amelî Türk Musikisi*. Vol.1 Istanbul.

Faroqhi, Suraiya N. 2006. "Declines and Revivals in Textile Production." In *The Cambridge History of Turkey*, ed. Suraiya N. Faroqhi. Vol. 3 New York: Cambridge University Press pp. 356-375.

Feldman, Walter. 1992. "Musical Genres and Zikir of the Tarikats of Istanbul." In *The Dervish Lodge. Architecture, Art and Sufism in Ottoman Turkey*, ed. Raymond Lifchez. California: California University Press pp.187-202.

Feldman, Walter. 1996. *Music of the Ottoman Court: Makam, Composition and the Early Ottoman Instrumental Repertoire*. Berlin: VWB.

Feldman, Walter. 2004. "Osmanlı Sufi Tarikatlarında Müzik." In *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf ve Sufiler*, haz. Ahmet Yaşar Ocak. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu pp. 627-648.

Feldman, Walter. 2012. "Mehter." In *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*, ed. P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, and W.P. Heinrichs. Accessed: June 4, 2021. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912$_{islamSIM_5}$149.

Feldman, Walter. 2015. "The Musical 'Renaissance' of Late Seventeenth Century Ottoman Turkey: Reflections on the Musical Materials of Ali Ufki Bey (c. 1610-1675), Hafız Post (d. 1694), and the 'Maraghi' Repertoire." In *Writing the History of Ottoman Music*, ed. M. Greve. Würzburg: Ergon Verlag pp. 87-138.

Feldman, Walter. 2019a. "Leisure in the Ottoman Eighteen Century", YouTube video, 58:31, "NYUAD Institute", Uploaded date: May 5, 2020, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r-c6vDrKYMAab$_{channel}$ = $NYUADInstitute$.51 : 57.

Feldman, Walter. 2019b. "The Emergence of Ottoman Music and Local Modernity." In *YILLIK: Annual of Istanbul Studies* (1): 173-179.

Fırat, Hasan Baran. 2019. "Dönemlendirme Çalışmaları ve Osmanlı-Türk Müziği Tarihyazımı: Bir Bilanço Denemesi." In *YILLIK: Annual of Istanbul Studies* (1):145-64.

Genç, Mehmet. 2000. *Osmanlı Imparatorlugu'nda Devlet ve Ekonomi.* Istanbul:Ötüken Yayınları.

Gölpınarlı, Abdülbaki. 1963. *Mevlevî Âdâb ve Erkânı.* Istanbul: Yeni Matbaa.

Gölpınarlı, Abdülbaki. 1983. *Mevlana'dan Sonra Mevlevilik.* Istanbul: Inkılap Kitabevi.

Güray, Cenk. 2019. "Osmanlı'dan kalan bir şiir ve müzik mirasi: Gazi Murad Reis'ten IV Murâd'a 'vakanüvislik' örneği olarak Yeniçeri âşikları." In *Dîvân'dan Nağmeler: Farklı Boyutlarıyla Edebiyat-Mûsikî İlişkileri* pp. 323-345.

Halvetî, Enfî Hasan Hulûs. 2007. *Tezkiretü'l-Müteahhirîn: XVI.-XVIII. Asırlarda Istanbul Velîleri ve Delileri*, prep. Mustafa Tatcı and Musa Yıldız. Istanbul: MVT Yayıncılık.

Hamadeh, Shirine. 2014. *The City's Pleasure: Istanbul in the Eighteenth Century.* SeattleLondon: University of Washington Press.

Hathaway, Jane. 2014. *Hacı Beşir Ağa: Osmanlı Sarayının En Ünlü Haremağası*, trans. Hazal Yalın. Istanbul: Kitap Yayınevi.

İhsanoğlu, Ekmeleddin., and Aynur, Hatice. 2003. "Yazmadan Basmaya Geçiş: Osmanlı Basma Kitap Geleneğinin Doğuşu (1729-1848)." In *The Journal of Ottoman Studies* (22): 219-255.

İlhan, M. Mehdi. 2012. "Patrona Halil İsyanı Yayınlanmamış Bir Yazmanın Değerlendirmesi." In 7. *Uluslararası Türk Kültürü Kongresi Bildirileri I, İstanbul Tar-*

ihi: Medeniyetlerin Buluşma Noktası Olarak İstanbul, 5-10 Ekim 2009, 603-622. Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi.

İnal, İbnülemin Mahmut Kemal. 1958. *Hoş Sadâ: Son Asır Türk Musikişinasları.* Istanbul: Maarif Basımevi.

İnalcık, Halil. 2010. *Has Bağçede Ayş u Tarab.* Istanbul: İş Bankası.

