

DISCLAIMER:

This document does not meet the current format guidelines of the Graduate School at The University of Texas at Austin.

It has been published for informational use only.

Copyright

by

Erol Gregory Mehmet Koymen

2016

The Report Committee for Erol Gregory Mehmet Koymen

Certifies that this is the approved version of the following report:

**Conservative Progressivism: Hasan Ferid Alnar and Symbolic Power in the Turkish Music
Revolution**

APPROVED BY

SUPERVISING COMMITTEE:

Sonia Seeman, Supervisor

Elliot Antokoletz

**Conservative Progressivism: Hasan Ferid Alnar and Symbolic Power in the Turkish Music
Revolution**

by

Erol Gregory Mehmet Koymen, B.M.

Report

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Music

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2016

Acknowledgements.

Many people and organizations have made this master's report possible. For their generous financial support, I would like to thank the following organizations: the Butler School of Music, which has provided both a Butler Excellence Scholarship and a teaching assistantship; The University of Texas at Austin Center for Middle Eastern Studies, for a Summer 2014 FLAS grant to study Turkish; The University of Texas at Austin Center for European Studies, for an Academic Year 2014-2015 FLAS grant to study Turkish; the Butler School of Music, the University of Texas at Austin Graduate School, and the University of Texas at Austin Center for Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies, for professional development grants; the Institute of Turkish Studies, for a Summer Language Grant; and the American Research Institute in Turkey, for a Summer Fellowship for Intensive Advanced Turkish Language Study at Boğaziçi University. By generously sharing their knowledge and access to valuable primary sources, Harun Korkmaz at the Istanbul University Turcology Research Institute, Süleyman Şenel, and especially Tahir Aydoğdu have made invaluable contributions to this report. At the University of Texas, numerous faculty members, including Dr. Elliot Antokoletz, Dr. Andrew Dell'Antonio, Dr. Katherine Arens, Dr. Samy Ayoub, Dr. Charles Carson, Dr. Jeannette Okur, and Dr. Michael Tusa have provided helpful input and support for this project. I would especially like to thank my advisor, Dr. Sonia Seeman, for her tireless support and many valuable insights. Finally, I would like to thank my parents, Dr. Ali Koymen and Dr. Vicki Sapp, for their continued love and support throughout my studies.

Abstract

Conservative Progressivism: Hasan Ferid Alnar and Symbolic Power in the Turkish Music Revolution

Erol Gregory Mehmet Koymen, MMusic

The University of Texas at Austin, 2016

Supervisor: Sonia Tamar Seeman

Abstract: This study examines the reciprocity of the musical relationship between the Turkish and Austrian nation-states during the first half of the twentieth century through analysis of interactions between Turkish Five composer Hasan Ferid Alnar and his Austrian teacher Joseph Marx. Through the lens of Pierre Bourdieu's Practice Theory and its concepts of habitus, fields of cultural production, and symbolic capital, I argue that the force driving this relationship was the strategic acquisition of symbolic capital by both parties within the context of their respective fields of music culture and power. By analyzing letters, documents, and newspaper articles found in Turkish and Austrian archives, I contend that the conservative composer Joseph Marx sought to bolster his powerful position in inter-war Austria through his activities as musical advisor in Turkey. Alnar, under the influence of his earlier teacher Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel, sought to enhance his positionality in the revolutionary early Turkish Republic as a progressive composer of Western-style music while preserving a space for Turkish Art Music marked by Republican

modernizers as backward and anti-revolutionary. From the perspective of disability theory, I locate a discourse of musical sickness and health in the Turkish Republican field of music's division into vigorous, national Turkish Folk and sick, non-national Turkish Art Music by re-considering nationalist ideologue Ziya Gökalp's role in the Turkish Music Revolution. Through musical analysis of Alnar's *Kanun Concerto* and examination of its reception, I argue that Alnar's association with Turkish Art Music caused him to be "musically disabled" in the context of the Turkish Folk/Art Music divide.

This study throws new light on the transnational role of music in negotiating power and identity in the Turkish and Austrian nation-states, and challenges the prevailing model of unidirectional flow of cultural capital from Europe to Turkey during the twentieth century. Examination of Alnar's dual musical habitus complicates the conventional narrative used to describe the Turkish Five group of composers. Analysis of the *Kanun Concerto* and its encoded agency challenges Pierre Bourdieu's characterization of cultural products as reactions to but not shapers of culture. Finally, re-considering the Turkish Folk/Art Music divide in the field of Turkish music-cultural production in terms of disability theory and challenging Ziya Gökalp's supremacy as theoretician of the Turkish music revolution bring new understanding to the Turkish Music Revolution.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Literature Review	19
Chapter 3: The Social Organism and the Disabling Field of Music-cultural Production in the Turkish Republic	41
Chapter 4: Historical Symmetry and Transnational Strategy: Joseph Marx in Istanbul... ..	83
Chapter 5: Strategy Performed on Stage and Hiding in Plain Sight: Hasan Ferid Alnar’s Concerts and Joseph Marx’s Reviews.....	114
Chapter 6: The Subversive Other Behind a Virtuosoic Veil: Hasan Ferid Alnar’s <i>Kanun Concerto</i>	133
Chapter 7: Hopelessly Disabled, or Lonely Visionary? Hasan Ferid Alnar Reception in Turkey.....	171
Chapter 8: Conclusion.....	188
Bibliography	192
Primary Sources.....	200

Chapter 1: Introduction

On Sunday, October 14, 1951 at around midnight, citizens of Vienna still tuned into the radio were in for a surprise. Perhaps hoping to hear a classical symphony or something of the sort before going to bed, they were greeted instead with a high, plucked-string instrument of foreign provenance accompanied by a string orchestra. The music seemed to be some sort of concerto, but exactly which sort could be determined. After making it through three movements of this foreign music, they learned they had just heard the live premiere of a concerto for a traditional Ottoman Turkish *kanun* and string orchestra. The *kanun*, they were likely told, was a traditional Ottoman zither-like instrument with roughly 26 rows of strings accompanied by sets of tuning levers manipulated to produce the various Turkish scales. In this case, they learned, the *kanun* was performed by the Turkish composer Hasan Ferid Alnar, who was heard as soloist and accompanied by the Vienna Symphony Orchestra.¹

How did a piece treating the Ottoman Turkish *kanun* and the Ottoman Turkish system of melodic modes (*makam*) to a Western European polyphonic setting come into being, and why was it premiered in Vienna? There are two potential narratives that could be employed to answer these questions. The first is a dominant, stereotyped narrative that has been established by twentieth-century historiographers of Turkish music to explain the genesis of Turkish forays into European music culture and European forays into Turkish music culture. This narrative has established dominant historical explanations, such as the role of Ziya Gökalp in determining the course of music reforms in the early Turkish Republic, and stereotyped stylistic categorizations,

¹ There are conflicting dates for the *Kanun Concerto*'s premiere: Yılmaz Aydın writes that the premiere was given on April 23, 1951 in *Türk Beşleri* (see Aydın 2003). However, the archivist of the Vienna Radio Symphony, Ulrike Grandke, indicated to me over the course of April, 2013 correspondence that the only concert on record featuring Hasan Ferid Alnar in 1951 took place on Sunday, October 14, 1951 between the hours of 12:05 and 2:05 am. I have also found a concert announcement in the Viennese Radio Journal (*Wiener Radio Zeitschrift*) indicating that Alnar was to conduct a concert with the Vienna Radio Symphony on October 14.

such as the Turkish Five group of first-generation Turkish Republican composers. The second narrative, which this report aims to develop, offers a more nuanced account of Hasan Ferid Alnar's career and the development of the Kanun Concerto by peeling behind the shiny historiographical packaging to reveal the diverse forces and styles beneath the surface. A brief foray into the first narrative will provide context for these challenges.

The story of modern Turkish music traditionally begins with the nineteenth-century period of increasing cultural contact between Europe and the Ottoman Empire. After a quick nod to the use of exotic Turkish settings and elements of Ottoman *mehter* music by eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century European composers such as Mozart and Haydn, the narrative jumps to 1828, the year marked by the arrival of Giuseppe Donizetti to the Ottoman Court. Donizetti Pasha, as he came to be called, was charged by Sultan Mahmud II with developing a Western-style band to replace the *mehter* music of the now-banned Janissaries. The narrative then recites the series of developments that occurred during the *Tanzimat* era of Ottoman reforms (1839-1876), when musical reforms along European lines continued apace with reforms to other Ottoman social, economic, political, and military structures. Giuseppe Pasha was followed by several other European music directors at the court, opera became fashionable both at the Ottoman Court and amongst Istanbul's elites, and European superstars such as Franz Liszt began to add Istanbul to their international tours. Scholars have characterized the Ottoman elite's penchant for all things European beginning in the nineteenth century—including music—in terms of the terminology *alafranga* and *alaturka*, with *alafranga* denoting musics and fashions newly imported from Europe and *alaturka* denoting Turkish musics and fashions.² The division of music into *alaturka* (Eastern) and *alafranga* (Western) categories had a profound influence on

² John Morgan O'Connell, "In the Time of Alaturka: Identifying Difference in Musical Discourse" *Ethnomusicology* 49, no. 2 (Spring/Summer 2005): 184-187.

existing Ottoman urban musical traditions, and was emphasized with greater zeal during the Republican period.³

In the traditional narrative, business as usual in the Ottoman Empire is interrupted by World War I, and shortly thereafter the collapse of the Ottoman Empire. This standard narrative adopted the Western European story of the “sick man of Europe” in which the Ottoman Empire had been propped up and protected by European powers aiming to preserve the European balance of powers during the nineteenth century. Defeat by the Allied powers spelled the end of this state of affairs, and the empire’s final collapse seemed imminent. Ottoman leaders signed the 1920 Treaty of Sevres, which called for the Ottoman Empire to be carved and distributed to hungry European powers in a manner antithetical to the Turkey that it ultimately became. The treaty called for Istanbul to become an international protectorate and for the Turks to be given the central Anatolian leftovers not doled out to would-be Armenian and Kurdish states, Greece, and the European powers. Mustafa Kemal’s heroism and foresight, however, saved the day, according to this narrative. Riding a wave of Turkish nationalism that had been swelling in the last years of the empire, Mustafa Kemal was able to establish a competing capital and parliament in Ankara and drive the Greeks out of Anatolia in the Turkish War of Independence, leading to recognition of Turkish sovereignty and ultimately establishment of the Republic of Turkey on October 29, 1923.⁴

Armed with a vision for a modern, secular, and Westernized Turkey, Kemal launched a blitzkrieg of reforms. The new Turkish Republic was to be a radical departure from the Ottoman Empire. Rather than a large imperial structure containing diverse peoples and religions, the

³ Patrick Bartsch, *Musikpolitik im Kemalismus* (University of Bamberg Press, 2011): 36-37.

⁴ Feroz Ahmad, *The Making of Modern Turkey* (New York: Routledge, 1993): 50-51

republic was to be ethnically, linguistically, and culturally Turkish, yet at the same time a participant in Western civilization. Kemal's politics and vision for the new Turkey, as described by Feroz Ahmad, were complex:

Kemal did not want to rule Turkish society by means of traditions, and social convictions and symbols, as Franco would do in Spain and to a lesser extent Mussolini in Italy. He preferred to create a new ideology and symbols which would permit Turkey to progress rapidly into the twentieth century. Not being a conservative, he feared neither secular modernism nor liberal democracy, though he viewed the latter as a brake to his own radicalism. Only Marxism, with an analysis of society based on classes and class conflict, provided an alternative to his world view which he refused to confront except with repression . . . The assumption of his regime was that [democratic institutions] would be introduced as soon as Turkish society had achieved the requisite stage of development.⁵

Whatever his future intentions, the course of the next several years in Turkey was far from democratic. For example, the Progressive Republican Party (PRP) was formed in 1924 as an opposition to the ruling Republican People's Party (RPP), but was quickly suppressed following a Kurdish rebellion in 1925. After that rebellion, the Law for the Maintenance of Order was passed, giving the government "virtually absolute powers" for the next four years.⁶ During these four years, Turkish society was radically reformed. Having already abolished the Muslim Caliphate in 1924, the state ordered the replacement of the fez with a western-style hat, the abolishment of the Muslim dervish orders, the adoption of the Western calendar, and the replacement of Muslim sharia law by an amalgam of European codes.⁷ Notably, the Ottoman script was replaced by a Latin one in 1928 within a span of several months.⁸ In 1929, commenting on the founding of national Schools to teach this script, Ataturk said that "'with its

⁵ Ahmad, 56

⁶ Ahmad, 58

⁷ Ahmad, 54-58.

⁸ See Geoffrey Lewis, *The Turkish Language Reform: A Catastrophic Success* (Oxford University Press, 1999).

own script and its native intelligence, our nation will take its place by the side of the civilized world.”⁹

Music reforms occupied a particularly prominent role in the revolution of Turkish society. In the standard reform narrative, Mustafa Kemal relied heavily upon Turkist ideologue Ziya Gökalp’s writings on music in his 1923 book *The Principles of Turkism (Türkçülüğün Esasları)*. Citation of Gökalp’s formula is so ubiquitous in scholarship on Turkish music as to appear to be a requirement. In his formula, Gökalp made a division between civilization and culture to argue that the proper music of the Turkish Republic would emerge from a combination of Turkish folk melodies with European polyphony. In his view, Ottoman music or “Eastern” music—music of the court, Mevlevi *tekke*-s, and popular urban entertainment—was not actually Turkish, but was instead adopted from the Byzantines and shared among Arabs, Persians, and other communities associated with the Ottoman Empire. This Ottoman music thus belonged to Ottoman civilization, and was not suitable for the Turkish nation. The music of the Turkish folk—the music found among rural Anatolian peasants—was the true music of Turkish culture in Gökalp’s view, but needed to be harmonized according to the rules of European music—which European music remains unclear in Gökalp’s formula—in order to make it suitable for Turkey’s entry into Western civilization.

With this formula in hand, the story goes, Mustafa Kemal set about revolutionizing Turkish music culture. In 1924, the Music Teacher’s School (*Musiki Muallim Mektebi*) teaching exclusively European music was established to train teachers of Western music.¹⁰ The court orchestra that had continued from Donizetti’s time was moved to Ankara, where it was renamed

⁹ Ahmad, 81.

¹⁰ Emre Araci, “The life and works of Ahmed Adnan Saygun” (PhD dissertation, University of Edinburgh, 1999): 37.

the Presidential Symphony Orchestra. Centers of Ottoman urban music-making, such as the Ottoman court and the Mevlevi *tekke*-s, were closed, and all Turkish music was banned from the radio for a nearly two-year period between 1934 and 1936, after which time increasing state control opened up the radio as a tool for propaganda, musical and otherwise. Paul Hindemith was invited to Ankara in 1935 to advise the government on the reform of Turkish music culture and the development of a state conservatory. On his suggestion, numerous Austrian and German musicians were brought to serve as teachers, conductors, and performers.¹¹

The initial crowning achievement of the revolution, arguably, was the emergence of the so-called ‘Turkish Five’—the first generation of Turkish Republican composers. According to the standard narrative, Necil Kazım Akses, Hasan Ferid Alnar, Ulvi Cemal Erkin, Cemal Reşit Rey, and Ahmed Adnan Saygun had been sent to European conservatories to study the latest European musical techniques, and upon returning to Turkey set about fulfilling Gökalp’s vision of a Turkish music both tied to Turkish culture via folk melodies yet participatory in European (and thus universal) civilization through application of European polyphonic techniques.

