



THE MAKASID AL-ALHAN VERSIONS OF MERAGI OR THE BOOKS MAY BE RENAMED? MERAGI BETWEEN TIMURID SHAH RUKH AND OTTOMAN MURAD

USLU Recep¹

ÖZ

Türk Müziği tarihini temsil eden kahramanların hayatları hakkında bilinmeyenleri araştırmak Türk müzikologlarının araştırma alanlarından biridir. Biyografilerin sağlıklı yazılabilmesi bu araştırma sonuçlarına bağlıdır. Dünya müzikologları da bu alanda çaba harcadılar. Abdülkadir Meragi yada Maragalı Abdülkadir Türkiye’de 1925’ten bu yana araştırılan Doğu ya da Türk müziği tarihinin önemli bir şahsiyetidir. O, hem müzik nazariyatçısı hem icracı hem de nazariyat yorumcusu olarak yerli ve yabancı araştırmacıların ilgisini çekmiştir. Bu makalede ele alınan eserlerinden Makasidü’l-elhan’ın tespit edilen yazmalarının çeşitli eserlerde tam bir listesi verilmiştir. Fakat bütün araştırmacılar Makasid yazmalarının tek bir eser, tek bir kompozisyondan oluşmuş eser olarak düşünmüş, bazılarının diğerlerine göre eksik olduklarını ifade etmişlerdir. Gerçekte ise bu araştırmada, bütün Makasid yazmalarının tek bir kompozisyondan oluşmadıklarını karşılaştırmalı metin yöntemi ile ortaya koymak amaçlanmıştır. Tek bir kompozisyondan oluşmayan aynı adı taşıyan eserler arasında edisyon kritik metodu uygulanamayacağı tespit edilmiştir. Makasidü’l-elhan yazmalarının aynı adı taşısa bile üç versiyon oldukları bu üç versiyonun ancak iki grup Makasid versiyonuna indirilebileceği bu araştırmanın sonuçlarından biridir. Makasid’in birinci gurubu Sultan Şahruh Timuri adına, ikinci gurubu ise ikinci Murad Osmani adına yazılmış yazmalardır ve kompozisyonları yüzde doksan oranında farklıdır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Abdülkadir Meragi, Makasidü’l-elhan, Türk Musikisi Tarihi, Sultan II Murad, Sultan Şahruh Timuri, İran Musiki Tarihi.

¹ Recep USLU, Dr. in Istanbul Medeniyet University STMF in Musicologi Department; recep.uslu@medeniyet.edu.tr. I wrote English and Thanks to operasyon@tercumanbul.com for controlling of English.

THE MAKASID AL-ALHAN VERSIONS OF MERAGI OR THE BOOKS MAY BE RENAMED? MERAGI BETWEEN TIMURID SHAH RUKH AND OTTOMAN MURAD

ABSTRACT

The study of unknowns about the lives of heroes who represent our music history is one of the research areas of Turkish musicologists. Healthy writing of biographies depends on research results. World musicologists also made efforts in this field. Abdulkadir Maragi or Abdulkadir of Maraga, who was studied on him in Turkey since 1925 is an important figure in the history of Turkish or Eastern music. He has attracted the attention of local and foreign researchers as both music theorist and performer and the theoretical commentator. In this article is determined Makasid al-alhan one of his Works that was given a complete list of the manuscripts of it in some research books. However, all the researchers' thought that the manuscripts of Makasid was a single work, consisting of a single composition compared to others. In fact, this research aims to reveal that not Makasid manuscripts are composed of a single composition with the comparative text method or the critical edition method. It has been determined that the critical edition method cannot be applied between Works of the same name which do not consist of a single composition. Even though Makasid manuscripts have the same name, it has been determined that they are three versions and can only be downloaded to two group versions with the critical edition method. The first group of Makasid was written for the name of Sultan Shah Rukh Timurid and second group was written for the name of Murad II Ottomani and their composition is different in ninety percent.

Keywords: Abdulkadir Maragi, Makasid al-alhan, The History of Turkish Music, Sultan Murad II, Sultan Shah Rukh Timurid, The History of Persian Music.

INTRODUCTION

As well as the problems of Abdülkadir Meragi's life, there are problems to be solved about his works. These problems are closely related to the history of music and musicology in Turkey. Whereas, Rauf Yekta has written the first example of the work related to Meragi's life in Turkey, after 2000 year the researches made on him increased. The difficulty of accessing Meragi's works was one of the reasons for the delay in researches. Being able to access his works has not been provided for the correct information to provide the desired academic development, there are other factors that prevent the accurate evaluation of accurate information.

Even the latest chronology about Meragi's life has tried to solve some unknowns with predictions. As a result, to guess the unknowns sometimes have a correct result, sometimes unwanted estimates have entered the literature. Transformation of the estimates into more precise expressions depends on the new findings and the correct analysis of the new findings. Accurate analysis in the social sciences as well as in sciences is possible with accurate assessments.

Questions about the number of Meragi's works about when they are written, whether they are the author's copy or not, are the subjects that all the world's musicologists such as Ethe, Farmer, Schiloah are focusing on. The completion of library catalogs with accurate information depends on these researches. After Sureyya Agayeva, who made the first academic study about Meragi, many issues were illuminated but there were also unresolved issues. For example, Why does Meragi's work not fit in the traditional writing of the preamble? Why aren't the names of his works in preamble in the places where they are supposed to be? Questions that arise from different perspectives like this, is one of the factors that extend the time in the solution of the problems between Meragi's works.