İzzî Efendi, Süleyman. 2019. *İzzî Tarihi (Osmanlı Tarihi 1157-1165/1744-1752).* Tarih ve Toplum Bilimleri Serisi Istanbul: Türkiye Yazma Eserler Kurumu Başkanlığı.

Jackson, Maureen, 2009. "Music." In *Encyclopedia of the Ottoman Empire*, ed. Gábor Ágoston, Bruce Alan Masters. New York: Facts on File pp. 403-409

Kalaitzidis, Kyriakos. 2015. "Post-Byzantine Musical Manuscripts as Sources for Oriental Secular Music: The Case of Petros Peloponnesios (1740-1778) and the Music of the Ottoman." In *Writing the History of Ottoman Music*, ed. M. Greve. Würzburg: Ergon Verlag pp. 139-150.

Kantemiroğlu [Dimitrie Cantemir]. 2001. *Kitâbu İlmi'l-Mûsikî alâ Vechi'l-Hurûfât* [*Mûsikîyi Harflerle Tesbit ve İcra İlminin Kitabı*], prep. Yalçın Tura. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Kara, Kerim. 2003. "Mehmed Nasûhî." In *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Islam Ansiklopedisi.* Vol. 28 Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı pp. 500-502.

Karabaşoğlu, Cemal. *Lâle Devri Mûsikişinasları: Sâlim ve Safâyî Tezkireleriyle Vakâyiü'l-Fuzalâ'daki Mûsikişinâslara Dâir Bilgiler.* İstanbul: Kutup Yıldızı Yayınları.

Karahasanoğlu, Selim. 2009a. "A Tulip Age Legend: Consumer Behavior and Material Culture in the Ottoman Empire: 1718-1730." PhD diss., Binghamton University State University of New York.

Karahasanoğlu, Selim. 2009b. *Politics and Governance in the Ottoman Empire: The Rebellion of 1730: An Account of the Revolution That Took Place in Constantinople in the Year 1143 of the Hegira/Vâki'a Takrîri Biñyüzukirküç'de Terkîb Olunmuşdur.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations.

Karahasanoğlu, Selim. 2016. The Tulip Age in Ottoman Historiography: A Critique." In History from Below, ed. Selim Karahasanoğlu, and Deniz Cenk Demir. Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi University Press pp. 163-187.

Karahasanoğlu, Selim. 2019. "Ben-Anlatıları: Tarihsel Kaynak Olarak İmkânları, Sınırları." In *Turkish History Education Journal* 8 (1): 211- 230.

Kayar, Melih. 2020. "I. Mahmûd Devri Kronolojisi: 2 Ekim 1730-14 Aralık 1754 (19 Rebîülevvel 1143- 28 Safer 1168)." *Gölgelenen Sultan, Unutulan Yıllar: I. Mahmud ve Dönemi (1730-1754)*, ed. Hatice Aynur. Vol.2 Istanbul: Dergâh Yayınları pp. 606-689.

Konrad, Felix. 2014. “Coping with "the Riff-Raff and Mob: Representations of Order and Disorder in the Patrona Halil Rebellion (1730).” In *Die Welt des Islams* 3(4), Vol. 54. Leiden: Brill pp. 363-398.

Korkmaz, Harun. 2020a. “I. Mahmûd Devrine (1730-1754) Ait İki Fasıl Mecmuası.” In *Gölgelenen Sultan, Unutulan Yıllar: I. Mahmud ve Dönemi (1730-1754)*, ed. Hatice Aynur. Vol.1 Istanbul: Dergâh Yayınları pp. 204-217.

Korkmaz, Harun. 2020b. “I. Mahmud’un Cariyesi Dilhayat’ın Ölümsüz Eserleri.” In *Z Dergisi* (4): 270-273.

Kurtaran, Uğur. 2014. *Sultan Mahmud I ve Dönemi.* Ankara: Atıf Yayınları.

Kurtaran, Uğur. 2015. “Sultan Birinci Mahmud Dönemi Osmanlı-Rus Siyasi İlişkileri.” In *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı: Belleten* 79 (285): 589-610.

Kutluğ, Yakup Fikret. 2000. *Türk Mûsikisinde Makamlar.* Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Mermutlu, Bedri. 2009. “Üsküdar’da Bir Elit Mezarlığı: Nasûhî Haziresi.” In *Uluslararası Üsküdar Sempozyumu VI, Istanbul, 6-9 Kasım,* 635-664. Istanbul: Üsküdar Belediyesi.

Mert, Talip. 1999. “Dilhayat Kalfa’nın Irası.” In *Musiki Mecmuası* 52(466): 68-72.