When I first became interested in the Turkish Five, this prevailing narrative seemed to offer a compelling and neat account of the Turkish music revolution. If we use the narrative to explain the premiere of Alnar’s concerto over Austrian radio, on the surface the work appears merely to be a product of Gökalp’s formula and Atatürk’s revolution. I was prompted to delve more deeply into Hasan Ferid Alnar’s biography, however, by the paucity of scholarly work on him and his oeuvre. As I did so, a few cracks in the prevailing narrative began to reveal themselves. Prior to the founding of the Republic, Alnar was intimately associated as a *kanun* performer and composer with the urban, Ottoman music deemed unsuitable for Turkish music by

¹¹ See Cornelia Zimmerman-Kalyoncu, *Deutsche Musiker in der Türkei im Zwanzigsten Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1985).

Gökalp. Indeed, the fact that the Western European concerto was written for the Ottoman court instrument, *kanun*, indicates a challenge to the prevailing political pattern of dismantling Ottoman-isms evident in other areas such as institutional closings and language reform.

Partly due to his mastery of the *kanun*, Alnar also appeared to me to be somewhat distinct from the other Turkish Five composers, none of whom mastered traditional Ottoman or Turkish instruments. A comparison of his compositional output to those of the other Turkish Five composers reveals it to be much thinner, and, as noted above, there is comparatively little scholarship on Alnar. When I looked at Alnar's educational background, further issues emerged. One of Alnar's first harmony teachers, Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel, was an opponent of the Gökalpian folk music-based conception of Turkish music who directly challenged Gökalp's formula in his 1940 book *Whose is Turkish Music (Türk Musikisi Kimindir?)*, casting doubt on the congruence between Alnar and Turkish Republican reforms. Alnar's teacher in Vienna, Joseph Marx, served as a musical advisor in Turkey from 1933 to 1935 immediately after Alnar's studies with him, prompting questions as to whether Alnar played a role in coordinating this position.

Alnar's apparent difference indicated that the Turkish music revolution had not gone quite as smoothly as is usually indicated in the scholarly literature on music in Turkey. If a member of the Turkish Five—seemingly the flagship group of the Gökalpian reforms—had ties to the Ottoman music enemy, what other aspects of the narrative had been glossed over? If Alnar had been a virtuosic and successful *kanun* performer, why did he decide to divert his path toward European-style, polyphonic music? Why did Alnar decide at the midpoint of his career to write a concerto for *kanun*—an instrument associated with a musical tradition that had been rejected by the very revolutionary surge? Why has Joseph Marx's influence on music in Turkey been

ignored and seemingly forgotten, while Paul Hindemith's activity as musical advisor shortly after Marx is relatively well known? How did Marx's approach differ from Hindemith's?

By exploring Alnar's & Marx's relationship, we see challenges to the conventional narrative of unidirectional flow from Europe to Turkey, and gain an enlarged view of the reciprocity of cultural relations between the two. In the prevailing narrative outlined above, it will be noted that the flow of cultural capital is more-or-less uni-directional. European composers did incorporate Turkish-inspired elements in their music, but these represent more a textbook example of orientalist cultural appropriation than a form of reciprocal cultural exchange. Otherwise, the Ottoman and Turkish states invite European musicians to plant the seeds of European civilization and enlightenment. Do Marx's visits to Turkey immediately after his work with Alnar in Vienna, however, indicate that the power dynamic involved in European musicians' work in Turkey was not quite as imbalanced as it initially appears? In other words, if musicians and musical institutions in Turkey gained training in European music from these European musicians, did the European musicians gain nothing in return? Was their motivation for repeated travel to Turkey simply a combination of (limited) monetary gain and altruism?

These questions led me to several hypotheses. First, I propose that the musical relationship between Hasan Ferid Alnar and Joseph Marx was based on a mutually beneficial exchange of power used by each of the two toward their strategic advantage. Second, I propose that Alnar's extensive background in urban Ottoman music placed him in a different position vis à vis emergent Turkish music from the other Turkish Five composers. Given the musico-ideological lines that had been drawn in the Turkish Republic, I argue that Alnar was musically disabled by his *habitus* in Ottoman music in the context of Republican Turkish music culture. Disability theory holds that disability is to be understood as an accommodational rather than

physical deficiency, meaning that individuals who possess traits which do not correspond to a constructed norm are considered to be disabled. In this way, Alnar's *habitus* in Ottoman music caused him to be disabled by the early Turkish Republican field of music which valorized the folk song and demonized Ottoman urban music traditions.

In order to make this argument, I re-consider Ziya Gökalp and his famous musical formula, challenging his singularity as determiner of the Turkish Republican field of music-cultural production. Through an analysis of Gökalp's application of Emile Durkheim's concept of social solidarity and Late-Ottoman practices of interior Orientalizing, I propose that Gökalp's musical formula exemplifies a discourse of musical disabling in the Turkish field of music-cultural production in which early reformers as well as Mustafa Kemal Atatürk himself participated. This discourse took primary aim at Ottoman music, accusing it of being sick and non-national. I argue that the music culture that resulted from this discourse disabled Alnar musically.

Evidence demonstrates that Alnar used his studies with Marx and the relationship that developed out of them strategically to achieve favorable positionality within a field of music-cultural production in Turkey being re-configured by reforms aimed at Westernization. Having already held a favorable position within the Late-Ottoman field of music-cultural production, Alnar saw a shift to European music as necessary to maintenance of favorable positionality. Furthermore, he continued to use his connection to Marx and to Vienna after his studies were completed to coordinate prestigious Viennese premieres and publications in order to maintain his positionality.

Through such tactics as funding Alnar's studies with Joseph Marx, Alnar's first harmony teacher Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel strategically used Alnar to further his own conception of a field

of music-cultural production in the Turkish Republic threatened by the competing conception proposed by Ziya Gökalp and his ilk. On the other side, Joseph Marx saw in his connection to Turkey won through Alnar a means to maintain his position of power within the field of music cultural production in inter-war Austria. Marx's own values aligned with those of the Austro-fascist *Staendestaat*, a conservative dictatorship that aimed to forge a distinctly Austrian identity as cultural superpower in order to resist Nazi expansion. However, though Marx's musical values aligned with those of the state and his works were popular due to their accessible, romantic/impressionist and above all tonal musical language, they were for the same reason threatened by both less popular, more autonomous musical modernisms such as expressionism and popular musics such as jazz.¹² Given that competition with musical modernists and popular musics would have conflicted with the conservative musical principles upon which his favorable positionality vis à vis the state was based, Marx viewed his work as advisor in Turkey as a means of resisting challenges to his status, as well as musical propaganda spreading Austria's international reputation as post-imperial cultural superpower.

Theory

Pierre Bourdieu's theorization of positionality within fields of cultural production provides a lens through which to understand contestations of power in artistic fields and the individual strategies deployed by actors in said fields to maintain or gain power. Using this theoretical framework, I map the web of overlapping strategies reaching across national boundaries deployed by Alnar, Arel, and Marx to advance their positionality within their

¹² Angelika Silberbauer, "Eine 'führende Musikerpersönlichkeit der Ostmark'—Joseph Marx." In *Eine Institution Zwischen Representation und Macht: Die Universität für Musik und Darstellende Kunst Wien im Kulturleben des Nationalsozialismus*, ed. Juri Giannini, Maximilian Haas, and Erwin Strouhal (Wien: Mille Tre Verlag, 2014), 328-330.

respective fields of music-cultural production. I contend that these strategies contributed at the same time to larger projects of national imagining oriented toward a great musical past in Austria and a modern musical future in Turkey. Bourdieu theorizes the field of cultural production as a more or less autonomous arena in which competition for capital is held. Capital in Bourdieuan terms is not taken to mean solely material capital, but also encompasses symbolic capital, which is measured by the degree to which individual agents in the field of cultural production are able to control the definition of the field of cultural production. Symbolic capital is, therefore, brought about by the struggle for favorable position in the field of cultural production, and this continuous struggle also serves to perpetuate the dynamism of the field. This struggle is not, however, readily evident to those engaged in it, for Bourdieu argues that only through its collective misrecognition by those engaged can it continue to exist. The struggle for favorable positionality is further influenced by the fact that individual agents enter the field already predisposed to occupy certain more or less favorable positions in the field.¹³

Bourdieu constitutes agents in the field of cultural production as dominated members of the dominant class, and argues that the products of the field of cultural production are adopted by the dominant members of the dominant class as means of domination. Nonetheless, actors in the field of cultural production are not merely the handmaidens of the dominants, for the symbolic value of their cultural productions depends on the degree to which they autonomously determine the definition of their field. There exists a continuum whereby agents with favorable position supplied by habitus and willingness to risk can make the biggest profits in symbolic capital by producing cultural products most distant from and least suited to the market of large-scale production and consumption, with the implicit understanding that their significant symbolic

¹³ Pierre Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991); Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977).

capital will eventually show dividends as material capital. Their cultural productions are therefore more autonomous insofar as they are produced solely for other producers in the field of cultural production. Agents in less autonomous fields of cultural production produce cultural products more tailored to large-scale consumption, and thus gain material capital while simultaneously losing symbolic capital, for in such case they have ceded the right to definition of the field of cultural production to those connected to it merely as consumers.

Bourdieuian theory constitutes an alternative midpoint between objectivism/structuralism and subjectivism. That is to say, Bourdieuan theory disallows both the possibility that human actions are merely acting out portions of a social super-structure as well as the possibility that actions exist merely as assertions of individual human will. Instead, Bourdieuan theory proposes the shaped and shaping force, *habitus*. For Bourdieu, *habitus* is a deeply ingrained, unconscious sense of the “rules” of practice in a particular field acquired through immersion—usually in childhood—which accounts for the “naturalness” with which familiar circumstances, social interaction, aesthetic choices, and other cultural practices present themselves to those holding a *habitus* derived from those same circumstances, interactions, choices, and practices. This force is shaped because it is brought about by nothing other than the actions of individual human agents—there is, in other words, no objective structure. The *habitus* is in turn shaping, however, as human agents unconsciously acknowledge its forces by way of a process of acculturation. Human actions therefore give the illusion of subjective freedom, because the objective forces of the *habitus* which constrain them are more or less invisible to their actors. At the same time, human actions are not random, but rather guided by mostly unconscious strategizing aimed at gaining capital within the context of the objective conditions that constrain them. These strategies in turn shape the *habitus*, which in turn shapes further human actions. In both post-

WWI Turkey and Austria, conflicting *habitus* shaped in opposing fields of cultural production have been characterized vis à vis one another using medicalized discourses of illness/disability and health. These discourses, I argue, brought about Alnar's musical disabling in the Turkish Field of music. Disability Theory thus provides a means of analyzing both medicalized discourses pertaining to music in Austria and Turkey and the particular case of Alnar's musical disabling in the Turkish Republican field of music.

Disability Theory holds that, over the course of the 19th century, there arose in Europe a new societal paradigm focused on the "normal," which was accompanied by the entrance of words used to label it, such as 'normal,' 'normalcy,' 'normality,' 'average,' 'norm,' 'abnormal.' Prior to the practice of classifying humans against the "norm," they were measured against the "ideal." Comparing real humans to the ideal meant that "one [could] never have an ideal body" and by extension that "there [was] in such societies no demand that populations have bodies that conform to the ideal."¹⁴

Discourses of normality and its opposing pathologies were deployed both within Western European societies and at a larger scale by Western European powers vis à vis the orient of which the Ottoman Empire composed a primary part. These discourses of normality were in turn adopted in a self-Orientalizing manner in the Turkish Republic. The shift from "ideal" to "normal" was brought about in large part by the development of statistics in the first half of the nineteenth-century. Lennard Davis identifies in particular the work of the French statistician Adolphe Quetelet, who "noticed that the law of error, used by astronomers to locate a star by plotting all the sightings and then averaging the errors, could be equally applied to the distribution of human features such as height and weight in order to reveal the "average man" of

¹⁴ Davis, Lennard J. *The Disability Studies Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2006): 3-4.

each country. This average man became both the basis of the new bourgeois classes and a new variant on the “ideal,” with Quetelet claiming that ‘an individual who epitomized in himself, at a given time, all the qualities of the average man, would represent all at once the greatness, beauty and goodness of that being.’”¹⁵

However, statistics’ association with eugenics meant that the “average” man did not suffice for long as an ideal. Already, Quetelet’s “law of errors” when applied to society had created outliers: those who were somehow abnormal began to be considered disabled or deviant. The eugenicist John Galton altered statistical theory based on Darwin’s theory of evolution in order to serve eugenicist aims. Rather than a conception in which all statistical outliers were deviant, Galton needed to be able to consider some outliers superior to others. He therefore reformulated Quetelet’s “law of errors” as “normal distribution.” Quetelet then ranked traits by dividing them into quartiles so that no longer the average but rather the most desirable human traits, such as ideal height or prodigious intelligence, could be emphasized by statistics. The result was a method of statistics that could be used to identify those with the most desirable physical and intellectual traits for the purposes of improving society and limiting the options of or indeed eliminating those deemed to be defective.¹⁶

Disability Studies scholars perform this de-construction of the development of normal and abnormal, able and disabled, in order to demonstrate that what we have come to understand as “disability” is defined not so much by pathological deficiency as accommodational deficiency. Certain human differences, such as poor vision, are readily accommodated in such a way that they are not perceived as disabilities. Others, such as a missing limb or an anxiety disorder, are perceived as disabilities precisely because they are not so readily accommodated in society. In

¹⁵ Davis, 2.

¹⁶ Davis, 6-8.

this way, some human variations come to be experienced simply as variations peripheral to the identity of the person, while others are experienced as disability or even freakishness central to the person's identity.¹⁷

I argue that Alnar's *habitus* caused him to be musically disabled. In order to make this argument, I re-consider Ziya Gökalp and his famous musical formula, challenging his singularity as determiner of the Turkish Republican field of music-cultural production. I propose that Gökalp's most significant contribution to the formulation of the field was in fact his refashioning in terms of a discourse characterized by the health of folk music and sickness of Ottoman music. Having been more or less fully trained in European music, the other Turkish Five composers were positioned favorably to appropriate elements of Turkish folk music as needed and could thus conform more easily to a field organized along European and Turkish folk music lines. In contrast with the other four composers, Alnar's deep engagement with urban Ottoman music constituted a *habitus* with which he was compelled to reckon.

The effect this *habitus* had on Alnar's positionality is influenced by the particular conditions of the field of music-cultural production in the Turkish Republic. The conditions that produced the Ottoman musical habitus had been removed through state force rather than cultural change over time through a process of violent repression. Therefore, figures such as Arel and his teacher Alnar were not participating in a discourse that was subversive in the sense of being progressive vis à vis the dominant discourse. They were participating in a parallel discourse that was rejected and perhaps mortally wounded by the state but which they nonetheless still perceived as being of equal or even superior strength to that discourse which would appear from the outside to be dominant. This set of circumstances accounts for the fact that Alnar's musical

¹⁷ Alex Lubet, *Music, Disability, and Society*, (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2011).

disabling is brought about not by affiliation with subversive progressives but rather due to his alignment with conservative actors in the field of music-cultural production in the Turkish Republic.