Until now, there have been similarities or variations in their works and copies, but the issue has not been adequately clarified. The first suggestion in 1974 by Ehad Arpad that Meragi's works were "similar to each other" was then repeated by Bardakçı (Arpad, p. 25; Bardakçı, p. 139). However, it was correct to identify it from the subjects of the twelve chapters of his works where it was given the contents, but sometimes he was also mistaken as in Kitab-ı Lahniyye (this topic will explained in the relevant place). Correspondingly, are all copies of Meragi's Cami al-alhan

called the same each other? Not enough research has been done on this issue and the work has been published by Taki Benesh in the conditions of the time. He is also one of the pioneering musicologists in the other works of Meragi and has not dwelled on the issue of diversity among the copies of his works. This issue raises the question whether non-equal copies should be considered as separate works and this question puts the researcher on a difficult path. Some of the problems of Meragi's works could have been solved only in recent times, but they have not ended. The work called Makasid that this article aimed to concentrate on is in the same situation.

The subject of this research, which will be about Makasid al-alhan, which is one of the Works of Meragi, is limited by Persian editions and manuscripts. In this article, the advantages and disadvantages of Turkish studies made about his works will not be discussed. Because this article will consist of an academic exchange of new findings, analysis, conclusions and recommendations on Makasid al-alhan. This article also aims to question whether or not to present a common text by a critical method on the copies of the book called Makasid al-alhan.

THE PROBLEM OF NAMING THE COPIES OF MAKASID AL-ALHAN:

The list of Makasid's copies seen in the studies conducted after Bardakçı's book is almost the same. The presentation of Makasid lists as a whole, inappropriate writing and analysis on the writing, it has the impression that all the manuscripts are in the same composition and they consist of the same text. Doubtful statements about whether it is really so, has been used by few researchers, but all researchers have not been able to solve this problem by 2015 and they have always considered Makasid as the copies of the same work. What is noteworthy in the new findings after 2015?

First of all is the fact that in the studies conducted after 2015, all the manuscripts which are known and listed under the name of Makasid do not consist of the same text. Secondly, it is understood that it was not correct to consider all of the works known under Makasid name are not the same. Since these two findings are related to each other, firstly, the issue of naming these works will be discussed.

Meragi entered the palace of Djalayirid as a musician and scribe when he was 15 years old. We know that he was a very good musician him very well because of his 30 music compositions named nevbet-i muretteb with mustezad, when he wrote 23 years old in the palace of Djalayirids. In almost all of his works, he explained this subject in different aspects and even made mistakes about the

date of the incident. Therefore, in order to have a correct knowledge on this subject, all the works must be read. In order to get the correct information, the order of writing must be correct with their writing dates, but the writing dates alone is not enough.

Meragi called the first of his works as *Kanz al-alhan* (the treasure of music). In his works, he made references to his earlier works which also give a clue as to which of his works he wrote earlier. For example, in the four copies of his work titled *Cami al-alhan* (in 1405, 1410, 1415, 1416), written between the ages of 52 and 62, there are references to *Kanz al-alhan*, thus, this confirms that he had written *Kanz al-alhan* before. But the fact that he wrote the other copies of a work of the same name with different additions or compositions creates new problems. In one of these four copies of *Cami al-alhan*, there is the addition of the lyrics which he called the *Madjalis*, but this part is not in other copies. Therefore, whether *Madjalis* is a separate work or not, has been a subject of debate among modern musicologists. However, apart from the obvious difference, the differences in the other *Cami al-alhan*'s texts or between *Sharh-i Advar* and *Makasid* copies were not investigated. Studies on the subject did not provide a clear opinion about the presence of a composition union in manuscripts. No sufficient critics/text comparison has been made on the copies of Meragi's works.

In some studies about the differences between the manuscripts known as *Makasid al-alhan*, that is the main subject of this article, the word "missing or incomplete" has been used, but what kind of a deficiency is that has not been clarified. Rauf Yekta has used the definition "missing" about some *Makasid* manuscripts for the first time, then you can find this definition in Murat Bardakçı's research. There has been a need for writing this article as there is no study with the text comparison/critical edition method on *Makasid al-alhan* manuscripts like *Cami al-alhan* manuscripts.

In some of my previously published papers I have announced that there were three versions of *Makasid al-alhan* and their translation into Turkish (Uslu, 2017 ve Uslu, 2018a, s. 118). Since the main purpose of the papers is to determine whether or not Meragi is affected by the philosophy of *Makasid*, there is no mention of the differences of the *Makasid* versions from each other. This article has emerged because the differences between the manuscripts should be clarified.

When the writing dates of the manuscripts known as Makasid al-alhan are listed, 1418, 1423, 1434, 1435, 1441 dates come forward. Considering the dates of Meragi's life and the dates near his death, the dates should be limited to 1418-1441. However, it is one of the new findings that the famous date of 1421, that was repeated in some studies and which was not seen between the dates given above, is a historical error. It was first reported in an article by H.G.Farmer that there had been a copy dated 1421, but the fact that the manuscript that he points to does not have this date has revealed the fact that it is a historical error. The manuscripts dated 1435 and 1441 from the dates given above are not handwritten by Meragi. So that it will be evaluated in the article last.