Mete, Ayşegül. 2018. "Mevlevî Mûsikişinaslar (XVIII. Yüzyıl).” In *Sakarya Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 20(38): 165-199.

Murphey, Rhoads. 1999. “Westernisation in the Eighteenth-Century Ottoman Empire: How Far, How Fast?” *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 23: 116-39.

Necipoğlu, Gülru. 1991. *Architecture, Ceremonial, and Power: The Topkapi Palace in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries.* New York: The Architectural Foundation-MIT Press.

Olley, Jacob. 2017. “Writing Music in Nineteenth Century Istanbul: Ottoman Armenians and the Invention of the Hampartsum Notation.” PhD diss., King’s College London.

Olson, Robert W. 1974. "The Esnaf and the Patrona Halil Rebellion of 1730: A Realignment in Ottoman Politics?." In *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 17(3): 329-44.

Oral, Yavuz. 1966. “Kadı Ömer Efendi. Rûznâme-i Sultan Mahmud Han-ı Evvel (1153-1157/1740-1744.” Graduation thesis. Istanbul Üniversitesi.

Özcan, Abdülkadir. 1992. “Biniş.” In *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Islam Ansiklopedisi.* Vol. 6 Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı pp. 184-185.

Özcan, Abdülkadir. 2003. “Mahmud I.” In *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Islam Ansiklopedisi.* Vol. 27 Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı pp. 348-352.

Özcan, Abdülkadir. 2020. “I. Mahmûd ve Döneminin Kısa Panoraması.” In *Gölgelenen Sultan, Unutulan Yıllar: I. Mahmud ve Dönemi (1730-1754)*, ed. Hatice

Aynur. Vol.1 Istanbul: Dergâh Yayınları pp. 20-33.

Özcan, Nuri. 2003. “Mehter.” In *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Islam Ansiklopedisi*. Vol. Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı pp. 545-549.

Özcan, Nuri. 2004. “Mevlevî Âyini.” In *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Islam Ansiklopedisi*. Vol. 29 Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı pp. 464-466.

Özcan, Özcan. 1965. “Kadı Ömer Efendi. Rûznâme-i Sultan Mahmud Han-ı Evvel (11571160/1744-1747).” Graduation thesis. Istanbul Üniversitesi.

Özpekel, Osman Nuri. 1999. “Şair ve Bestekâr Osmanlı Padişahları.” In Osmanlı Kültür-Sanat Ansiklopedisi." Vol: 10 Ankara: Osmanlı Kültür-Sanat Ansiklopedisi pp. 607-627.

Öztuna, Yılmaz. 1974. *Türk Musikisi Ansiklopedisi*. Vol.2 Istanbul.

Paçacı-Tunçay, Gönül. 2013. “Zaharya.” In *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Islam Ansiklopedisi*. Vol. 44 Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı pp. 76-77.

Pamuk, Şevket. 2000. *A Monetary History of the Ottoman Empire*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Pekin, Ersu. 2012. “Âşık Çelebi’nin Musannifleri, Hanendeleri, Sazendeleri.” In *Bir Allâme-i Cihan: Stefanos Yerasimos Anısına*, ed. Edhem Eldem, Ersu Pekin, and Aksel Tibet. Istanbul: Kitap Yayınevi pp. 505-574.

Pekin, Ersu. 2012. “Evliyâ Çelebi’nin Müzik Kaynakları.” In *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnamesi’nin Yazılı Kaynakları*, ed. Hakan Karateke and Hatice Aynur. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu pp. 286-342.

Pekin, Ersu. 2013. “İki Itrî için Üç Yazı.” In *Itrî ve Döneminde Disiplinlerarası Bakışlar. Itrî ve Döneminde Disiplinlerarası Bakışlar Sempozyum Bildirileri, İstanbul Üniversitesi Kongre ve Kültür Merkezi Beyazıt Yerleşkesi, 3 December 2012*, 51-88. İstanbul: İstanbul Kültür Sanat Vakfı.

Pekin, Ersu. 2015. "Istanbul’un Sesleri: Osmanlı Döneminde Istanbul’daki Müzikler.” In A*ntik Çağ’dan XXI. Yüzyıla Büyük Istanbul Tarihi*, ed. Coşkun Yılmaz. Vol. 7 Istanbul: Istanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi (Kültür A.Ş.) Yayınları pp. 36-61. Accessed: June 15, 2021. https://Istanbultarihi.ist/235-Istanbulun-sesleri-osmanli-doneminde-Istanbuldaki-muzikler

Pekin, Ersu. 2018. “Surnamenin Müziği 2: 18. Yüzyıl Başlarında Istanbul’da Müzik.” In *Filiz Çağman’a Armağan*, ed. Ayşe Erdoğdu, Zeynep Atbaş, and Aysel Çötelioğlu. Istanbul: Lale Yayıncılık pp. 455-528.