Alnar's *habitus* in Ottoman music therefore put him in the position of both a progressive and a conservative. Alnar was in the position of an ostensibly progressive composer participating on the front lines of the revolution to establish Turkishness in music. However, I demonstrate that his association with conservative teachers Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel and Joseph Marx and the intertwining webs of strategizing that bound them to each other affiliated Alnar with deeply conservative musical thought. This conservative musical thought was musically disabling to Alnar in the Turkish field of music-cultural production, but was itself a disabling force to which Alnar contributed in the Austrian field of music-cultural production. I demonstrate that the *Kanun Concerto* was a result of these strains of conservative and progressive thought, and can be considered a subversive musical product through which Alnar sought to reconcile his conflicting musical *habitus* with the tenets of Republican progressivism while at the same time challenging Republican repression of the Ottoman past and its music. In this sense, the *Kanun Concerto* is also site of a productive mediation between Ottoman and Western musical materials leading to an emergent musical language. On the one hand, the concerto was met with skepticism by critics and musicians—including Alnar himself—for its subversive critique, but on the other the concerto has served as a vehicle for progressive negotiation vis à vis Republican orthodoxies for later agents in the field of music-cultural production in Turkey.

I situate my analyses of Alnar's, Arel's, and Marx's transnational strategizing and my examination of Alnar's musical disabling within the context of theories of nationalism that foreground the influence of cultural practices on state formation and of state formations on

cultural practices. I take as a theoretical jumping-off point Benedict Anderson's theorization of the nation-state as "imagined community" brought into being through cultural practices.¹⁸ I update Anderson's theory in terms of historiography's "transnational turn," understanding the nation as "an ideology that changes over time and whose precise elaboration at any point has profound effects on wars, economies, cultures, the movements of people, and relations of domination."¹⁹ This transnational approach provides an explanatory model for conceptions of national identity in Austria and Turkey that I propose both shape and are shaped by intersecting imaginings of an idealized *Wiener Klassik* and a desired Turkish musical modernity.

Acknowledging Micol Seigel's caution that "comparisons obscure the workings of power" by reifying national characteristics, I approach the comparison of music's role in national identity formation in Austria and Turkey primarily through careful transnational analysis of the web of individual interactions and strategies linking Alnar, Arel, and Marx to each other.²⁰

The Kanun Concerto is the product of these competing strategies. Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel made the suggestion that Alnar compose a piece for Kanun in the mid-1940s with the purpose of furthering his own conception of Turkish music threatened by reformers in the Turkish Republic. Joseph Marx was deeply invested in the idea that music should be first and foremost a reflection of national origins. Due perhaps to the influence of Arel, or perhaps his own views on national music, Marx was indifferent to or unaware of the Ottoman-folk dispute in Turkey, and thus considered both appropriate for Turkish national music. It is likely that Marx approved of the Kanun Concerto as a genuinely national piece of Turkish music and secured the

¹⁸ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (London: Verso, 1983).

¹⁹ Briggs, Laura, Gladys McCormick, and J. T. Way. "Transnationalism: A Category of Analysis." *American Quarterly* 60, no. 3 (September 2008): 625-648.

²⁰ Seigel, Michol. "Beyond Compare: Historical Method after the Transnational Turn," *Radical History Review* 91 (Winter 2005): 62-90.

1951 Viennese premiere. In so doing Marx provided for both his and Alnar's strategic gain within their respective fields of music-cultural production, while for Alnar, the Kanun Concerto also provided a platform on which to attempt to mediate between his two musical *habitus*.

Indeed, as a mediation between two different music cultures, the Kanun Concerto constitutes an attempt at realizing an alternative to the conception of Turkish national music proposed by Gökalp and state reformers which places Ottoman and European music at opposing poles of a Social-Darwinist musical spectrum. The Concerto is at the same time an attempt by Alnar to mediate between his own two musical *habitus*—Ottoman urban and European classical—set in opposition to each other by conditions in the Turkish Republican field of music. The Kanun Concerto mediates between Ottoman urban and Western musical traditions through combination of the Ottoman kanun with European string instruments and concerto form, of Ottoman *makam*-s, with their microtonal divisions of the whole tone and characteristic movement patterns, with European polyphony derived from the chromatic scale. Out of this attempted reconciliation emerges a hybrid musical language that maintains the scalar profile of the makams but sacrifices their microtonal make-up at the altar of harmony. This hybrid musical language in turn becomes the vehicle for a critique of Turkish Republican society which gives voice to the Ottoman music violently silenced by Republican reformers.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

As a researcher straddling the disciplinary boundary between musicology and ethnomusicology, I employ archival, ethnographic, and music analytical methods in order to conduct this study of Alnar's career. In addition to biography, historical analysis, and studies of music's role in identity formation, I rely on documents found in Austrian and Turkish archives. These include newspaper and journal articles, as well as heretofore-unexamined letters from Hasan Ferid Alnar to Joseph Marx. To illustrate the continued influence of his *habitus* in Ottoman urban music on Alnar's career and the productive mediation that it brought about, I conduct a musical analysis of Alnar's *Kanun Concerto*. In order to deepen discussion of Alnar's reception, I examine articles about Alnar written in Turkey at the end of his life and immediately after his death, and I include excerpts from an interview conducted with *Kanun Concerto* performer Tahir Aydođdu in Austin, Texas in April, 2015.

Works by Yılmaz Aydın, Erdoğan Okyay, and Safinaz Rizeli are valuable as biographical and historical resources on Hasan Ferid Alnar. However, they share certain limitations characteristic of existing literature on the Turkish Five. They are all inclined toward a "great man" approach that is understood as sufficient justification in and of itself for writing. They do not engage with any historical or social theory, nor do they treat their subject matter critically. Aydın's book is the only one among them that subjects Alnar's works to musical analysis, and his contribution in that arena is hampered by lack of a more in-depth study of *makam*.

Turkish music scholar Yılmaz Aydın's 2002 book *The Turkish Five in Light of the Musical Relationship between Turkey and Europe* resulted from his doctoral thesis at the University of Cologne, and was published in German by Peter Lang Publishers, and in Turkey by

Müzik Ansiklopedisi Yayınları.¹ In this book, Aydın considers Alnar alongside the other four composers who make up the Turkish Five. The chapter on Hasan Ferid Alnar gives a brief biography outlining Alnar's musical education and activity as a conductor before focusing on three of his works: the Prelude and Two Dances for orchestra, the Cello Concerto, and the Kanun Concerto. For each of these, Aydın gives background on the premiere followed by a brief formal analysis with an identification of main themes and their correlations in the Turkish makam system. Aydın concludes with a useful list of Alnar's works and recordings made of them.²

Erdoğan Okyay's 1998 book *An Award to Ferid Alnar (Ferid Alnar'a Armağan)*, published by the Sevda-Cenap And Music Foundation, provides a more thorough biographical account as well as a partial collection of journalistic writings about Alnar. Notably, Okyay weaves his account of Alnar's life from Alnar's own memoirs and excerpts from his notes and letters. Okyay also includes a chapter on the award ceremony at which Alnar was posthumously awarded a medal by the Sevda-Cenap And Music Foundation and a chapter compiling a list of Alnar's works and selected concert programs.³

With her 1991 thesis written at the Istanbul Technical University Turkish Music State Conservatory, Safinaz Rizeli makes a useful contribution by way of a compilation of various articles about Alnar published at the end of his life as well as a collection of Alnar's own writings on the challenges of prosody confronting the introduction of European opera to Turkey. Rizeli gives a brief biography of Alnar, a list of his works, and a brief and superficial analysis of the *Kanun Concerto*. In the rest of her thesis, Rizeli includes a list of performances of the *Kanun Concerto* between Alnar's death and the time of writing, an account of Alnar's technical

¹ All translations from Turkish and German are the author's own.

² Aydın.

³ Erdoğan Okyay, *Ferid Alnar'a Armağan* (Ankara: Sevda-Cenap And Müzik Vakfı Yayınları, 1999).

innovations in *kanun* technique by Ruhi Ayangil, the first performer of the *kanun concerto* after Alnar's death, and a collection of scores from Alnar's Ottoman compositional period.

Unlike the writers discussed above, Atilla Sağlam takes a decidedly critical, even revisionist, tack in his 2009 book *Türk Musiki /Müzik Devrimi (The Turkish Music Revolution)*. Sağlam presents five essays on issues of evolution and revolution in Turkish music, making his boldest claim in the third essay "Türk Musiki Devrimi ve Ziya Gökalp" ("The Turkish Music Revolution and Ziya Gökalp").⁴ Arguing that Gökalp's infamous musical formula was merely a reflection of the views of European orientalists and contemporary Turkish thinkers, Sağlam provocatively posits that there is no direct connection between Gökalp's musical formula in *Türkçülüğün Esasları (The Principles of Turkism)* and Atatürk's music revolution.

Two other essays in Sağlam's volume are pertinent to discussion of Alnar's negotiation of the field of music-cultural production in the Turkish Republic. In his fourth essay, "*Kemalist bir Devrim: Türk Musiki Devrimi*" ("A Kemalist Revolution: The Turkish Music Revolution"), Sağlam focuses on the role of Kemalism in the Turkish music revolution, discussing the internal divisions it imposed on Turkish music culture and the institutions such as the radio used to impose them, as well as reactions to the divisions from Turkish musicians and critics. The final essay, "*Türk Musikisinde Armoni Meselesi ve Mahmut Ragıp Gazimihal Etmeni*" ("The Question of Harmony in Turkish Music and Mahmut Ragıp Gazimihal's Role"), treats the issue of harmonizing Turkish music, focusing on harmonization in the late Ottoman Empire, French musicologist Eugene Borrel's effect on the issue of harmonization, Turkish musicologist Mahmut Ragıp Gazimihal's call for a harmonic system particular to Turkish music, and Alnar student Kemal İlerici's development of such a system.

⁴ Atilla Sağlam, *Türk Musiki/Müzik Devrimi*, (Bursa, Alfa Aktüel Basım Yayım Dağıtım: 2009).

Cornelia Zimmerman-Kalyoncu's invaluable 1985 book *Deutsche Musiker in der Türkei im Zwanzigsten Jahrhundert* (*German Musicians in Turkey During the Twentieth Century*) provides insight into the reasons for scholarly neglect of Joseph Marx's activity as music advisor in Turkey, of which she makes no mention.⁵ All of the Austro-German musicians Zimmerman-Kalyoncu discusses worked in Ankara, while Marx's work was in Istanbul. Istanbul had been the imperial capital, but became a second city to Ankara as the latter became the center of the revolution of creating Turkishness in music in the early years of the Turkish Republic.

A notable distinction between Austrian and German musicians in Turkey that emerges in Zimmerman-Kalyoncu's account is the lack of any indication that the former used Turkey as a means of escape from persecutory policies at home in Central Europe. Most of the German musicians Zimmerman-Kalyoncu discusses used Turkey as a means of escaping the Nazis. Austrian musicians who worked in Turkey, on the other hand, did not share this goal during the early and mid-1930s, for they were not yet being directly confronted by—or in some cases were receptive to—the extreme policies of the Nazis.

Otherwise, Zimmerman-Kalyoncu gives an overview of the activities of Austro-German musicians in Turkey through thorough archival research and interviews, correspondence, government documents, and reports compiled by German musicians. She devotes considerable attention to Paul Hindemith's role as advisor to the Turkish government from 1935-1937 on the organization of Turkish musical culture along Western lines, discussing his activities in Ankara, and examining his fifty-six-page report handed to the Turkish government, *Vorschläge für den Aufbau des türkischen Musiklebens* (*Proposals for the Development of Turkish Musical Life*).

⁵ Cornelia Zimmerman-Kalyoncu, *Deutsche Musiker in der Türkei im Zwanzigsten Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1985)

She then details Ernst Praetorius' work as conductor of the Presidential Symphony Orchestra and work at the Ankara State Conservatory from 1935 until his death in Ankara in 1946, Carl Ebert's role as founder of the opera and theater school in Ankara from 1936-1947, and Eduard Zuckmayer's work as music pedagogue at the Gazi Eğitim Enstitüsü from 1936 until his death in 1972. Throughout this chapter, Zimmerman-Kalyoncu notes that Turkey served as an escape from persecutory Nazi cultural policies for these musicians.

In a section on Austrian musicians in Turkey, Zimmerman-Kalyoncu discusses Austrian conductor Hermann von Schmeidel's work as musical advisor in Ankara and his report handed to the Turkish Ministry of Education *Bericht und Vorschlaege M.M.M. – Musikhochschule (Report and Proposals M.M.M. [Musiki Muallim Mektebi] – Music School)*. This report was evidently understood by von Schmeidel as an addendum to Hindemith's, and as such does not expand notably upon Hindemith's. Von Schmeidel was not contracted further by the Turkish government after submitting it.

Recent works by Austrian scholars Andreas Holzer, Monika Kröpfl, Anita Mayer-Hirzberger, and Angelika Silberbauer have opened up possibilities for examining the construction of Austria's and Vienna's identity as "music-land" and "city of music," respectively. As in the fledgling Turkish Republic, prominent actors in the post-WWI Austrian nation-state attempted to gain control over the field of music-cultural production in order to assert a particular conception of Austrian national identity. The historical orientation of the Austrian reformers, however, was opposite to that of reformers in Turkey. While the post-WWI Turkish nation-state aimed at international modernity, the post-WWI Austrian nation-state aimed at revival of perceived historical greatness in music as a means to achieving international cultural dominance.

Monika Kröpfl, Andreas Holzer, and Angelika Silberbauer have examined Joseph Marx's positionality in the field of Austrian music and his work in Turkey. In her 2009 article, "‘ICH [HABE] NIEMALS EINER ANDEREN PARTEI ANGEHÖRT [...] ALS DER PARTEI DER BEGABTEN!’ Joseph Marx im Spiegel der austrofaschistisch-ständestaatlichen und nationalsozialistischen kulturpolitischen Konzepte" ("‘I HAVE NEVER BELONGED TO ANY OTHER PARTY ... THAN THE PARTY OF THE GIFTED!’ Joseph Marx in Light of the Austrofascist-Staendestaat and National Socialist Cultural-Political Concept"), Kröpfl explores Joseph Marx's conservative cultural politics in the context of the Austrian Staendestaat and Nazi Germany.⁶ She concludes that Marx's cultural biases against modernism and popular culture were his own and not developed out of fealty to the Nazi occupiers. In her contribution to the 2014 volume *An Institution between Representation and Power: the University for Music and Performing Arts Vienna in the Cultural Life of National Socialism (Eine Institution zwischen Repräsentation und Macht: Die Universität für Musik und Darstellende Kunst Wien im Kulturleben des Nationalsozialismus)* titled "Continuities of a 'Leading Musical Personality of the Ostmark'" ("Kontinuitäten einer 'führenden Musikerpersönlichkeit der Ostmark'"), on the other hand, Angelika Silberbauer presents a more disturbing catalog of Marx's Nazi associations, arguing that Marx avoided direct statements on his political views in order to maintain and gain influential friendships. Andreas Holzer compares the activities of Joseph Marx and his German contemporary Paul Hindemith as musical advisors in Turkey in his 2009 article "Joseph Marx

⁶ Monika Kröpfl, "‘ICH [HABE] NIEMALS EINER ANDEREN PARTEI ANGEHÖRT [...] ALS DER PARTEI DER BEGABTEN!’ Joseph Marx im Spiegel der austrofaschistisch-ständestaatlichen und nationalsozialistischen kulturpolitischen Konzepte." *Studien zur Musikwissenschaft* 55: 2009, 338.

und Paul Hindemith also “Musikalische Botschafter” in der Türkei,”⁷ and discusses Marx as composition teacher in his 2001 article “Joseph Marx als Lehrer.”⁸

Anita Mayer-Hirzberger’s 2008 book “—ein Volk von alters her musikbegabt”: *der Begriff ‘Musikland Österreich’ im Staendestaat* (“—A musically gifted Folk since time immemorial: the Term ‘Musicland Austria’ in the Staendestaat) provides a painstaking analysis of discourses of Austria as the “land of music” vital to my consideration of Joseph Marx’s work as music advisor in Turkey. Mayer-Hirzberger argues that Austria’s alleged musical superiority was deployed to emphasize Austria’s distinctiveness as “land of music” during the *Staendestaat* (1934-1938) years. By revealing the portrayal of composers as “model Austrians,” Mayer-Hirzberger moreover demonstrates the use of music discourses to fashion a particular Austrian subjectivity.