The first of the manuscripts known as Makasid al-alhan is dated 1418 (Rizavi's manuscript) and it has been published by Taki Benesh. Taki Benesh is so confident that this manuscript was Makasid al-alhan, so he wrote and published with the name of Makasid al-alhan without any discussion and criticism on the cover of the work. Fortunately, he published facsimiles of several pages of the manuscript and these pages provided an idea of the name of manuscript. In fact, his main purpose was that there were documents supporting him. But the diversity of writing in and on the cover of the manuscript requires questioning. Unlike used nestalik in the other works of Meragi, in the manuscript of Rizavi is written with nesih calligraphy. A book name should be sought in the introduction of this work, which started by nesih in vowels and then continued with nesih calligraphy without vowels. The name of the author is clearly seen in the introduction of the book and the name of the book can be called "Muhtasar der ilm-i musiki". At the end of the copy, there is a record of completion on Ramadan A.H. 821 / October 1418. But the name of the book is clearly not in this part named feragh. Then in a note attached to the edge of the feragh part with the talik calligraphy that writes "I finished writing this Makasid book in a hurry". In this note, the name Kitab-ı Makasid name is seen for the first time (Benesh, Mukaddime, 1977, p. 35 and 142). If we accept that the note in this talik calligraphy is written by Meragi (the meaning of the sentence makes it compelling), it is still unclear whether the work is called Makasid al-alhan. In this case, we can attribute the book only to one of the names of Makasid fi ilmul-musiki or Makasid der ilm-i musiki. This result supports firstly the possibility that the name of the book may not be Makasid al-alhan.

"Kitab-ı Makasid al-alhan fi ilmi al musiki kâtibuhu ve vâziuhu Abdulkadir-i Meragi al-Hafız al-Meragi gafarallahu zunubehu" writing on the cover of the manuscript that is given in the

introduction of the book published by Benesh means “This is the book of music science named Makasid al-alhan, it was written by Abdulkadir Meragi, he was Hafiz and of Maraga, God forgive his sins”. In this case, somebody has written this name after Meragi’s death, and his only justification may be the talik calligraphy note in the end of the book. We have mentioned the possibility that this note may not point to the same name. Binesh did not put forward any ideas in the introduction of the book and did not suspect the name of the book. In the notes on the lower edge of the front cover of the manuscript have been written twice as Makasid al-alhan. Taki Benesh has not explained what these notes are and whether they belong to Meragi. Have these notes been written later or are the notes written by Meragi? We don’t know.

In the same year Meragi wrote two books. One of the books was written to Mirza Baysunghur in November 1418 and the other to Shah Rukh in December 1418, one month after the other. In spite of the fact that He named one of them Kitab-ı Lahniyye, some musicologists gave this work in the list of manuscripts called Makasid al-alhan since only the topics in the twelve chapters were similar each other and few of them recorded different book named “Mukhtasar der ilm-i musiqi”. There is no name for the book at the introduction of the book that he wrote for Shah Rukh and this manuscript has the same fate. The book written for Shah Rukh is either listed under the name of Muhtasar Der ilm-i musiki or listed under the name of named Makasid al-alhan.

It was written for the first time by M. Ali Terbiyet that Meragi had a book called “Kitab-ı Lahniyya” written in the same year by him. However, the fact that Terbiyet did not mention any manuscript of this work has caused doubts. Taki Benesh has written the idea that this issue should be considered with suspicion, however it is one of the new findings that his prediction was not correct.

Meragi has referred to both books of his work Kitab-ı Lahniyye and Kanz al-alhan in the Makasid al-alhan that was written for Sultan Murad in 1423 (this citation is understood from TSMK manuscript). It is natural that the reference sentence for these works in the book titled Makasid al-alhan dated October 1418 and published by Taki Benesh has not been in the right place, since it was written two months before Kitab-ı Lahniyye. Although this Makasid for Shah Rukh is completed after Kitab-ı Lahniyye (Having obtained a copy of this book in 1435, Emir b. Hızır Mali Mevlevi Karamani should be remembered here), however, also reference sentence to his works is not the same in his Makasid al-alhan, which he wrote in honor of Shah Rukh at the end of the same

year and finished in December 20, 1418 (Paris NB, Suppl. Pers. No. 1121, vr. 64b²), As a result of the text comparisons It is understood that the text compositions of Makasid written in October 1418 and Makasid for Shah Rukh were almost the identical with the method of text comparison. Thus, it can be estimated that there is reference to Kitab-i Lahniyye in the manuscripts named Makasid written in 1423 (Rauf Yekta manuscript) and Makasid written in 1434 (Tehran-Melik manuscript, nr. 832/1) due to the reference in the TSMK manuscript. We should also mention that there is a reference to Kitab-ı Lahniyye in Leiden University Library's manuscript and Nuruosmaniye Library's manuscripts (Leiden manuscript, fol. 48.l and Nuruosmaniye manuscript fol. 80.l) like in TSMK manuscript.