Pekin, Ersu. 2020. “Hızır Ağa’nın Çalgıları: Tefhîmü’l-Makâmât’ın Resimklerini Okuma Denemesi.” In *Gölgelenen Sultan, Unutulan Yıllar: I. Mahmud ve Dönemi (1730-1754)*, ed. Hatice Aynur. Vol.1 Istanbul: Dergâh Yayınları pp. 218-281.

Plemmenos, J. G. 2002. “Ottoman Minority Musics: The Case of the Phanariot Greeks of Istanbul.” PhD diss., University of Cambridge. https://doi.org/10.17863/CAM.20438.

Popescu-Judetz, Eugenia; Sirli, Adriana Adabi. 2000. *Sources of 18th century Ottoman Music: Panayiotes Chalathzoglou and Kyrillos Marmarinos' Comparative Treatises on Secular Music.* Istanbul: Pan Yayıncılık.

Popescu-Judetz, Eugenia. 1999. *Prince Dimitrie Cantemir.* Istanbul: Pan Yayıncılık.

Popescu-Judetz, Eugenia. 2002. *Tanburi Küçük Artin: A Musical Treatise of the Eighteenth Century.* Istanbul: Pan Yayıncılık.

Popescu-Judetz, Eugenia. 2007. *Türk Musiki Kültürünün Anlamları*, trans. Bülent Aksoy. Istanbul: Pan Yayınları.

Poulos, Panagiotis, 2019. "Spaces of Intercommunal Musical Relations in Ottoman Istanbul." In *YILLIK: Annual of Istanbul Studies* (1): 181-191.

Russell, Alexander. 1756. *The Natural History of Aleppo.* London: Printed for A. Millar.

Rüstem, Ünver. 2019. *Ottoman Baroque: The Architectural Refashioning of Eighteenth-Century Istanbul.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rüstem, Ünver. 2020. "İmparatorlukta Yenilenme, Mimarîde Çağdaşlık: I. Mahmûd ve Osmanlı Baroku." In *Gölgelenen Sultan, Unutulan Yıllar: I. Mahmud ve Dönemi (1730-1754)*, ed. Hatice Aynur. Vol.2 Istanbul: Dergâh Yayınları pp. 482-615.

Sabev, Orlin (Orhan Salih). 2020. "I. Mahmûd Döneminde Müteferrika Matbaası." In *Gölgelenen Sultan, Unutulan Yıllar: I. Mahmud ve Dönemi (1730-1754)*, ed. Hatice Aynur. Vol.1 Istanbul: Dergâh Yayınları pp. 456-471.

Sabev, Orlin. 2006. *İbrahim Müteferrika ya da ilk Osmanlı Matbaa Serüveni.* Istanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi.

Şahin, Ahmet. 2015. "Osmanlı Istanbul'unda Dinî Musiki.", In *Antik Çağ'dan XXI. Yüzyıla Büyük Istanbul Tarihi*, ed. Coşkun Yılmaz. Vol. 7 Istanbul: Istanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi (Kültür A.Ş.) Yayınları pp. 66-73. Accessed: June 15, 2021. https://Istanbultarihi.ist/239-osmanli-Istanbulunda-dini-musiki

Sanal, Haydar. 1964. *Mehter Musikisi.* Istanbul: Millim Eğitim Basımevi.

Sanlıkol, Mehmet Ali. 2011. *Çalıcı Mehterler.* Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Sarıcaoğlu, Fikret, and Coşkun Yılmaz. 2008. *Müteferrika: Basmacı İbrahim Efendi ve Müteferrika Matbaası: Basmacı İbrahim Efendi and the Müteferrika Press.* Istanbul: Esen Ofset.

Sarıcaoğlu, Fikret. 2007. "Üsküdar'da Osmanlı Padişahları: Göçler, Binişler ve Selâmlıklar (XVIII. Yüzyıl)." In *Uluslararası Üsküdar Sempozyumu V, Istanbul, 1-5 Kasım*, 549-568. Istanbul: Üsküdar Belediyesi.

Sarıcaoğlu, Fikret. 2008. "Rûznâme." In T*ürkiye Diyanet Vakfı Islam Ansiklopedisi.* Vol. 35 Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı pp. 278-281.