Bourdieuian theory helps to shed light on the role of musical activity in constituting and negotiating social structures in several recent ethnomusicological monographs: Jane Sugarman’s 1997 book *Engendering Song: Singing and Subjectivity at Prespa Albanian Weddings* and Thomas Turino’s 2008 book *Music as Social Life: The Politics of Participation*. In his 2013 book *Alaturka: Style in Turkish Music (1923-1938)*, John Morgan O’Connell uses Bourdieuian theory to illuminate the strategic decisions about performance style taken by an early Turkish Republican artist and contemporary of Hasan Ferid Alnar.

Jane Sugarman presents a compelling account of the role of musical practice in negotiating power relations in changing contexts. Sugarman uses Bourdieuian *habitus* to

⁷ Holzer, Andreas. “Joseph Marx und Paul Hindemith also “Musikalische Botschafter” in der Türkei.” *ANKLAENGE, Wiener Jarbuch für Musikwissenschaft* (2009):197-208.

⁸ Holzer, Andreas. “Joseph Marx als Lehrer.” In “Marjan Kozina: International symposium about Marjan Kozina, on the occasion of the concert performance of his operetta *Majda*.” edited by Primož Kuret, 37-42. Slovenia: Novo Mesto Press, 2001.

examine the re-construction and re-negotiation of binary, patriarchal gender identity through singing among Prespa Albanians.⁹ In so doing, she is responding to the interpretive anthropological approach to ethnomusicological study dominant at the time of writing, which she deems inadequate for examining music not simply as “expressive form” through which “a world of meanings” can be interpreted but as itself a constitutor of said world.¹⁰ She places Bourdieu’s concept of “the collective habitus of a community as the repository of its deep structures” in dialogue with Foucault’s concept of genealogies of discourse that recognizes in addition to dominant systems of power relations alternative discourses that “may also be constituted within a society in contradictory, disjunct ways.”¹¹ She in turn expands upon Foucault’s conception of discourse by including “Bourdieu’s attention to nondiscursive, experiential domains.”¹²

Through an examination of context, singing style, song subjects, and performance etiquette, Sugarman establishes that singing is integral to Prespa social life and plays a particularly prominent role in Prespa wedding celebrations. These performative practices construct the Prespa “system” of social relations, including its clearly defined, patriarchal gender roles. By comparing field research on Prespa weddings in Albania and North America, Sugarman demonstrates that deviations in North America from the traditional Prespa gendered division of singing emerge in response to the conditions of North American consumer capitalism. Sugarman argues that these deviations in the North American context constitute a discourse imagining more equal Prespa gender relations. Moreover, this practice-based discourse pre-exists a reimagining of North American Prespa gender relations on a linguistic plane.

⁹ Jane Sugarman, *Engendering Song: Singing and Subjectivity at Prespa Albanian Weddings* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997).

¹⁰ Sugarman, 27.

¹¹ Sugarman, 28.

¹² Sugarman, 29.

In his book, *Music as Social Life: The Politics of Participation*, Thomas Turino uses Bourdieuan theory in conjunction with Peircian semiotics to gain deeper insight into the role of musical activity in the creation of social groups ranging in scope from old-time bands to nation-states. Turino's application of Peircian semiotics to analysis of musical discourse constitutes a powerful tool for examining the particular effectiveness of musical communication for certain semantic purposes. Likewise, Turino's formulation of cultural formation and cultural cohort provided a useful method for understanding the interaction of social life, cultural practices, and identity.

Most significantly for this study, Turino conducts his analysis in terms of a conception of four fields of music taken from Pierre Bourdieu's concept of fields of artistic practice. Turino understands Bourdieu's conception of a field as "specific [domains] of activity defined by the purpose and goals of the activity as well as the values, power relations, and types of capital (e.g., money, academic degrees, a hit song, athletic prowess, the ability to play a guitar) determining the role relationships, social positioning, and status of actors and activities within the field."¹³ Turino groups the four fields on a continuum according to two categories: participatory versus presentational, and high fidelity versus studio audio art. Participatory music-making prioritizes inclusivity at the expense of individual virtuosic display, while presentational music-making allows for the flowering of individual virtuosity while sacrificing inclusivity. High-fidelity recording prioritizes apparent verisimilitude of the recording to live performance. Studio audio art, on the other hand, makes no reference to live performance and prioritizes control over the sounds produced.

¹³ Thomas Turino, *Music as Social Life: the Politics of Participation* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 2008): 25-26.

In a Zimbabwe case study relevant to examination of the construction of Turkish national identity, Turino examines the use of rural songs and dances to construct national identity in an urban setting. Turino applies the four fields framework to contrast participatory performance among the rural Shona to the use of rural songs and dances in a presentational setting to forge Zimbabwean national identity through processes of indexical snowballing. As in the Turkish case, the diversity of expressive practices of rural Zimbabwe is used to present the unity of the Zimbabwean nation-state to its citizens.¹⁴

However, Turino's application of Bourdieu's theory of fields exhibits some flaws. In Bourdieu's formulation fields of cultural production exist as fields only so long as agents struggling for domination perpetuate them. Turino, on the other hand, treats the fields as objective structures seemingly separated from particular contexts and human manipulation. Summing up his four fields, Turino proposes that they are "meant to point to the distinctive nature of different types of musical goals, values, musical roles, processes, practices, and styles" and "point to fundamentally different conceptions of what music is and what it can do for people."¹⁵ Furthermore, in Turino's view "different societies tend to value certain fields over others for particular reasons in given historical moments."¹⁶ Given their international applicability, Turino thus seems to characterize the fields as entities somewhat akin to Platonic forms existing irrespective of material conditions. As a result, they do not exhibit any trace of the dynamic competition that both perpetuates the existence of and drives change in Bourdieu's fields, which are necessarily tied to a particular coterie whose members compete with each other for influence. The fact that Turino's fields appear in fact to be his own, general divisions

¹⁴ Turino, 122-154.

¹⁵ Turino, 88.

¹⁶ Turino, 89.

imposed on musical practices disconnected from any particular social or cultural context appears particularly glaring in *Music as Social Life*, given that the book intends to demonstrate the contingency of social formations upon cultural practices yet is based on an a-historical, a-political misconception of Bourdieu's concept.

Additionally, Turino appears at various points to employ Bourdieu's concept of habitus while labeling it merely "habit." Taking his formulation from Peirce, Turino proposes that "the use of habit as a focal concept ... helps us understand how the dynamics of individual lives are fused with social life through the processes of socialization" and that "habits influence practices and are therefore real forces in individual lives and in the social world."¹⁷ Some twenty pages later, Turino introduces Bourdieu's concept of habitus, describing that "a person's internalized dispositions and habits (Bourdieu uses the term habitus) are products of relations to the conditions around her and her concrete experiences in and of the environment" and that "our practices and the things we produce affect, to greater or lesser degrees, our environment, which in turn affects our dispositions, which in turn affect our practices, which in turn affect external conditions, and so on."¹⁸ Turino goes on to note that "Bourdieu's model appears circular and, some have claimed, too mechanical, static and unconscious."¹⁹ The two formulations appear remarkably similar, prompting the reader to wonder why Turino uncritically maintains two separate yet very similar theoretical approaches to a single concept. Furthermore, Turino has again failed to note the dynamism noted above that is a constituent component of Bourdieuan theory, which would seem to nullify claims to its circularity.

¹⁷ Turino, 95.

¹⁸ Turino, 120.

¹⁹ Turino, 120-121.

John Morgan O'Connell's 2013 book *Alaturka: Style in Turkish Music (1923-1938)* provides a valuable counterpart to this study of Alnar as an examination of strategic adoption of European musical practices in the realm of performance style by a Turkish musician.²⁰ O'Connell uses theorizations of style proposed by Pierre Bourdieu and Dick Hebdige to examine early Turkish Republican musician Münir Nurettin Selçuk's strategic deployment of performance choices to mediate between *Alaturka* music and the state-driven project of musical Europeanization in the early Turkish Republic. O'Connell first examines early Turkish debates about musical style. He then takes Selçuk as a case study, examining Selçuk career choices, performance methods, and self-presentation, as well as his representation by critics in the media, to demonstrate Selçuk's use of elements of *Alafranga* style to modernize *Alaturka*.

O'Connell uses Bourdieu's concept of 'doxa' (a self-evident natural order controlled by dominant groups) and Bourdieu's understanding of arenas of discourse and practice to understand the relation between the *alaturka* and *alafranga* style categories in the early Turkish Republic. O'Connell notes that the Turkish Republican state deployed these style categories "as a musical gloss for contemporary representations of an Ottoman past and a Republican present" and that the state "manipulated [*alaturka* and *alafranga* style categories] strategically to discriminate against an imperial style of Turkish music in favor of a national style ..."²¹ O'Connell proposes that, in Bourdieuan terms, "*alaturka* was a 'heterodox' expression of an 'orthodox' standpoint articulated through *alafranga*."²²

In order to situate Münir Nurettin Selçuk in this disputed arena, O'Connell places Bourdieu in conversation with Hebdige. Hebdige considers style to be a means of reinforcing

²⁰ John Morgan O'Connell, *Alaturka: Style in Turkish Music (1923-1938)* (London: Ashgate, 2013).

²¹ O'Connell, *Alaturka*, 25.

²² O'Connell, *Alaturka*, 26.

(usually sub-altern) class identities—in Selçuk’s case *alaturka*. Bourdieu, on the other hand, sees style as a tool in the hands of actors to cross class identity—in Selçuk’s case “by co-opting the cultural capital associated with *alafanga* to advance musically and to progress socially.”²³

O’Connell demonstrates that Selçuk strategically deployed elements of *alafiranga* style available to him to advance his career and propose a solution to the problem of Turkish national music in terms of *alaturka*. These elements include a period of study in France that Selçuk employed to strategic advantage throughout his career, Selçuk’s use of elements of European vocal technique, his Western recital style of concertizing in fashionable venues, his European dress and mannerisms, and his eschewing of negative stereotypes such as drunkenness and slovenliness associated with *Alaturka* musicians. Through these measures, Selçuk achieved a compromise between his early training and success in *Alaturka* music and dramatic shifts in favor of *Alafiranga* in the field of Turkish music after the founding of the Turkish Republic in 1923.

O’Connell’s examination of Selçuk’s strategic adoption of European performance practices provides a valuable counterpart to my analysis of Hasan Ferid Alnar’s strategic use of European compositional techniques and performance venues. Like Alnar, Selçuk was a musician with favorable positionality in the Late-Ottoman field of music-cultural production who was confronted with the need to adapt to changing conditions in the Turkish Republic. Though very different from one another on the surface, the two musicians adopted similar strategies at similar points in their musical development.

O’Connell’s characterization of *alaturka* as a “heterodox’ expression of an ‘orthodox’ standpoint articulated through *alafiranga*”, however, is problematic in the case of figures such as Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel. Arel acknowledged that his positionality was threatened by conditions

²³ O’Connell, *Alaturka*, 18.

in the Turkish Republic and acted strategically through such figures as Alnar to maintain favorable positionality. However, Arel would likely not have accepted a characterization of himself as “heterodox.” This is not to argue that O’Connell may only characterize historical figures in terms they themselves would have accepted. Rather, O’Connell fails to recognize the momentum of cultural capital held by such figures as Arel, who considered themselves to be ‘orthodox’ amidst dramatic changes being instituted by the Turkish state. In other words, though Republican elites sought a dramatic and immediate change in Turkish cultural orientation, they were unable actually to effect immediate change, leaving slippage between old and new stores of cultural capital and figures such as Arel in cultural limbo.

Two groundbreaking volumes demonstrate the extent to which scholars have thus far considered the relationship between music and disability in terms of the effect of mental and physical differences upon composers, performers, and dramatic characters, as well as the reception of disabled composers’ music. In line with disability theory, these scholars consider disability to be a cultural construction based upon human variation. They emphasize that disability is “defined by local society and culture rather than an immutable and inherent quality of individual minds or bodies.”²⁴ I extend this culturally contextualized conception of music and disability by considering the disabling of Ottoman music in the Turkish Republican cultural context and Alnar’s musical disabling in that context.

The first of these volumes, Neil Lerner and Joseph Straus’s 2006 edited volume *Sounding Off: Theorizing Disability in Music*, analyzes the interaction between physical and mental disability and music from three perspectives: Narrating Disability Musically, Performing Disability Musically, and Composing Disability Musically. Essays from Paul Attinello and

²⁴ Lerner and Strauss, 6.

Joseph Straus are especially relevant to my study of Alnar, and deal with musical responses to widespread contemporary disability. These essays are relevant for two reasons. First, both Attinello and Straus address composers' engagement with widespread disability in their historical and cultural contexts, as opposed to experiences with their own disability. Second, both scholars consider this engagement in reactive terms. In Attinello's and Straus's characterizations, composers—be they minimalist or serialist—compose works that reflect certain disabilities widespread at the time, but these works and their engagement with disability do not appear to have any impact upon society. In my consideration of the genesis and reception of the *Kanun Concerto*, I attempt to contextualize the work as both a reaction to and negotiation of Alnar's experience of disability in relation to his own circumstances and as a productive mediation that subsequently influenced the field of music in the Turkish Republic.

The first essay from *Sounding Off* that I consider, "Fever/Fragile/Fatigue: Music, AIDS, Present, and ..." by Paul Attinello, examines musical responses to the AIDS epidemic during the nineteen-eighties. Attinello contends that "much of the music written about AIDS focuses ... on fear, mourning, or existential crises around the idea of death."²⁵ In Attinello's view, a different musical response to the AIDS crisis can be found in new age music, minimalism, and process music. Noting that these musics became popular around the same time that AIDS entered the public consciousness, Attinello proposes that these overtly non-teleological musics "fulfilled a cultural need" to "[retreat] from the terrors of death."²⁶ In both cases, musical responses to the AIDS epidemic appear to be purely reactive.