The TSMK manuscript dated 1435 mentioned above is not Meragi's handwriting. Another copyist named Muhammad ibn Ilyas has written it. It is believed that the text composition is the same as the manuscripts dated 1423 and 1434. The manuscript dated 1423 is the key point of the subject and it has not been possible to compare texts because it is in a private collection. However, the only witness that supported this issue is the manuscript of Makasid dated 1441. Certain Makasid manuscripts are mistakenly listed in some lists of as separate works such as Konya Chelebi manuscript and Ankara National Library manuscript. The book review of the Ankara National Library manuscript was made by Fazlı Arslan for the first time (Arslan, 2015, p. 190. The only error in the presentation is the fact that the instruments are explained one by one). Information has been given about this manuscript however no comparison was made with other manuscripts. The writing of the manuscript is not written by Meragi, but by another person named Abdullah Sabzawari. This manuscript must have been brought to Anatolia by Fethullah Shirvani from Herat. There is no dedication in it the name of any sultan. In this case, the first thing that comes to mind is that the manuscript dated 1441 should be similar to the manuscript date of October 1418. But, it is seen in the comparison that the text of the manuscript is the same as the TSMK manuscript such as Leiden and Nuruosmaniye manuscripts. There are one to two percent differences among them and such minor differences can be caused by the scribe's spelling preferences or errors. The Ankara National Library manuscript has a text difference of 90-95% with the Makasid al-alhan manuscripts dated October and December 1418. It is believed that this manuscript was written

² This manuscript consists of a few books. 1. Kanz at-tuhaf, 2. Makasid al-alhan, 3. Others. In A.H.838 / A.C. 1435, Amir ibn Hizir Mali Karamani Mavlavi has it in Anatolia. He was a person around of Murad II Ottoman.

from Makasid al-alhan dated 1434 (Tahran-Melik manuscript, nr. 832/1). Thus, it is estimated that the 1434 dated manuscript had the same text composition as the manuscripts like Makasid dated 1423 written for Sultan Murad. In addition, the scribe who wrote the copy of Makasid al-alhan dated 1441 clearly wrote the name of book in the introduction of book like traditional introduction.

As a result of this analysis, it Shah Rukh found that the texts of the manuscripts of Makasid al alhan dedicated to Shah Rukh in December 1418 and dated October 1418 without dedicated copy were ninety percent identical. In addition, the Makasid manuscript dated 1435 written for the name of Sultan Murad and was written with a text completely different from the previous ones. Nuruosmaniye and Leiden manuscripts, which were dedicated to Sultan Murad, and the Ankara National Library Manuscript have been found to have the same text as TSMK manuscript dated 1435. Although it cannot be seen by the author of this article, it can be argued that the copy dated 1423 for Sultan Murad and manuscript dated 1434 had the same text as TSMK manuscript dated 1435 version.

HAD MERAGI KNOWN THAT HE HAD WRITTEN A BOOK THAT HAS TWO TEXTS?

In 1418 Meragi was 65 years old and lived in Herat. Sultan Shah Rukh worked hard to keep the Timurids together. He often tried to suppress riots rather than going out to frequent conquests like his father did. Although he loved science, he couldn't give time to scientists. Scientists were deprived of his lack of interest and their psychologies and morale were deteriorating. Abdülkadir Meragi was one of those who deeply felt this psychological effect. In 1418, Meragi must have wanted to draw attention by writing the book to Shah Rukh and to Mirza Baysunghur. It had been five years since the dead of Sharif Courjani (d. 1413), who had been the teacher of Shah Rukh and the protector of Meragi. A name of a book may have attracted the attention of Shah Rukh which recalls the philosophy of Makasid in the works of al-Taftazani and al-Djurdjani whose fame reach beyond till the Ottomans. The fact that he had even named his first the book written with nasih calligraphy suggests whether this work could not have been written for the Ottomans that liked the nasih writing. The Ottomans were showing their commitments like the Western Province of Timurids, since the Ankara war in 1402. Shah Rukh was sending a delegation from time to time to the Ottomans to supervise, giving gifts, taking gifts. Had Shah Rukh an intention to send an envoy to the Ottomans so that A book was written under this name Makasid in 1418? Or was it an attempt for Meragi to draw Shah Rukh's interest to remind the old days by the word Makasid,

which he found as a remedy for his distress. This question led me to conclude that Meragi was influenced by the philosophy of Makasid, as I have mentioned in an article in 2018 (Uslu, 2018a). Thus, it supports that he has been affected by the Makasid philosophy given that the morality manners information he provided in his works, the information that the Quran should be recited before the music chapters, almost all of his poems in his work are called Madjalis that consist of poems intended for social religion and morality, but mostly his preference for using the term "makasid" in some of his works and as wrote works to both Shah Rukh who like this philosophy and Murad.

In 1423, Meragi was 70 years old and lived in Herat, when he wrote the book of Makasid al-alhan for Sultan Murad II. Shah Rukh's envoys carried his work to Ottoman Sultan. Certainly, these envoys also reported the wishes of Shah Rukh as well as the gifts they brought to Murad. Meragi had certain reasons behind the fact that he wrote books to Shah Rukh and Sultan Murad in different compositions. These reasons can be political-sociological or psychological. Therefore, the writer Abdulkadir Meragi was aware that he had written two works with the same name. The main question is that did Shah Rukh realize that these two books under the same name were written in different compositions? Did the other Timurian intellectual statesmen realize this? Did the Ottomans realize this? If they noticed, what was their attitude? Fark ettilerse tavırları ne olmuştur? We can say that Shah Rukh knows this situation and kept his mouth shut and high state officials around him kept their mouth shut too. How could the Ottoman statesmen have corresponded this, even though the Timurid statesmen kept their mouth shut? Could the gossip of "ulama" (high schoolars) who may suspect that both of the books have the same name be prevented? Doesn't it mean that probably Amir Karamani has copied the manuscript of Makasid for Shah Rukh in Edirne? (like Paris 1121)

Now, it is understood that the composition of the texts were different between the Makasids. Has Meragi referred to this work as a different work in his other works? In our studies, it was found that Meragi has always referred to with the same name without separating them from each other, even in his latest work Zavaid-i Favaid-i Ashara (Uslu, 2018b, p. 1). This situation has certainly misled the researchers about whether it is the same work or not.