Schick, Irvin Cemil. 2020. "I. Mahmûd Döneminde Hat Sanatı." In *Gölgelenen Sultan, Unutulan Yıllar: I. Mahmud ve Dönemi (1730-1754)*, ed. Hatice Aynur. Vol.1 Istanbul: Dergâh Yayınları pp. 430-455.

Schweigger, Salomon. 2004. *Sultanların Kendine Yolculuk 1578-1581*, trans. S. Türkis Noyan. Istanbul: Kitap Yayınevi.

Şenel, Süleyman. 2012. "Türkü." In *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Islam Ansiklopedisi*. Vol. 41 Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı pp. 612-616.

Tanman, Baha M.. 2020. "I. Mahmûd Dönemi Mimarîsinde Payitaht-Eyalet İlişkileri." In *Gölgelenen Sultan, Unutulan Yıllar: I. Mahmud ve Dönemi (1730-1754)*, ed. Hatice Aynur. Vol.2 Istanbul: Dergâh Yayınları pp. 516-555.

Tanman, Baha. 1994. "Istanbul Mevlevîhâneleri." In *The Journal of Ottoman Studies* (XIV): 177-183.

Tatçı, Mustafa. 2004. *Üsküdarlı Muhammed Nasûhî ve Divânı*, Istanbul: Kaknüs Yayınları.

Tezcan, Baki. 2010. *The Second Ottoman Empire*. Cambridge University Press.

Toderini, Giambatista. 1787. *Letteratura Turchesca*. Venezia: Presso Giacomo Storti.

Toderini, Giambattista. 2018. *Türklerin Yazılı Kültürü ve Edebiyatı*, trans. Mehmet Serdar Bekar. Istanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi.

Tuğlacı, Pars. 1990. "Çırağan Mevlevihanesi." In *Tarih ve Toplum*, 13(73): 44-45.

Türkal, Nazire Karaçay. 2012. "Silahdar Fındıklılı Mehmed Ağa, Zeyl-i Fezleke (1065-22 Ca.1106 / 1654-7 Şubat 1695)." PhD diss., Marmara Üniversitesi.

Ünver, A. Süheyl. 1978. "Beşiktaş-Çırağan Mevlevihanesi Hakkında." In *Mevlânâ ve Yaşama Sevinci*. Konya pp. 165-171.

Uslu, Recep. 2009. "Esad Efendi'de Müzik Estetiği." In *Musikişinas* (10): 192-232.

Uzluk, Feridun Nafiz. 1963. "Taş Yazıtlarda Türkçe Vakfiyeler, Arapça Yazıtlarda Türkçe Söz ve Şiirler." In *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı: Belleten* (11): 251-267.

Uzun, Efgan. 2013. "Sultan I. Mahmud'a Ait Bir Ruzname (H. 1147/M. 1734)." In *Turkish Studies - International Periodical for The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic* 8(7): 687-703.

Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı. 1977. "Osmanlılar Zamanında Saraylarda Musiki Hayatı." *Belleten* (41): 79–114.

Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı. 2011. *Osmanlı Tarihi,* Vol. IV (1). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

Wielemaker, Alexander. 2020. "The Taksim Water Network: Renegotiation of Authority and Dynastic Legitimacy." In G*ölgelenen Sultan, Unutulan Yıllar: I. Mahmud ve Dönemi (1730-1754)*, ed. Hatice Aynur. Vol.2 Istanbul: Dergâh Yayınları pp. 556-603.

Woodhead, Christine. 2010. "Şehnâmeci." In *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Islam Ansiklopedisi*. Vol. 38 Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı pp. 456-458.

Woodhead, Christine. 2012. "Rūznāmedji." In *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*, ed. P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, and W.P. Heinrichs. Accessed: 19 July 2021. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912$_{i}slam_{S}IM_{6}$356.

Wright, Owen. 1992a. *Words without Songs: A Musicological Study of an Early Ottoman Anthology and Its Precursors*. London: Routledge.

Wright, Owen. 1992b. *Demetrius Cantemir: The Collection of Notations Part 1: Text*. Londra: University of London.

Yaycıoğlu, Ali. 2016. *Partners of the Empire: The Crisis of the Ottoman Order in the Age of Revolutions*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Yılmaz, Hakan. 2015. "1730 Patrona İsyânı ile İlgili Kısa Kroniklerden Rûznâme Yazarı 'Ahmed' Kimdir?" In *Sosyal ve Kültürel Araştırmalar Dergisi* 1(2):103-126.

Yılmaz, Hakan. 2018. "Patrona Vak'ası Hakkında Yazılmış Kısa Kronikler ve Devrin Vak'anüvisi Küçük Çelebi-zâde 'Âsım'ın 'Târîhçe'si." In *Doğu-Batı* 21(85): 178-216.