In his essay "Inversional Balance and the 'Normal' Body in the Music of Anton Webern and Arnold Schoenberg," Joseph Strauss interprets changing responses to disability in pre- and

²⁵ Attinello, 16.

²⁶ Attinello, 19.

post-WWI Central Europe from the development of inversional symmetry in the Second Viennese School. Strauss interprets Arnold Schoenberg's and Anton Webern's early, free atonal works in terms of an organicist, corporeal conception of musical structures as "music bodies with potentially disabling problems."²⁷ By constructing works whose inversional symmetry is disrupted and then only partially fulfilled, Strauss argues, Schoenberg and Webern are participating in a contemporary *Expressionist* fascination with the *grotesque* and a pseudo-scientific interest in the *degenerate*. In so doing, Strauss argues, they create "an artistic means for arousing and channelling anxiety about disability."²⁸

Strauss argues that this means of exploring disability through musical materials changed dramatically in the aftermath of the First World War, when disability became a highly-visible component of everyday life. The response that Schoenberg and Webern developed to the post-war context—twelve-tone serialism—constitutes in Strauss's view a rejection of their previous engagement with disability through incomplete inversional symmetry. In both composers' post-war music, "the sense of inversional balance is far more pervasive and far more stable than in their free atonal music," indicating that their reaction to daily post-War encounters with war-related disfigurement and injury was to avoid as much as possible musical engagement with disability.²⁹ Again, Strauss characterizes Schoenberg's and Webern's responses to both pre- and post-war disability as reactionary, and does not consider the role of these works in shaping future cultural practices.

Joseph Strauss's 2011 book *Extraordinary Measures* provides a model for considering Alnar's musical disabling, a framework for assessing the impact of the *Kanun Concerto* as a

²⁷ Strauss, 261.

²⁸ Strauss, 264.

²⁹ Strauss, 266.

productive mediation with impact on the field of music in Turkey, and an example of organicist and corporeal understandings of music and musical repertoires important for the Turkish Republican case. As in *Sounding Off*, Strauss devotes the majority of his book to the impact of physical and mental difference on music through cases such as Beethoven's deafness and Schubert's syphilis. However, Strauss establishes a particularly fluid definition of disability as social and cultural construction important to my analysis of Alnar's musical disabling. With reference to identity groups based upon gender, race, and sexual orientation, Strauss proposes that "the construction of disability involves the opposition of a normative standard (e.g., male, white, straight, able-bodied) and a deviant Other (e.g., female, non-white, gay, disabled)."³⁰ Strauss includes in his consideration "the full range of physical and mental differences to which the human body is subject, whether congenital or acquired ..."³¹ and notes with reference to music that "nonnormative bodily features and ... nonnormative musical features ... may be understood as either desirable or disabling, depending upon the context."³² As I argue below, Alnar's engagement with Ottoman music constitutes an embodied habitus or, in Strauss's terms, an acquired mental and bodily difference. In the context of the early Turkish Republic, Alnar's *habitus* in Ottoman music thus constituted a nonnormative, disabling mental and musical feature.

The second chapter of Strauss's book, "Composers with Disabilities and the Critical Reception of their Music," provides a model for considering Alnar's *habitus* in Ottoman music as a productive force in the composition of the *Kanun Concerto* as well as for evaluating the *Kanun Concerto* itself as a productive mediation between competing *habitus* and conceptions of "normality." In his discussion of disabled composers such as Landini (blindness), Beethoven

³⁰ Strauss, 10.

³¹ Strauss, 10.

³² Strauss, 11.

(deafness), and Smetana (deafness/syphillis), Strauss argues that disability is “not an affliction to be suffered, not a mark of divine inspriation, not an obstacle to be overcome (and thus ignored), but a source of creative identity.”³³ In reference to Landini, a 14th century Florentine composer famous for his memory and improvisational ability, Strauss argues that “his abilities in both areas were enhanced by his blindness” and proposes that “one might say that his blindness enabled him to do more successfully the crucial things that all composers of his day were expected to do.”³⁴

In his discussion of Smetana’s late music and its reception, Strauss notes divergent modes of analysis with reference to the deafness and mental disarray Smetana suffered as a result of syphillis. Strauss quotes an from an analysis of Smetana’s final work—the String Quartet No. 2—by Derek Katz: “it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the quartet has been tainted by its composer’s illness ...” and that “as a product of disease, the quartet itself must be diseased.”³⁵ In his analysis, however, Strauss sees in the second quartet’s fragmentation not the mark of disease but a distinctive means of expression suited to Smetana’s experience of disability.

Strauss’s discussion of Beethoven reception illustrates the role that disabling discourses can play in the reception of composers and their works. Furthermore, his discussion highlights the autonomous cultural agency that critical reception grants to certain works, and that is important to my consideration of the reception of Alnar’s *Kanun Concerto*. Strauss considers three stages of reception of Beethoven’s late works, each of which was colored by conceptions of his disability. Critics during Beethoven’s lifetime considered his last works “artistically inferior and defective, the direct result of his inability to hear.”³⁶ After Beethoven’s death, critics

³³ Strauss, 17.

³⁴ Strauss, 21.

³⁵ Strauss, 31.

³⁶ Strauss, 28.

“identified a third period (i.e. the late style) to segregate the apparently defective final works from the healthy ones that came before.”³⁷ Finally, Strauss contends, an interpretation of Beethoven’s late works began with Richard Wagner’s 1870 monograph *Beethoven* that still holds sway today: Beethoven’s deafness as “mark of divine inspiration” that “enabled him to ascend to spiritual heights.”³⁸ These stages of Beethoven criticism demonstrate both the degree to which perceived disability influences the reception of particular composers and the degree to which reception of works can become a space in which actors draw upon the agency embedded in works to advance their own positionalities.

Finally, in the sixth chapter of *Extraordinary Measures*, “Disability within Music-Theoretical Traditions, Strauss examines organicist, corporeal music theoretical discourses significant to my analysis of the constitution of a disabling field of music-cultural production in the Turkish Republic. Strauss’s claim in this chapter is that “the central metaphor of the music theories [that he surveys] is that a work of music is a human body, a living creature with form and motion, and often with blood, organs, limbs, and skin as well.”³⁹ These musical bodies, Strauss contends, “might be either normal or abnormal.”⁴⁰ The “normality” of musical bodies is often characterized in terms of organicism. Here Strauss makes a crucial point: the opposite of “normal” organicism is not necessarily the inorganic, or mechanical. Rather, he contends, the “praiseworthy organic (i.e., the harmonious, symmetrical body) depends on the concept of the disabled organic (i.e., the deformed, disabled body).”⁴¹ Music theoretical traditions that emerged starting in the mid-nineteenth century, Strauss argues, made it their business to distinguish

³⁷ Strauss, 28.

³⁸ Strauss, 28.

³⁹ Strauss, 103.

⁴⁰ Strauss, 103.

⁴¹ Strauss, 103

healthy, “normal” musical bodies from unhealthy “abnormal” ones. In this way, Strauss posits, one might consider standard music theories “not only normalizing discourses but also disabling discourses.”⁴²

Strauss’s examination of Viennese music theorist Heinrich Schenker’s theoretical framework reveals that a theorist as influential as Schenker extended the diagnostic evaluation of musical bodies to the level of an entire repertoire. This concept of a sickly or disabled repertoire is vital to my examination of the disabling of Ottoman Music writ large in the Turkish Republic. Schenker conceived explicitly of musical works as bodies, writing in *Free Composition (Der Freie Satz)* that “it should have been evident long ago that the same principle applies both to a musical organism and to the human body: it grows outward from within.”⁴³ Schenker conceived of musical form in terms of the lives of said bodies through his concept of “source-path-flow.” In this formulation, music proceeds in an organic fashion mirroring the human life-cycle, along which it encounters obstacles, or “blockages,” which impede the linearity of music with verticality in the form of dissonances. In their role as simulacra of the challenges inevitably encountered in life, blockages contribute to the health of pieces of music. However, excessive verticality of the kind that Schenker claimed to find in the dissonance of modernist music disastrously impede flow and brought about “paralysis” of the musical body in Schenker’s view. Strauss extrapolates from Schenker’s condemnation of certain modernist works such as Stravinsky’s Piano Concerto that in Schenker’s theoretical framework “an entire repertoire can be disabled. A repertoire is also a body—a *corpus* of work.”⁴⁴

⁴² Strauss, 105.

⁴³ Strauss, 117.

⁴⁴ Strauss, 121.

As we shall see, these concepts of musical works and musical repertoires as bodies subject to normality and abnormality, symmetry and disfigurement, health and disability, are vital to understanding Alnar's positionality. Alnar was caught in the midst of several variations on these themes. His Austrian teacher, Joseph Marx, was very much in the Schenkerian camp opposed to the alleged un-naturalness of musical modernism. In the Turkish Republic, musical discourse was heavily influenced by a disabling discourse established by Turkist ideologue Ziya Gökalp's application of Durkheimian social organicism to the Turkish nation state. In that discourse, the repertoire of Ottoman music in which Alnar had a *habitus* was disabled and labeled "sick." Alnar was himself therefore disabled by his *habitus* in the field of Turkish music, and the *Kanun Concerto* was the product of his mediation between healthy Western music and "sick" Ottoman music.

Bourdieuian Practice Theory in conjunction with Disability Theory and theories of the nation state provide a theoretical framework for understanding the fields of music cultural production in the Turkish and Austrian Republics and examining Hasan Ferid Alnar's positionality and strategizing in them in terms of educational choices, performance sites, and reception. A music analytical framework combining European and Ottoman *makam*-based approaches allows for a discussion of negotiation of power dynamics expressed through musical traditions coded Western and Eastern, healthy and sick. Analysis of the *Kanun Concerto* reveals Alnar's mediation between these musical traditions to create an emergent musical language which challenged existing social conditions and provided a platform for later actors to critique the field of music-cultural production in Turkey and to advance their own positionality in that field. The next chapter begins this examination by analyzing the construction of a disabling field

of music cultural production in Turkey in accordance with Ziya Gökalp's proposal for the development of Turkish national music.

Chapter 3: The Social Organism and the Disabling Field of Music-cultural Production in the Turkish Republic

The fall of the Ottoman Empire and subsequent founding of the Turkish Republic brought enormous change to the field of music-cultural production in which Alnar had previously been favorably positioned. In this chapter I examine the re-constitution of the Turkish field of music during the Turkish Music Revolution and the responses of Alnar, Arel, and other agents in the early Turkish Republic. Following the founding of the Republic, state actors imposed a disablist discourse drawing on Ziya Gökalp's musical formula to enact and legitimate changes upon the field of music in Turkey. In the midst of debates over the proper music for the Turkish nation, the state attempted to eliminate Ottoman musical culture through closing and manipulation of institutions such as the Mevlevi *Tekke* and the radio. Though Alnar was initially well placed in the field of Late-Ottoman music-cultural production, these state-led changes threatened his positionality and prompted him to strategically shift his path toward European music so as to maintain favorable positionality. This shift was furthermore encouraged by Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel, an agent whose prestigious positionality was threatened in the context of Gökalpian reform. Though Alnar's study of European music led to his inclusion in the Turkish Five—the first generation of European-style composers in the Turkish Republic—his *habitus* in Ottoman music separated him musically from the rest of this group and led to his musical disabling in the Turkish Republican field of music.

Prodigious Talent Meets Favorable Positionality: Alnar's Youth

In the late Ottoman field of music-cultural production, Alnar was exceedingly well placed. Having been born in Istanbul, the political and cultural capital of the Ottoman Empire, he was at the center of both the *Alaturka* and *Alafranga* fields in the Ottoman Empire. However, in

the changing field of music-cultural production in the Turkish Republic, Alnar's positionality was threatened by the Turkish state's assault on the musical repertoires and institutions of the Late-Ottoman period. Alnar was therefore prompted to re-orient his musical activities toward Europe and a new role as Turkish national composer.

Alnar was a child prodigy in music, and from the beginning of his musical life participated in both European and Ottoman musical activities. He was born in Istanbul in 1906 as the first child of Hüseyin, who worked as an official with the postal service. Alnar's household was musical—his mother Saime played *kanun* and *ud* and sang and his uncle played *ud*.¹ From a young age Alnar began to sing and his musical abilities were quickly recognized as prodigious.² He began singing in polyphonic choirs at age eight at the German school in Istanbul, and shortly thereafter began playing *kanun*.³ The fact that Alnar's mother and uncle played music at home and that he began singing in the choir at the German school at an early age awoke his musical interest and talent at a sufficiently early age for *habitus* formation in both Ottoman and European music traditions. Alnar also began composing early, and completed his first piece, a *Tahirbuselik Longa*, at age 13. Three years later he led the premiere of his monophonic operetta *Kelebek Zabit* at the Şehzade National Theater, as he put it “with shorts and a baton.”⁴

Perhaps due to the fact that a *kanun* was available to him at home, Alnar's initial success came with *kanun*, and in his memoirs, he writes perhaps hyperbolically that four months after he began *kanun* lessons, his teacher Kanuni Vitali Efendi told him that he had nothing left to teach him.⁵ Alnar quickly became known as one of the best *kanun* players in Istanbul, and also

¹ Okyay, 23.

² Rizeli, 6.

³ Okyay, 21.

⁴ Okyay: 22: Alnar presumably means to indicate by “shorts” that he was still a child at the time for whom short pants would have been appropriate.

⁵ Okyay, 21.

learned to play *kemençe*.⁶ Early recognition of his talents on *kanun* led to encouragement and a place in the *Darüttâlim-I Musîkî*, which afforded him an opportunity to hone his *kanun* playing and perform and tour extensively in Europe, opening his eyes to future possibilities.

At the same time, his early schooling at the Istanbul German School provided exposure to Western music, in addition to a prestigious education and training in German. His early recognition as a *kanun* player and experience composing doubtless placed him favorably in the eyes of the very influential Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel, who studied and composed both Ottoman and European-style music. Though Alnar only studied with Arel for one year, Arel remained an important supporter of Alnar for decades thereafter. His studies with Arel in turn opened up contact with Edgar Manas, one of the most respected teachers of Western music in Istanbul at the time.

Reflecting the *Alaturka/Alafranga* division of the time, Alnar continued his *Alaturka* activities by performing on *kanun* and composing Ottoman music while developing his knowledge of Western harmony. In 1922 at age 16 he became a member of the *Darüttâlim-I Musîkî* society on *kanun*, and continued to play Ottoman music with this group until 1927, touring to such locations as Izmir, Cairo, and Berlin. In Berlin, the group stayed for three months to perform and make a recording—including a solo *taksim* on *kanun* by Alnar—at the Prussian State Music Ethnology Archive.⁷ In 1923, Alnar published his first compositions—the *On saz semai'si* in the *alaturka* style.⁸ At the same time, he began to develop his abilities in Western music, buying a piano and taking a year of harmony lessons with Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel in

⁶ Rizeli, 4; Okyay, 29.

⁷ Okyay, 38: This recording was likely made for Erich Moritz von Hornbostel. Von Hornbostel was director of the Phonogramm Archiv from 1906 to 1933.

⁸ Okyay, 30-31.