The fact that Meragi has always cited the same name of Makasid al-alhan in the works has led modern musicologists to mistakes. Since the difference between the manuscripts cannot be

precisely clarified, the musicologists have gathered the manuscripts similar to the Makasid al-alhan in a single list. The manuscripts are listed since Rauf Yekta with the consideration that they are in the same composition but some of them are written with the missing text. The point, which is not expressed, remains that the scribes may have skipped in the text either intentionally or unknowingly. This issue will be evaluated separately because it is closely related to the critical method of the edition.

As a result, Meragi knew that he was writing a book with the same name of Makasid al-alhan, consisting of two different texts, and was probably proud of him. Probably, according to him, this situation shows how a person who is a Turk has perfectly control over Persian language.

CAN THE CRITICAL METHOD OF THE EDITION BE APPLIED TO ALL MAKASID AL-ALHAN MANUSCRIPTS?

The mission critical method of the edition is a method used to obtain a single healthy text from many copies. The application of this method depends on certain conditions. The most important of these conditions is that all manuscripts have copies of the book with the same composition.

Since Meragi always referred to Makasid al-alhan as if it were a single book then, can one single text of the book be obtained with the critical method of edition when all Makasid manuscripts are put together? The musicologists dreamed of achieving a goal, as if Meragi had a single book called Makasid al-alhan. For this reason, when they compare the manuscripts that they can observe, they describe some of them as incomplete. In particular, they mistakenly thought that it might be a common text among Makasid manuscripts in Meragi's writing. Rauf Yekta must be one of the first people to have made an effort to produce a single text while copying Makasid manuscripts. However, it is not possible to compare the text between works that do not have a common text and the critical method of edition cannot be applied to such books. If the application is attempted, the result will be a new work and this new work cannot be considered to be a work belonging to Meragi. Another example of this situation is Zavaid-i Favaid-i Ashara (Uslu, 2018b, p. xiv. Necessary explanations were made in the published work).

The first edition of the manuscripts of Makasid that was published by Benesh has not been dedicated, but the second to Shah Rukh, and we mentioned that the third one was dedicated to Murad (Uslu, 2018a, p. 118). The first two of these three versions are very similar to each other as

of texts of composition and there is a difference of almost 5-10 percent among them. The fact that the compositions are in the same sentence ordering means that critical method of edition can be applied. The text of the book published by Taki Benesh can only be criticised with the text of the book written for Shah Rukh. Text comparison cannot be made between the second and the third. As a result, it is inevitable that two different Makasid al-alhan texts are formed. One of them will be the text of Makasid presented to Shah Rukh and the other one will be written in the text of Makasid for Sultan Murad.

What could be the background of the using of “incomplete” qualification by careful investigators on manuscripts? There is a possibility that the scribes may have skipped some texts while copying the manuscripts may have been in the mindsets of the researchers about the reason for describing the manuscripts as incomplete. Because of the extended length of the work and the concerns about not being able to complete the writing of the work at the desired time, it is a possibility that some parts might have been skipped by scribes skip when writing. As a matter of fact, there are examples showing that the scribes skipped certain parts of Makasid manuscripts written for Sultan Murad II. However, it is not possible to create a single book of Makasid al-alhan text with the book of Makasid written for Sultan Murad and the book of Makasid book written for Shah Rukh, despite the fact that these kinds of skipping cannot be easily determined. Critical method of edition cannot be applied to these two different Makasid texts.

Makasid manuscripts are composed of two different compositions to provide two different books. In this case, it is inevitable to emerge a problem with the same name that two works consisting of two different compositions.

In his later works Meragi used the same name and citation phrases without making any distinction to the book of Makasid al-alhan. As the two different works have the same name, they confuse the minds of the readers and researchers. In this regard, a naming solution can only be proposed as follows: Makasid al-alhan li’s-Sultan Shah Rukh Timurid and Makasid al-alhan li’s-Sultan Murad Ottoman. Because both of them are referred to as the “Sultan” in the works.

Meragi did not write two completely different books for them because perhaps he wanted to prevent the rumors that he wrote a better book for one of them. Thus, it was perhaps a source of pride for him to write books that were identical.

WHAT ARE THE IMPORTANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MAKASID MANUSCRIPTS?

I have mentioned about the conclusion that we have to separate them into two groups of manuscripts, one for Sultan Shah Rukh and the other for Sultan Murad. Then, we also mentioned that there can be no critical method of edition on these two different texts. Since it is not possible to talk about all the differences here, it will be enough to talk about some features that will be the evidence for the two works cannot be translated into one text. We need to underline that Meragi used similar sentences in both of his books, but these similarities are not enough to create a single text with the critical method of edition.

Introduction part: Having a lot of similar sentences in the prayer and introduction section of the books is another feature. This feature has been misleading for musicologists who thought that they are the same book. The dedications for Sultan Murad in the introduction are remarkably similar to the sentences for Shah Rukh (1121, fol. 3a). However, there are a few different expressions in the introduction of both Makasid. For example, there are two different words “I wrote” and “I edited” in the introduction of the book for Shah Rukh, but “he wrote” and “he edited” in the introduction of the book for Murad (it is not known what he wrote in 1423 manuscript, but it is estimated to be the same as the TSMK manuscript; “in muhtasar ra der ilm-i musiki te’lif kerdem” in MS 1121, fol. 2a second line; and “in muhtasar ra müretteb gerdanidem” in MS 1121, fol. 2a last second line; and “muvashshah ve musherref gerdanidem” in MS 1121, fol. 3a in sixth line; and “in muhtasar ra der ilm-i musiki telif kerd” and “muvashshah ve musherref ve muzeyyen gerdanidem” in MS TSMK, fol. 2b in ninth line and 3a second line; in MS NO, fol. 2a in sixth line, fol. 2a “izafet kerd” in ninth line and “muvaşşah ve müşerref ve müzeyyen gerdanidem” in fol. 2b in fourth and fifth lines; Leiden MS, fol. 1b the same). Here are the different words that are required to be drawn: “te’lif kerd” and “te’lif kerdem”, and “izafet kerd” and “izafet kerdem” and “muzeyyen”. You can find the different words between the introductions of Makasid manuscripts. In both Makasid manuscripts, praise for Shah Rukh and Murad is almost the same, a few words and names are different. The four hadiths at the end of the introductions are the same in both Makasid for Shah Rukh and Murad copies. In the Ankara National Library the manuscript (no. 06MilYzA.5238) that Abdülbaki Nasır Dede used, has also the four hadith text in the end of introduction.

First chapter: One of the most important differences of the Makasid texts is the first chapter. The starting sentences and the continuing composition of the first part are completely different from each other. After the subject of the first chapter, Sultan Shah Rukh's Makasid book starts saying by: "Know that music is a Greek word" and Sultan Murad's Makasid book starts saying by "the sound is a matter of hearing formations". And both sentences continue with a different composition (Manuscript in the National Library of Ankara begins with the definition of sound). Both consist of three parts of the first section, which are numerical similarities. At the end of the first part of the Benesh publication he writes I gave these definitions in Cami al-alhan book, but at the end of the first part of the book for Shah Rukh he writes I gave these definitions in Kanz al-alhan, thus he creates a difference so that different books' names in the text, but in both parts the other sentences are identical. The first chapter of Makasid, written by Sultan Murad, is completely different, no book names are mentioned at the end. The second part is the first chapter about how sound is formed is similar to each other of Makasid for Shah Rukh with TSMK manuscript. The third part of the first chapter deals the reasons of the subtlety and thickness of the sound. The third part of the first chapter in Makasid book for Shah Rukh and Makasid published by Benesh consists of the same text, but the third part of Makasid for Murad has different text. In addition to these differences, it is also observed that some sentences are used in different parts.

We can find the sentence about the definition of "cem" that is in the second part of the book for Shah Rukh, in the middle of the first chapter of the book for Murad. In this respect, the ability to meet similar sentences in different chapters should not put musicologists into a misconception that the two works are the same. The multiplicity of different sentences is one of the most important features that distinguishes the two Makasid works. Like the differences text between the first chapters, there are differences in other chapters of the books.

One of the differences between the two works is the order of the parts in a chapter. Sometimes a part in the chapter found in Makasid for Shah Rukh is in a different order in Makasid for Murad. It is possible to give examples from the parts found in the second chapter.

Second chapter: Makasid for Shah Rukh has six parts: 2/1 division of the frets on a wire, 2/2 Intervals and proportions, 2/3 reasons for disharmony in music, 2/4 Adding intervals to each other, 2/5 Removal of intervals, 2/6 cutting intervals in half. 2/7 Widespread-order chapter in strings. Makasid for Murad has nine parts: 2/1 division of the frets on a wire, 2/2 Intervals and proportions,

2/3 Interval rates with ancient method, 2/4 common intervals, 2/5 reasons for disharmony in music, 2/6 adding intervals to each other, 2/7 Removal of intervals, 2/8 Excess of intervals from one another, 2/9 cutting intervals in half.

As seen, there are differences between in the order and the number of parts of the second chapter. It should be kept in mind that the parts are mostly composed of different texts of the same subject, even if they contain some similar sentences.

As an example, in the first chapter of the second section again, the section where it is explained by always making divisions on a wire portion consist of similar sentences while describing the places where the frets are formed on a wire. But it even differs in the names referred to in his book in the sentences he built in continuation. In the Makasid he wrote to Shah Rukh as he said, "I found a more accurate method for this topic and wrote it in Cami al-alhan" (MS 1121, fol. 8b; Biniş, p. 17 identical) whereas in the book he wrote to Murad, he tries to create a difference in the sentence he built by saying "I wrote in Kanz al-alhan" (TSMK, fol. 8a) on the same subject again in the same place.

The differences in the book names in the citations that were seen many times are the sentences that he took refuge so as to make a different expression. As an example for the differences of the chapters that we want to show here, the part for "reasons of disharmony" in the second chapter are in the third part in the first book of Makasid for Shah Rukh however it is in the fifth part in the second book of Makasid for Murad and their texts are different in both.

The chapter, that is not in either of the manuscripts, may be added to another manuscript. Hence, it can be seen from the second chapter above that, there is the part of interval rates with the ancient method (numbered 2/3), in the Makasid for Murad, but there is none in the Makasid for Shah Rukh. Due to a difference of five years between the writing of these two works, it means that Meragi enriched his work by making new additions.