1923.⁹ Following Arel's move to Izmir, Alnar continued lessons in harmony, counterpoint, and fugue with the influential Armenian composer Edgar Manas while performing with the *Darüttâlim-I Musikî*, continuing to study kemençe, and pursuing studies in architecture.¹⁰ During this period he composed piano pieces, vocal fugues, fugues for piano, and a triple fugue for strings.¹¹

Not only was Alnar well-placed in the field of Late-Ottoman music-cultural production, his disposition developed in childhood was also ideally suited to it. From his early and extensive experience with Ottoman music he gained a *habitus* in Ottoman music. At the same time, however, and in keeping with the contemporary *Alaturka/Alafranga* musical bifurcation, it can be argued that Alnar already possessed a disposition in Western music as well, due to his early exposure to Western, polyphonic music at the Istanbul German School. But had this early exposure not been confronted with the objective conditions established by the contemporary field of musical-artistic production in which Alnar operated, it seems doubtful that he would have purchased a piano and aggressively pursued study of Western music. As it was, his efforts in this area can already be considered as a strategy to maximize symbolic profits, perhaps with a view toward hedging his bets against the uncertainty of the future market for musical-symbolic capital. Indeed, in 1924 Alnar received word that the newly re-configured ministry of education was taking applications to send two music students to Europe for study.¹² Alnar applied, seemingly desirous of leaving his circumstances in Turkey. He wrote in his diary how excited he was at the possibility “to work, to escape from being a professional musician (“*çalgıcılıktan kurtulmak*”)

⁹ Okyay, 25-29.

¹⁰ Okyay, 32-33.

¹¹ Okyay, 33.

¹² Okyay, 34.

...”¹³ Again, Alnar presciently realized that, though he might occupy a high position in the field of Ottoman musical production, he would make greater gains in symbolic capital with European training. Still, despite his prescience, and despite the founding of the new Turkish Republic by Mustafa Kemal and the new capital in Ankara, Alnar could not anticipate that the field of music-cultural production in Turkey was about to be the site of a major battle for control of the determination of the field.

Drawing the Battle Lines in the Turkish Field of Music

The development of Alnar’s career was set against the changing field of cultural production which called for a musical revolution in the Republican period. In the Late-Ottoman period, music was categorized in terms of *Alaturka/Alafranga*, with *Alaturka* denoting Turkish music and *Alafranga* European music. During the Republican period, the *Alaturka* category was itself divided by the construction of categories of Turkish Folk Music (*Türk Halk Müziği*) and Turkish Art Music (*Türk Sanat Müziği*). Musicians and cultural reformers grouped according to the two emerging visions for Turkish national music: Ziya Gökalp’s hybrid folk-European national music and Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel’s modernized Ottoman music. Analysis of these two visions will therefore yield insight into Alnar’s strategic negotiations in the early Republican period.

Scholars of Turkish music have traditionally pointed to Late-Ottoman Turkist ideologue Ziya Gökalp’s thought on music as outlined in his 1923 book *The Principles of Turkism* (*Türkçülüğün Esasları*) as the primary inspiration for Atatürk’s dramatic musical reforms, and thus engagement with Gökalp’s thought on music has been ubiquitous in Turkish music scholarship. I also consider engagement with Gökalp’s legacy as vital to establishing the

¹³ Okyay, 35.

oppositional dynamic in the field of music-cultural production in the Turkish Republic. However, both new historical sources and new theoretical developments make a re-evaluation of Gökalp's formula for Turkish music and its long-term effects on the field of music-cultural production in Turkey necessary. In light of recent work by Attila Sağlam, I propose a re-evaluation of Gökalp's formula for Turkish music based on a close analysis of the foundations of his thought. Relying on Disability Theory, I counter Sağlam's claim that there was no relationship whatsoever between Gökalp's and Atatürk's thought on the reform of Turkish music. I grant with Sağlam that Gökalp's discussion of the importance of folk music to national culture was not unique to him, but rather part of a broader Late-Ottoman discourse. Indeed, Gökalp's music formula and much of the substance of subsequent music reforms are derived from late Ottoman writers such as Rıza Tevfik Bölükbaşı, Fuad Köprülü, and especially Musa Süreyya Bey and Necip Asım Bey.¹⁴ However, I argue that through his reading of Durkheim and participation in a process of Ottoman "interior Orientalizing," Gökalp adopted a more radical stance which called for the euthanization of "sick" Eastern music. In so doing, his thought laid the foundation for a field of music-cultural production in the Turkish Republic based on musical disabling, of which Alnar was the victim.

A reading of Gökalp's formula in terms of disability theory yields new insight into its importance in re-shaping the field of music-cultural production in the Turkish Republic. Gökalp identifies three categories of musical material—Western, Ottoman/Eastern, and folk—and proposes the method by which they are to be manipulated into a new Turkish music:

Before the arrival of European music there were two kinds of music in our country, the first being the eastern music that was borrowed from Byzantium by al-Farabi, the second the folk melodies that were a continuation of ancient Turkish music. Like Western music, Eastern music grew out of that of ancient Greece. The ancient Greeks, not considering

¹⁴ See Reyhan Altınay. *Cumhuriyet Döneminde Türk Halk Müziği*. (İzmir: META Basım Matbaacılık Hizmetleri, 2004).

adequate the full and half tones found in folk melodies, added to them quarter, eighth and sixteenth tones ... These tones were not natural but artificial, which is why they are not to be found in the folk melodies of any nation. Thus, Greek music was an artificial music based on unnatural tones that involved a boring monotony, unlike anything in life . . .¹⁵

According to Gökalp, the development of opera in Western Europe during the Middle Ages necessitated the removal of these quarter, eighth, and sixteenth tones. Furthermore, as it consisted of a “succession of feelings, emotions and passions, [opera] added harmony and in so doing saved Western music from monotony,” thus leading to “modern Western music.”¹⁶

Music in the East, however, stagnated in Gökalp’s view:

Eastern music remained completely unchanged, retaining its quarter tones and continuing to lack harmony. After having been translated into Arabic by Al-Farabi, this sick music was also translated into Persian and Ottoman because of court esteem. The Greek Orthodox, Armenian, Chaldean and Syrian Churches and the Jewish Rabbinate also borrowed this music from Byzantium. In the Ottoman realm it was the one institution that united all Ottoman elements, hence it was indeed appropriate to call it ‘Ottoman unifying music.’¹⁷

Having introduced the three candidates for inclusion in the new music for the Turkish Republic, Gökalp proposes his formula:

Today, we are thus confronted with three kinds of music: Eastern, Western and folk. I wonder which of them is our real national music? We have already noted that Eastern

¹⁵ Mehmet Kaplan, ed. Ziya Gökalp: Türkçülüğün Esasları (Istanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1976): Avrupa musikisi girmeden evvel, memleketimizde iki musiki vardı: Bunlardan biri Farabi tarafından Bizans’tan alınan şark musikisi, diğeri eski Türk musikisinin devamı olan (halk melodileri) nden ibaretti.

Şark musikisi de, garp musikisi gibi eski Yunan musikisinden doğmuştu. Eski yunanlılar, halk melodilerinde bulunan tam ve yarım sesleri kâfi görmeyerek, bunlara dörte bir, sekizde bir, on altıda bir sesleri ilâve etmişler ve bu sonkilere (çeyrek sesler) namını vermişlerdi. Çeyrek sesler tabii değildi; sun’iydi. Bundan dolayıdır ki hiç bir milletin halk melodilerinde çeyrek seslere tesadüf edilmez. Binaenaleyh, Yunan musikisi gayr-I tabii seslere istinat eden bir sun’I musiki idi. Bundan başka, hayatta yeknesaklık olmadığı halde, Yunan musikisinde aynı melodinin tekerrüründen ibaret olan üzücü bir yeknasaklık vardı (Mehmet Kaplan, ed. Ziya Gökalp: Türkçülüğün Esasları (Istanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1976)), 138-139.

¹⁶ Aynı zamanda, opera, duyguların, heyecanların, ihtirasların tevâlisinden ibaret bulunduğundan, (armoni) yi ilâve ederek, garp musikisinin doğmasına sebep oldu (Mehmet Kaplan, ed. Ziya Gökalp: Türkçülüğün Esasları (Istanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1976), 139.

¹⁷ Şark musikisine gelince, bu tamamiyle eski halinde kaldı. Bir taraftan çeyrek sesleri muhafaza ediyordu, diğer cihetten armoniden hâlâ mahrum bulunuyordu. Farabi tarafından Arapçaya nakolunduktan sonra bu hasta musikisi sarayların rağbetiyle Acemceye ve Osmanlıcaya da naklolunmuşlardı. Diğer taraftan Ortodoks ve Ermeni, Keldani, Süryani kiliseleriyle Yahudi hahamhanesi de bu musikiyi Bizans’tan almışlardı. Osmanlı memleketinde, bütün Osmanlı unsurlarını birleştiren yegâne müessesese olduğu için, buna (Osmanlı ittihad-ı anâsır-ı musikisi) namını vermek de gerçekten çok münasipti (Mehmet Kaplan, ed. Ziya Gökalp: Türkçülüğün Esasları (Istanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1976)),139.

music is both sick and non-national, whereas neither folk nor Western music is foreign to us since the first is the music of our culture and the second that of our new civilization. I submit, therefore, that our national music will be born of a marriage between folk and Western music. Our folk music has given us many melodies. If we collect these and harmonize them in the Western manner, we shall have both a national and a European music.¹⁸

The prevailing understanding in Turkish music scholarship of Gökalp's formula and the reforms which followed points to his dissection of culture from civilization—understood to draw on Johann Gottfried Herder's (1744-1803) notion of the *Volk* which was implemented in the formation of new nation states and Ferdinand Tönnies' (1885-1936) distinction between “community” and “society.”¹⁹ Gökalp's ‘culture’ can be approximated as the unique moral and aesthetic traits that establish the solidarity of a particular nation, such as language and education. ‘Civilization’ is defined by traits shared among many nations, such as theology, philosophy, science, and technology.²⁰

In his music formula, Gökalp employs these frameworks to turn prevailing Ottoman music historiography on its head and denigrate Ottoman urban music while elevating rural Anatolian music. As Walter Feldman has demonstrated, there had been little interest in Ottoman music culture in defining a specifically “Turkish” music, the term “Turk” being derogatory and of European origin.²¹ Identity associated with Islamic civilization held far more prestige than

¹⁸ Bugün, işte şu üç musikin karşılarında: Şark musikisi, garp musikisi, halk musikisi.

Acaba bunlardan hangisi, bizim için millidir? Şark musikisinin hem hasta, hem de gary-ı millî olduğunu gördük. Halk musikisi harsımızın, garp musikisi de yeni medeniyetimizin musikileri olduğu için, her ikisi de bize yabancı değildir. O halde, millî musikimiz, memleketimizdeki halk musikisiyle garp musikisinin imtizacından doğacaktır. Halk musikimiz, bize birçok melodiler vermiştir. Bunları toplar ve garp musikisi usulünce (armonize) edersek hem millî, hem de Avrupaî bir musikiye mâlik oluruz (Mehmet Kaplan, ed. Ziya Gökalp: Türkçülüğün Esasları (Istanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1976)), 139-140.

¹⁹ See Ferdinand Tönnies, *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft: Grundbegriffe der reinen Soziologie* (Berlin : K. Curtius, 1920): “Gemeinschaft” is translated as “community,” and is taken to refer to social groupings formed by a feeling of togetherness, whereas “Gesellschaft” is translated as “society, and taken to refer to social groupings formed by a communal goal. This formulation is roughly analogous to Durkheim's concept of mechanical versus organic solidarity.

²⁰ Martin Stokes, *The Arabesk Debate* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992): 26.

²¹ See F. Asli Ergul, “The Ottoman Identity: Turkish, Muslim or Rum?” in *Middle Eastern Studies* 48: 4 (2012): 629-645.

Turkish national identity throughout most of the history of the Ottoman Empire, and a mythology was thus curated for Ottoman music which “was designed to give the impression that it . . . grew from common Islamic sources, reaching back to Hellenic times.”²² Gökalp takes this view and turns it around through adoption of the culture-civilization dichotomy. He considers the music of urban Ottoman culture to be a product of Eastern civilization no longer suitable for Turkey. The music of the Turkish peasantry, on the other hand, belongs to Turkish culture and therefore needs only to be combined with musical techniques of Western/European civilization in order to form a music uniquely Turkish yet primed for membership in European civilization

Scholars of Turkish music allude to the predecessors of Gökalp’s thought, but then proceed to grant him pride of place as theorizer of the Turkish music revolution. In *The Arabesk Debate*, Martin Stokes mentions the writings of Late-Ottoman musicians and intellectuals such as Musa Süreyya Bey and Necip Asım [Yazıksız] Bey, but goes on to assert that Gökalp “so profoundly influenced Mustafa Kemal as to be the blueprint for the entire revolution.”²³ John Morgan O’Connell also gives credit to Necip Asım [Yazıksız] in his 2013 book *Alaturka: Style in Turkish Music*. However, he reasons that the auspiciousness of *The Principles of Turkism*’s date of publication and Gökalp’s prominence justify a focus on his formula for Turkish music.²⁴

More recently, in his 2009 book *The Turkish Music Revolution (Türk Musiki/Müzik Devrimi)*, Atilla Sağlam proposes a radical revision of Turkish music scholarship based on analysis of the writings of the Late-Ottomans mentioned by Stokes and others. Sağlam argues that *The Principles of Turkism* was not actually the source of Atatürk’s thought on folk music and national culture. Claiming that Gökalp’s thought has more in common with that of European

²² Walter Feldman, “Cultural Authority and Authenticity in the Turkish Repertoire” *Asian Music* 22, No. 1 (Autumn, 1990 – Winter, 1991).

²³ Martin Stokes, *The Arabesk Debate* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 26.

²⁴ John Morgan O’Connell, *Alaturka: Style in Turkish Music (1923-1938)* (London: Ashgate, 2013).

orientalists, Sağlam argues that Atatürk's thought on music has more in common with other Turkists such as Namık Kemal and Mehmet Akif. Sağlam bases this argument on two points: first, given the evident weakness of Gökalp's musical knowledge, to claim that Atatürk took his primary inspiration from Gökalp "doesn't line up when you consider [Atatürk's] national and international experience and accumulation of knowledge."²⁵ Second, Sağlam proposes that there is a crucial difference between Atatürk's and Gökalp's conception of Turkish national music. Atatürk spoke of "re-working folk music according to the general most recent musical laws," while Gökalp wrote merely of the need to "harmonize [folk melodies] in the Western manner."²⁶ Reasoning that, given his evident lack of musical knowledge, Gökalp could only have been thinking of the simple Italianate harmonies brought to the Ottoman Empire by figures such as Donizetti and Guatelli Pasha, Sağlam concludes that "even though both Gökalp and Atatürk may share the evasion of the "sick music"... , between Gökalp's and Atatürk's recipes for evading, liberating, or curing that music, there is absolutely no similarity of any kind to be found."²⁷

It is, however, precisely this "sick" music that indicates a connection between Gökalp, Atatürk, and the Turkish Music Revolution. I acknowledge with Sağlam the likelihood that Gökalp was not the only writer on music to influence Atatürk's thought and that elements of Gökalp's musical formula did not originate with him. However, I argue that Gökalp, Atatürk, and other Turkish music reformers adhered to an ideology of social sickness and health rooted in 19th century Western European organicist and eugenicist views of society. Gökalp's musical formula, which diagnoses Ottoman music and "cures" Turkish folk music, is a particularly clear

²⁵ Sağlam, 89: O'nun ulusal ve uluslararası deneyim, bilgi ve birikimi göz önüne aldığında uygun düşmez.