We have mentioned that Meragi's citations to previously written books give a clue as to the order of writing among his books. This kind of citations are one of the proofs that the texts between the two Makas are different. We have shown that even his references made to Kanz al-alhan and Cami al-alhan books that he wrote before Makasid were one of the differences between the two Makasid copies. He referenced to Cami al-alhan in Makasid for Sultan Shah Rukh (Paris MS 1121, fol. 8b;

Biniş, p. 17) and to Kanz al-alhan in Makasid for Murad (TSMK, fol. 8a), thus he tried to make a difference between the two Makasid books. Another important example is also his reference to the Kitab-i Lahniyya Book in Makasid li's-Sultan Murad.

The ninth chapter of Makasid's book is about the subject of rhythm named “ika-cycles”. There are also different sentences as much as the similar sentences in of both Makasid texts. The similarities in topic and text should not mislead the musicologists to think that the two works are the same. For example, rather than giving a lot of examples of extensive different sentences, a reference to his own book can be given instead. While telling about rhythm named remel, that is one of the ika-cycles, there is a reference sentence to both of Kitab-ı Lahniyye and Kenz al-alhan in Makasid for Murad (TSMK, fol. 54a). This reference sentence does not exist in the “remel” topic where he explained with similar but shorter sentences in Makasid that he wrote for Shah Rukh (Paris 1121, fol. 62a-b; Biniş, p. 95 remel with the same sentences) and there is no reference to Kitab-i Lahniyye in any part of the book.

Twelfth chapter: The reason why we discuss this chapter is that it presents us with one of the very distinct differences. One of the topics mentioned in this chapter is the instruments part. Meragi, in the seventh part of twelfth chapter in Makasid for Shah Rukh, discussed instruments in a wide perspective and he explained the instruments one by one and even explained the changes he made in the instruments clearly. A similar section is found in Makasid published by Benesh, and Cami al-alhan manuscripts but there are no sentences concerning his own inventions and enhancements in these books, these sentences are more distinct in Makasid for Shah Rukh. The seventh part of twelfth chapter of Makasid for Murad is also devoted to instruments, the instruments part consists only of classification, the instruments are not explained one by one. This part of twelfth chapter on instruments is one of the major differences between the two Makasid.

The last subject: The differentiation between the topics of two Makasids is one of the issues that differentiate between the two manuscripts. The last part of last chapter of Makasid for Shah Rukh is about “mutedil” which is a music form and the last part of Makasid for Murad is about good manners for musicians in an assemblage that is named as <meclis edebleri> that is which I translated as “stage information”. One of the ways to differentiate manuscripts is with the last topic of last chapters.

Meragi, sometimes changed the place of sentences, sometimes added new parts in chapters, sometimes changed the order of parts, sometimes made different tables or shapes, sometimes wrote different numbers on the tables, sometimes gave parts on the same topic to different chapters. After all, he wrote two Makasid al-alhan books consisting of two different texts. We have written some of the important differences above. Examples concerning the differences between the two Makasid can be multiplied. The most important difference is of course the difference in the text composition of the work with the same name. Makasid for Sultan Murad is a new text that is built almost entirely with different sentences. It is inevitable to see that there are similar sentences since they tell the same subjects, but the proportion of similar sentences is very low. The proportion of similar sentences is such low that it is not enough to name the works as the same text. On average, the difference between two books is over ninety percent.

All of these findings support that the Makasid written for Shah Rukh and the Makasid written for Murad is not made up of a common text and that Makasid copies cannot be transformed into a single text by applying critical method of edition. What can be done in this case?

WHAT CAN BE MADE FOR MAKASID MANUSCRIPTS?

First we have to admit that Meragi has written three separate Makasid versions. After the comparison, we must also accept that two groups of Makasid text can be generated and we can form in two groups. The first group is those that are similar to the text of Makasid for Shah Rukh, and the second group is those similar to the text of Makasid written for Sultan Murad. According to the data obtained so far, we can collect Makasid manuscripts in two groups:

First group of Makasid manuscripts for Shah Rukh: 1- Makasid in Meshed-Rızavi Library no 539, published by Benesh in 1977, 2- Meshed-Rızavi Library no. 6454 (copy from 539 according to Bardakci, p. 143), 3- Paris Bibliotheque Nationale Library, no. 1121, written for Shah Rukh.

Second group is the Makasid manuscripts for Murad: 1-The manuscript written 1423 of Rauf Yekta (nowadays in special collection), 2- TSMK Revan Library, no. 1726 written 1435, 3- İstanbul Nuruosmaniye Library, no. 3656 written 1497, 4-İstanbul Belediye no. K4 (copy from Nuruosmaniye Library no 3656), 5-Leiden University Library, no. Or.271 written 1580, 6-Tahran Melik Library, no. 832/1 written 1434, 7-Ankara National Library, No. 06MilYzA.5238 written

1441. Since the name of the work is written at the introduction of this last manuscript, it is obligatory to use the name a Makasid al-alhan for manuscripts which are written for Sultan Murad.

Bardakçi listed fourteen manuscripts of Makasids (Bardakçi, 1986, p. 142-143). We investigated ten manuscripts on his list and found the group of all ten which they belonged to. One of the manuscripts in list is a different book named Kitab-ı Lahniyye in Bodleian Library Ouseley, no. 264 (old number 385) (Uslu, 2015, p. 38-39).