²⁶ Sağlam, 80: genel son musiki kurallarına göre halk musikisini işleme.

²⁷ Sağlam, 80: Aracı'nin dedindiği "hasta musiki"den kaçınma hem Gökalp'n hem de Atatürk'ün ortak yaklaşımları olsa bile bu musikiden kaçınma, kurtulma veya bu musikisi iyileştirme reçeteleri yönünden Gökalp ile Atatürk arasında herhangi bir benzerlik bulunmaz.

example of this ideology. I argue that, through his study of sociology and Emile Durkheim and his participation in a tradition of interior Orientalizing directed at Arab Ottoman provinces, Gökalp gained a conception of society as an organism subject to normal/healthy and pathological states which he found applicable to the Late-Ottoman discourse on music. Specifically, this conception allowed him to call for the removal of “sick” Eastern music and the Westernized rehabilitation of folk music.

Gökalp, Durkheim, and the Turkish Social Organism

Ziya Gökalp (1876-1924) was instrumental both as the founder of Turkish sociology and as the scholar through whom Emile Durkheim’s thought was transferred to Turkey. While studying in Istanbul beginning in 1896, Gökalp became affiliated with the Society of Union and Progress and began to study Turkism. He maintained these affiliations during political exile in his home city of Diyarbakır.²⁸ Following the 1908 revolution by the “Young Turks” which re-established the 1876 constitution suppressed by Sultan Abdülhamid, Gökalp moved to Thessaloniki (Salonika) to serve as the Diyarbakır delegate to the Young Turks’ “Committee of Union and Progress.”²⁹ There, Gökalp began to forge his own intellectual path, rejecting the other ideologies competing for influence in the declining Ottoman Empire—pan-Islamism and pan-Ottomanism—and ultimately pan-Turkism (Turanism) in favor of a Turkism focused on a non-expansionist Turkish nation-state.³⁰

While in Salonika, Gökalp intensively studied Emile Durkheim, whose theory of organic solidarity as outlined in *The Division of Labor in Society* proved foundational to Gökalp’s

²⁸ Taha Parla, *The Social and Political Thought of Ziya Gökalp* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985): 12; Said Amir Arjomand, “A la Recherche de la Conscience Collective”: Durkheim’s Ideological Impact in Turkey and Iran,” *The American Sociologist* 17, no. 2 (May 1982): 95.

²⁹ Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002): 209; Parla, 15.

³⁰ Parla, 15.

thought.³¹ In Salonika, Gökalp could order Durkheim's books and, with the help of a grant from the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP), send a student to study with Durkheim and have his lecture notes sent back to Salonika.³² In 1912, sweeping educational reforms by the CUP led to the first university chair in sociology in the empire for Gökalp at the University of Istanbul.³³ In Istanbul, he also took over the editorship of the *Türk Yurdu* publication and began to cement his place as "the outstanding theoretician of the Turkist movement."³⁴ As Said Amir Arjomand suggests, Gökalp "saw in Durkheim's sociological system the key to certain specifically Turkish social phenomena which currently preoccupied him" and worked to apply Durkheim's theory of society to the cause of Turkish nationalism.³⁵

Emile Durkheim's writing reflects the statistical and eugenicist trends illuminated by disability theory, and he outlines a conception of society as organism subject to states of normalcy and sickness. Adoption of his ideas in the Late-Ottoman Empire is also part of a tradition of engagement with Enlightenment and logical-positivist ideas by progressive Ottoman intellectuals. Durkheim's conception of society was taken in part from Herbert Spencer (1820-1903), an early sociologist who is also counted as an important contributor to social Darwinism. Durkheim's adoption of Spencer's concept is part of a sustained engagement with Spencer's work in *The Division of Labor in Society*. Both of these thinkers are the heirs to

³¹ Susan C. Pearce, "The 'Turkish Model' of Sociology: East-West Science, State Formation, and the Post-Secular," *The American Sociologist* 43, no. 4: pg. 409; Pearce, 411; Interestingly, Durkheim's sociological theories also proved influential to Iranian twentieth-century Islamic reformist Ali Shari'ati (see Arjomand 1982). Musical Westernization was also an important trend in twentieth-century Iran, though it was significantly interrupted by the 1979 revolution (see Farhat, Hormoz. 1991. "Western musical influences in Persia." *Muzikoloski Zbornik* 27: 87-96, and, Youssefzadeh, Ameneh. 2000. "The Situation of Music in Iran since the Revolution: The Role of Official Organizations." *British Journal of Ethnomusicology* 9 (2): 35; Robert F. Spencer, "Culture Process and Intellectual Current: Durkheim and Atatürk," *American Anthropologist* 60, no. 4 (Summer 1958): pg. 648.

³² Arjomand, 95.

³³ Lewis, 229; Arjomand, 95.

³⁴ Lewis, 350.

³⁵ Arjomand, 95.

August Comte's conception of positivism, which placed "social physics" at the top of a hierarchy of sciences graded by complexity including mathematics, astronomy, physics, chemistry, and biology, and which was also highly influential in the late Ottoman Empire and the Republic of Turkey.³⁶

In his 1893 book *The Division of Labor in Society*, Durkheim delineates the structures of mechanical and organic solidarity essential to his understanding of organic society. Mechanical solidarity arises in those societies in which there is little division of labor—in other words, societies whose members are not materially dependent on each other for survival. Mechanical solidarity produces social homogeneity, for it arises out of a "social cohesion whose cause lies in a "certain conformity of all particular consciences to a common type ..."³⁷ The lack of labor division means that "all the members of the group [are] individually attracted to one another because they resemble one another."³⁸

Organic solidarity—the goal for the new Turkish Republic—is characterized by the lack of resemblance of individual members of the society to each other.³⁹ This lack of resemblance is due to the fact that each individual has different tasks to complete within the division of labor. Unlike mechanical solidarity, which is only possible "in so far as the individual personality is absorbed into the collective personality ... [organic solidarity] is possible only if each one has a sphere of action which is peculiar to him: that is, a personality."⁴⁰ The society united completely on the basis of resemblances would be "the veritable social protoplasm," as each of its members

³⁶ Pearce, 408.

³⁷ Emile Durkheim, *The Division of Labor in Society* (New York: The Free Press, 1966): 105.

³⁸ Durkheim, 105.

³⁹ Parla, 42-50.

⁴⁰ Durkheim, 131.

would be indistinguishable from the other.⁴¹ As one ventures up both the societal and biological ladders, this is increasingly less the case:

Even as the segmented type becomes effaced as we advance in scale of social evolution, the colonial type disappears in so far as we go up in the scale of organisms. Already impaired among the earthworms, although still very apparent, it becomes almost imperceptible among the mollusks, and ultimately only the analysis of a scholar can find any traces of it among the vertebrates. We do not have to show the analogies between the type which replaces the preceding one and that of organic societies. In one case as in the other, the structure derives from the division of labor and its solidarity. Each part of the animal, having become an organ, has its proper sphere of action where it moves independently without imposing itself upon others. But, from another point of view, they depend more upon one another than in a colony, since they cannot separate without perishing.⁴²

The organs in this organic society, moreover, have a brain to coordinate their various separate functions:

It is the [nerve ganglia] which exercise the domination . . . Interposed in the path of sensations, it is exclusively through their mediation that the latter reflect themselves in movements . . . The great social sympathetic must, then, comprise, besides a system of roads for transmission, organs truly regulative which, charged to combine the intestinal acts as the cerebral ganglion combines the external acts, would have the power either to stop the excitations, or to amplify them, or to moderate them according to need.⁴³

Durkheim mixes societal and biological terminology so adeptly that the distinction between the two realms is blurred. In terms of Durkheim's positivist sociology, society is not like an organism, it is an organism.

Moreover, societies, like organisms, are subject in Durkheim's conception to both health and sickness. Indeed, the third chapter of his 1895 book *The Rules of Sociological Method* is titled "Rules for the Distinction of the Normal from the Pathological." In it, he writes that "for societies, as for individuals, health is good and desirable; sickness, on the other hand, is bad and

⁴¹ Durkheim, 174.

⁴² Durkheim, 192.

⁴³ Durkheim, 218.

must be avoided.”⁴⁴ Given that conceiving of a species which “in itself and through its own basic constitution [is] incurably sick” is impossible, and that “it would be inexplicable if the most widespread forms of organization were not also—at least in the aggregate—the most advantageous,” Durkheim concludes that “health is the paramount norm and consequently cannot be in any way abnormal.”⁴⁵ The fact that this norm is by definition the most healthful and advantageous to survival is for Durkheim “proof of [its] superiority.” That which does not conform to the norm is then necessarily “morbid or pathological.”⁴⁶

For Durkheim, “the advantage of distinguishing the normal from the abnormal is principally to throw light upon practice” so that the organism’s/society’s path can be righted if it has entered a pathological state.⁴⁷

This is what occurs in transition periods when the whole species is in the process of evolving, without yet being stabilized in a new and definitive form. In that situation only the normal type extant at the time and grounded in the facts is one that relates to the past but no longer corresponds to the new conditions of existence. A fact can therefore persist through a whole species but no longer correspond to the requirements of the situation. It therefore has only the appearance of normality, and the generality it displays is deceptive; persisting only through the force of blind habit, it is no longer the sign that the phenomenon observed is closely linked to the general conditions of collective existence.⁴⁸

When a society is in a period of transition, characteristics that constituted normalcy may no longer apply to new circumstances, and the society may thus begin to take on the characteristics of the pathological. For this reason, Durkheim argues, the sociologically informed course of action is simple:

We need only to work steadily and persistently to maintain the normal state, to re-establish it if it is disturbed, and to rediscover the conditions of normality if they happen to change. The duty of the statesman is no longer to propel societies violently towards an ideal which appears attractive to him. His role is rather that of the doctor: he forestalls the

⁴⁴ Emile Durkheim, *The Rules of Sociological Method* (New York: The Free Press, 1982): 86-87.

⁴⁵ Durkheim, *The Rules of Sociological Method*, 93.

⁴⁶ Durkheim, *The Rules of Sociological Method*, 91.

⁴⁷ Durkheim, *The Rules of Sociological Method*, 94.

⁴⁸ Durkheim, *The Rules of Sociological Method*, 94-95.

outbreak of sickness by maintaining good hygiene, or when it does break out, seeks to cure it.⁴⁹

The view of society as organism subject to states of sickness or health is exemplified by the proposed role of statesman as doctor in periods of societal change and evolution, and has the effect of making revolution appear to be an organic and inevitable process. Gökalp was writing *The Principles of Turkism* with such a period of societal change and organic r/evolution in mind. With Durkheim's framework, Gökalp was able to move beyond a conception advocated by such Late-Ottoman figures as Musa Süreyya Bey and Necip Asım Bey in which urban Ottoman, or Eastern, music was merely less suitable for the new Turkish nation state than folk music. Instead, Gökalp was able to identify Ottoman music as a relic from a previous model of social organization and therefore as pathological, a "sick" music that had to be removed for the health of the Turkish nation.

The Western "ideal" and the Indolent Arab: Overlapping Orientalisms

In his musical formula, Gökalp joined Durkheimian musical euthanasia with a 19th century tradition of "Ottoman orientalism" directed at Ottoman Arabs. Gökalp employed these frameworks in order to strengthen his case against "Eastern" music by undermining the prestige Ottoman music had traditionally derived from its presumed origins in ancient Greek, "Eastern" civilization. However, neither Durkheim's thought nor the prevailing culture/civilization understanding of Gökalp's formula account for the peculiar geographical sleight of hand Gökalp employed to describe the origins of Eastern and folk music:

The rhythmic music of the East is a musical technique which al-Farabi borrowed from Byzantium and transposed into Arabic. This music penetrated the Havas class of Arabs, Persians and Turks but remained restricted to that class, for it was never able to penetrate the lower strata of the people. This is why Muslim nations have never been able to demonstrate in music the originality that they have in architecture. The Turkish lower classes have created a national popular music by continuing the techniques they had

⁴⁹ Durkheim, *The Rules of Sociological Method*, 104.

developed under Far Eastern civilization, and the Arab and Persian lower classes also continued to use old techniques. As a result, Eastern music has not become the national music of any Eastern nation. Another reason for not calling this Islamic music is the fact that it is not used only by Muslim nations but also in the religious ceremonies of the Orthodox nations, the Armenians and the Jews.⁵⁰

This passage takes us on a tour of the Middle and Far East. Gökalp begins with Eastern music in Byzantium. However, he immediately adds that this music was “transposed into Arabic” by Al-Farabi, just as, in the passage cited above from *The Principles of Turkism*, Gökalp points out that “eastern music ... was borrowed from Byzantium by al-Farabi” and “translated into Arabic by Al-Farabi.” Gökalp’s move was to conflate the origins in Eastern, or Greek, civilization that had been a source of prestige for Ottoman urban music during the Ottoman period with the contemporary resonance of “Eastern” with the shrinking Ottoman Empire’s heavily Arab, eastern provinces in order to undermine the prestige of Ottoman music.

The historical conditions undergirding this move have been articulated in Ussama Makdisi’s concept of Ottoman self-Orientalizing whereby “Ottomans represented their own Arab periphery as an integral part of their engagement with, explicit resistance to, but also implicit acceptance of the indolent Ottoman East.”⁵¹ The loss of Crimea to Russia in 1774, Egypt to Napoleon in 1798, and Greece in the Greek war of independence in the 1820s, among other military crises, forced the Ottoman Empire to re-evaluate its position vis-à-vis European powers, prompting the era of comprehensive reform known as the *Tanzimat*. The Ottoman reformers “acknowledged the subject position of the empire as the ‘sick man of Europe’” and set about articulating “an Ottoman modernity: a state and civilization technologically equal to and temporally coeval with the West but culturally distinct from and politically independent of it.”⁵²

⁵⁰ Gökalp, 42.

⁵¹ Ussama Makdisi, “Ottoman Orientalism,” *The American Historical Review* 107, no. 3 (June 2002): 768.

⁵² Makdisi, 776.

Continuous loss of European territory over the course of the empire's final century culminating in the 1912-1913 Balkan wars further strengthened this "separate but equal" orientation vis à vis Europe.

Within the confines of Western European and American societies, statistics allowed for the disabling of those who did not align with the "norm." On a larger scale, eugenics allowed for a conception of Western Europeans at the top of the evolutionary ladder predicated upon the idea that "the Orient and everything in it was, if not patently inferior to, then in need of corrective study by the West."⁵³ No longer was the Ottoman Empire to be thought of as "an orthodox Islamic dynasty superior to all other empires."⁵⁴ Rather, it would adopt a European temporal conception of "all cultures and peoples at different locations along a continuous evolutionary stream of time" in keeping with nineteenth-century European Orientalist and scientist thought.⁵⁵ Therefore, though nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Ottoman reform projects explicitly proposed parallel European and Ottoman courses of development, these projects implicitly acquiesced to a framework in which "Orientals" were either irredeemably beneath European levels of civilization and even biological development, or could only hope for re-habilitation via adoption of Western models. Just as it led to the wholesale disabling of the Orient on a larger scale, this conception of European progress opened the door to Ottoman Orientalism and the disabling of groups within the Ottoman Empire.