As a result, these two groups of Makasid manuscripts must have separate text critique. The method proposed by this article can be followed to name two separate books: 1-Makasid al-alhan fi ilmil-musiki for Shah Rukh Timurid and 2- Makasid al-alhan fi ilmil-musiki for Murad Ottoman. Among the Makasids, the latter can be called more perfect because it was written five years after the first one. In order to follow the development and change in Meragi's ideas in terms of musicology and the history of music, both of them need to have the right texts with critical text method.

CONCLUSION

In this article, it is aimed to research the manuscripts of Makasid al-alhan that is one of the works of Meragi.

One of the results of the article is the text differences between the Makasid manuscripts. The text differences was created by Meragi.

One of the results of this article shows that the Makasid manuscripts are in three versions.

One of the results of the article is that to mention a book with three versions of the same name and to refer to them seems to have been cited in a single book. This situation have some difficulties as we have determined that not all Makasid manuscripts are the same in this article.

One of the results of the article is that it is possible to reduce the books which have been identified as three versions into two books with the text-critical method. The findings of this article can be used to identify which of the two Makasids are separated or whichever they are.

This article shows some important differences between the two Makasid al-alhan manuscripts. All of the books listed as Makasid al-alhan manuscripts consist of two different texts that cannot be

described as copies of each other. It is understood that two groups of Makasid al-alhan were written from the classification of these different texts. It is not possible to create a common text by using the critical method of edition in these two groups.

That is the suggestion for this article to name the manuscripts that are composed of the two Makasid groups: 1-The first group, which was written for the first time in 1418, should be called Makasid al-alhan for Shah Rukh Timurid. 2-The second group, which was written for the first time in 1423, should be called Makasid al-alhan for Murad II Ottoman. It should also be noted that the compositions are different.

The article proposes to the researchers that you can decide which type of Makasid you have obtained by using the data in this article.

Last question: Which group Makasid text is needed in terms of musicology and world music history? In order to follow the development and change in music theory and in Meragi's ideas, both of them need to have the right texts with critical text method.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arpad, Ehad (1974). “Abdülkadir Merâgî”, *Küçük Türk İslam Ansiklopedisi*, İstanbul, Fasikül I, s. 25-26.

Arslan, Fazlı (2015). “Herat Bölgesi Sanat merkezinden İsimler: Abdülkadir Meragi, Oğlu Abdülaziz, torunu Mahmud, Abdurrahman Cami, Hüseyin Baykara, Alişah”, *İslam Medeniyetinde Musiki*, İstanbul: Beyan yay., s. 183-197

Bardakçı, Murat (1986). *Maragalı Abdülkadir*, İstanbul: Pan yay.

Benesh, T. (1977). “Mukaddime”, in *Makasidü'l-elhan*, ed. Taki Biniş, Tahran.

Ethe, H. (1980). *Catalogue of Persian the manuscripts in the India office Library*, London

Farmer, H. G. (1986). *Studies in Oriental Music* (ed. E.N.). Frankfurt

Farmer, H. G. (1940). “Abd al-kadir b. Ghaybi”, *Encyclopedia of Islam*, Leiden: Brill yay. I, 66-67; ayz., “Abdulkadir Gaybi”. *İslam Ansiklopedisi*. İstanbul: MEB yay. c. 1, s. 83-85

Meragi, *Kitab-ı Lahniyye*, Bodleian Library, Ouseley, nr. 264

Meragi, *Makasid al-alhan*, ed. Taki Benesh, Tahran 1977; In doctoral thesis of Cemal Karabaşođlu, this book has been translated into Turkish but confused with Makasid for Sultan Murad.

Meragi, *Makasid al-alhan bi's-Sultan Şahruh Timuri*, Paris BN Suppl. Persian MS. no. 1121

Meragi, *Makasid al-alhan bi's-Sultan Murad-ı Sani Osmani*, TSMK Revan yazması, no. 1726; Leiden University Library, no. Or.271 yazması; İstanbul Nuruosmaniye Library, no. 3656 (ve İstanbul Belediye no. K4 NO yazmasından kopya); Ankara Milli Kütüphane Milli Ktp. No. 06MilYzA.5238 yazması 1441 tarihli.

Rauf Yekta Bey (1925). *Esatiz-i Elhan Abdülkadir Meragi*. İstanbul: Özel yay. 1341

Schiloah, A. (1979). *The Theory of Music in Arabic Writings 900-1900*. Münih

Terbiyet, M. Ali (1314 hş). “Abdülkadir Meragi”. *Danışmendan-ı Azerbaycan*, Tebriz 1314 hş., s. 258-264

Tetik-Işık, Seher - R. Uslu (2013). *Music Bibliography Foreign Publics: Muzik Bibliyografyası Yabancı Yayınlar*. İstanbul: Pan Yay.

Uslu, R. (2015). “Ünlü Müzisyen Meragi Hakkında Yeni Bulgular”. *Rast Müzikoloji*. III/1, s. 32-41

Uslu, R. (2016). *Music Bibliography -I Books*, İstanbul: Çengi yay.

Uslu, R. (2017). “Makasid’ın Kac Versiyonu Vardır?”. *musikidergisi.com*. çevrimiçi er.tarihi 15.09.2017

Uslu, R. (2018a). “Meragi ve Makasid Felsefesi”, *Current Academic Studies in Fine Arts*, ed. M. Yılmaz, Ankara: Gece kitaplığı yay., s. 115-123

Uslu, R. (2018b). *Meragi'nin Son Müzik Eseri Zevaid-i Fevaid-i Aşere*, Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi yay.