A striking parallel is to be found here with changing European paradigms of "ideal" and "normal." In both pre-enlightenment societies characterized by the "ideal" and the pre-reform Ottoman "orthodox Islamic dynasty superior to all other empires" which had merely to

⁵³ Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979): 40-41.

⁵⁴ Makdisi, 771.

⁵⁵ Makdisi, 772.

perpetuate its assuredly superior existence, individual people were necessarily and unavoidably deficient in comparison to already achieved perfection. If the paradigm is shifted toward human progress, however, individual people or groups of people were deemed abnormal or inferior when placed within the vast organicist, positivist frameworks of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Reformist Ottomans oriented increasingly toward proto-nationalist Turkism found internal inferiority and backwardness to be “nowhere . . . more apparent than in the Arab provinces of the empire.”⁵⁶ This “Ottoman man’s burden” necessitated that the empire “uplift and civilize those peoples who were considered stagnant.”⁵⁷ Though at the time that Gökalp published *The Principles of Turkism* the Ottoman Empire had been defeated in the First World War and the Arab provinces had been lost, conceptions of Eastern and Arab backwardness, and indeed of Arabs and the Eastern parts of the Ottoman territory as impediments to Turkist progress, retained rhetorical power. Indeed, by the time that *The Principles* was circulating, any obligation toward Arab Ottomans as fellow citizens was lost, leaving behind primarily negative associations of Arabs as backward.

Thus, Ottoman orientalism arose as the concept of a diverse, multi-ethnic Ottoman Empire was gradually replaced amidst territorial losses by a racialized, Turkist conception of the Turkish nation with Gökalp at the ideological helm. The citizens of this new Turkish nation “represented themselves as nationally different from and superior to the Arabs whose historical value had passed, and whose present status was subordinated to a putatively more vigorous Turkish nation.”⁵⁸ Increasingly, a conception of the empire as “a Muslim Great Power ruled by

⁵⁶ Makdisi, 770.

⁵⁷ Makdisi, 783.

⁵⁸ Makdisi, 792.

an Ottoman Turkish elite” emerged, centered in an Istanbul located closer and closer to the Westernmost European border of the shrinking empire and “re-made” into the most modern city in the empire during the *Tanzimat* era.⁵⁹ In keeping with nineteenth-century European scientism, the Arabs at the easternmost borders of the empire were viewed as deficient on the scale of racial progress in terms of Ottoman Orientalism. The Turks—considering themselves guides to Arab evolutionary progress—saw themselves in a position to join European civilization and make distinct contributions to it—if they adopted the proper modern tools

In Gökalp’s conception of music, adopting these tools was contingent on fully “disabling” and “euthanizing” “Eastern” music in order to assert the dominance of a homogeneous Turkish nation-state. In so doing, Gökalp made manifest the practice of Orientalism as eugenics. In Gökalp’s musical formula, Western music was re-fashioned as the superior eugenic ideal toward which to strive, folk music could be re-habilitated through prosthetic combination with Western music, and Eastern music with its Arab associations was hopelessly sick and could only be euthanized.

Gökalp’s geographical sleight of hand played an additional role vis à vis folk music. By specifically linking Eastern, or Ottoman, music to Arab music, among others, Gökalp de-coupled Ottoman music from association with the Turkish center of the Ottoman Empire. He thus ensured that Turkish folk music, whose origins were ironically further east in Central Asia in Gökalp’s conception, could not be conceived of as a sickly, racially-deficient product of the East, but rather as a vigorous product of Anatolia which needed only the prosthesis of Western music in order to be rehabilitated as a healthy music for the Turkist nation-state to be. At the same time, Gökalp’s note that the use of Ottoman music by various non-Muslim religious groups has

⁵⁹ Makdisi, 779.

dissuaded him from labeling Eastern music as “Islamic music” served to further dis-associate Ottoman music from the uniformly Turkish and Muslim Turkish nation-state to be.

Gökalp developed his formula through participation in a racialized Turkist conception of the Ottoman state which arose in conjunction with 19th century eugenics and both European and Ottoman Orientalism. Conceiving of the society and by extension the society’s music in Durkheimian terms as an organism, Gökalp acting as diagnostician diagnosed the sick Eastern music that no longer corresponded to conditions of normalcy re-formulated by historical circumstances and increasingly nationalistic Turkism, and proposed a cure to be carried out by a future statesman as doctor. Via a eugenicist tradition of Orientalism coming both from within and without the Empire, he strengthened his position against Ottoman music by re-signifying Ottoman music with attributions applied to Arab Eastern provinces now viewed as “indolent” and backward. With the euthanization of Ottoman or “Eastern” music, the task at hand was to rehabilitate Turkish folk music toward the new Western ideal with the aid of prostheses provided by Western musical polyphonic techniques.

The effect of Gökalp’s formula was, I argue, the construction of a field of music-cultural production in the Turkish Republic in which, much as in Schenker’s dismissal of Stravinskian modernism, an entire musical tradition could be sickly and exact a toll on listener’s health. Moreover, various statements by Atatürk indicate that he was influenced by this conception of Turkish music. For example, Atatürk is quoted as complaining about the state of Turkish music broadcast over the radio: “What is the state of that radio? Always weeping and moaning songs. Do away with them, this nation has a right to joy and gladness.”⁶⁰ Here, Ottoman music is associated with a psychological disturbance retarding the evolution of the Turkish nation.

⁶⁰ Sağlam, 72: ‘Nedir bu radyonun hali? Hep ağlayan, inleyen şarkılar. Kaldırın şunları, bu milletin neşe ve sevinç hakkıdır.

In public settings, Atatürk made repeated reference to Ottoman music's lack of strength and its resulting lethargizing effect. In his famous 1928 *Sarayburnu Gazinosu* speech, Atatürk compared Eastern music negatively to Western music:⁶¹

Tonight as a nice coincidence I heard two of the East's most select music groups. But, my observation about Turkish feelings is this: today that music, that simple music, doesn't suffice to satisfy the Turk's very open spirit and emotions. Now over there the music of the civilized world is heard. The people, who until now have appeared as if they were lifeless confronted with the sweet singing known as Eastern music, now moved immediately to movement and activity. They are all playing. That is very natural. Truly, the Turk's natural disposition is merry and joyful. If that beautiful temperament [of the Turk] is not noticed once and for all, it is not the mistake [of the Turk]. Defective movements have sad and disastrous results. To not notice that is an offense. So, that is why the Turkish nation is laden with grief. However, now the nation has corrected its mistakes with blood; now its heart is at ease, now the Turk is happy, as is his nature. Now the Turk is happy, because the (true Turkish) spirit does not relish in that state which has so disturbed its memory.⁶² At the same time, that belief is a heartfelt wish (1928).⁶³

At another point, Atatürk implied the weakness of Ottoman music while articulating a formula for Turkish national music strikingly similar to Gökalp's:

Ottoman music doesn't have enough strength to sing the great revolutions in the Turkish Republic. We need a new music and that music will be a polyphonic music which takes its essence from folk music. When we come to the thing that you have called habit, does an Anatolian villager listen to your Ottoman Music? Did he ever? There is no habit of that music with [such a villager] (1934).⁶⁴

⁶¹ For a careful discussion of conflicting accounts of this speech, see John Morgan O'Connell, *Ataturka: Style in Turkish Music (1923-1938)* (Ashgate: 2013): 58-64: After considering varying versions and interpretations of the speech, O'Connell concludes that Atatürk used the performances given that evening to demonstrate the unsuitability of Eastern music for the Turkish Republic.

⁶² Though this translation is otherwise the author's own from Kocatürk 1999, for this sentence I have consulted O'Connell's translation in O'Connell 2013.

⁶³ Kocatürk: Bu gece burada güzel bir tesadüf eseri olarak şarkın en seçkin iki musiki topluluğunu dinledim. Fakat, benim Türk duyguları üzerindeki gözlemim şudur ki, artık bu musiki, bu basit musiki, Türk'ün çok açık ruh ve hissini tatmine (satisfaction) kâfi gelemez (to suffice). Şimdi karşıda medeni dünyanın musikisi de işitildi. Bu ana kadar şark musikisi denilen terennümler karşısında cansız gibi görünen halk, derhal harekete ve faaliyete geçti. Hepsini oynuyorlar. Bu pek tabiidir. Hakikaten, Türk yaradılıştan şen ve neşelidir. Eğer onun bu güzel huyu bir zaman için fark olunmamışsa, kendinin kusuru değildir. Kusurlu (defective) hareketlerin acı (bitter, sad), felaketli (disastrous) neticeleri vardır. Bunu fark etmemek, kabahattir. İşte Türk millet bunun için gamlandı. Fakat, artık millet hatalarını kanı ile düzeltmiştir; artık gönüllü rahattır, artık Türk şendir, yaradılışında olduğu gibi. Artık Türk şendir, çünkü ona ilişmenin tehlikeli olduğu tekrar ispat istemez, kanaatindedir. Bu kanaat aynı zamanda temennidir.

⁶⁴ Utkan Kocatürk, Atatürk'ün Fikir ve Düşünceleri, (Ankara: Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi (1999): 'Osmanlı musikisi Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'ndeki büyük inkılapları terennüm edecek kudrette değildir. Bize yeni bir musiki lazımdır ve bu musiki özünü Halk Musikisinden alan çok sesli bir musiki

These statements indicate that Atatürk adopted a disabling view of Ottoman music as sick, lacking in strength, and causing lethargy in listeners. In the first of the above statements, it is as if Atatürk has deliberately spoken in the manner of a Durkheimian Statesman as doctor.

Observing that “simple” Eastern music is no longer suitable to the condition of the Turk who has violently corrected the “mistakes” of the past, Atatürk speaks as if Eastern music’s continued presence will bring about dire results for the Turkish nation. In the second statement, Atatürk references the alleged “weakness” of Ottoman music more directly, and again notes that it is not suitable to the needs of the Turkish Republic. The fact that Atatürk publicly expressed such views indicates that he was participating in the disabling field of music that Ziya Gökalp helped to establish with his musical formula in *The Principles of Turkism*, and that this conception continued to influence his views on the field of music in the Turkish Republic.

Sağlam relates an account of Atatürk’s thoughts on a modern Turkish music derived from Ottoman music that makes clear that Atatürk was very opposed to music with roots in Ottoman/Turkish art music such as Alnar’s *Kanun Concerto*. Thinking to fulfill Atatürk’s wishes for a polyphonic music based on Turkish music, a certain Dr. Talay took a *peşrev* and a *saz semai* (genres of Ottoman/Turkish Art music) to Istanbul composer Edgar Manas to be arranged polyphonically. Apparently, Talay had the result played before Atatürk and several other musical and cultural notables. After some discussion over the work’s merits, Atatürk slammed his fist on the table and said “that’s reactionism!” (“Bu bir irticadır!”). According to Sağlam, “this means that Atatürk knows that the root of ‘Turkish music’ of the Ottoman period is Mevlevi music

olacaktır. İtiyat dediğiniz şeye gelince, sizin Osmanlı musikinizi Anadolu köylüsü dinler mi? Dinlemiş mi? Onda o musikinin itiyadı yoktur.

[Sunni Sufi mystical music] and that it has a natural tie to religion. He says in quite clear words it will not be possible to benefit from a music with that root.”⁶⁵

Gökalpists and Musical Disabling

In order to gain control of the field of music-cultural production in Turkey, the Gökalpists strategized so as to turn the field as they found it on its head: what was thought to be native was actually an imposter. And for the attack on this imposter, claws came out. According to the Gökalpists, Ottoman music was not merely non-native and no longer suitable for conditions in the Turkish Republic, it was sick, indolent, and un-natural. The truly native music, which in the context of Turkish nationalism was key to control of the field of symbolic capital, was located among the Anatolian peasants, waiting for its European prosthesis.

This discourse created a disabling field of music-cultural production in the Turkish Republic, and Alnar was disabled by/in it. In the second quote above, Atatürk refers to the lack of a “habit” of Ottoman music among Anatolian villagers—in other words, the real Turks. Such a statement from Atatürk would have sent a clear message to Alnar that there was little place for his *habitus* in Ottoman music within the Turkish Republic. Upon hearing such a statement from Atatürk, it seems likely that Alnar, ostensibly one of those leading the charge of the music revolution, would have felt the need to “conceal” his “habit” of Ottoman music so as to pass as a full-blooded Turkish Republican composer. To put the problem in terms of Practice Theory and Disability Theory, the practice of Ottoman music was a site of negative symbolic capital in the field of Turkish Republican music-cultural production and moreover was associated with sickness and weakness, and Alnar’s *habitus* in Ottoman music was therefore not accommodated

⁶⁵ Sağlam, 108: demek ki Atatürk Osmanlı dönemi ‘Türk Musikisi’ kökeninin mevlevi musikisi olduğunu ve bunun din ile doğal bağını biliyor. Bu kökene sahip bir musikiden yararlanılamayacağına yönelik çok açık sözler söylüyor. Zaten musiki devrimine ilişkin sözleri ve uygulamaları da bu açık sözlerdeki fikirlerin kararlı göstergesi olarak değerlendirilmelidir.

by the segment of Turkish society to which he ostensibly belonged. This circumstance indicates that Alnar can be considered disabled by lack of accommodation in the sense that he possessed a characteristic deemed by those in power to constitute an illness.

Challenging Gökalp: Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel

Seeing the field of Ottoman cultural production in which he was prominently positioned increasingly threatened by the emergent disablist discourse and accusations of illness outlined above, Alnar's first harmony teacher Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel strategized to re-situate the beleaguered Ottoman music in terms of Turkish ethnic nationalism. Arel (1880-1955) was a practitioner of both Ottoman and Western music, having composed both Ottoman monophonic and Western polyphonic music, as well as numerous polyphonic pieces of music incorporating Turkish *makam*-s. In terms of the Alafranga/Alaturka musical dichotomy, in other words, Arel effectively controlled all aspects of the field of Ottoman music-cultural production.

Moreover, Arel was otherwise highly educated and prosperous. Growing up in Istanbul and Izmir, he enjoyed the best education that the Ottoman Empire could offer, ultimately completing studies in law at the Imperial Law Faculty in Istanbul and learning French, German, English, Arabic, and Persian. Early in his career, he worked in a series of civil service positions which took him on an extended visit to Europe and the United States and evidently made him rather wealthy—his personal library was considered among the finest in Ottoman Turkey for both law and music. In terms of Bourdieuan theory, Arel was both a dominant member of the field of cultural production and a member of the dominant class of the Ottoman Empire. Arel was not, in other words, a member of a sub-altern group as John Morgan O'Connell's account of *Alaturka* might lead us to believe.

Though interested in reforming Ottoman music, Arel had little incentive to disturb the field of music-cultural production in Turkey, for he already possessed the symbolic capital necessary to define the field in terms of Alaturka/Alafranga.⁶⁶ With the founding of the Turkish Republic and the “Gökalpist” music revolution that accompanied it, however, Arel’s dominant positionality was abruptly and dramatically challenged by the modernist folk/Western hybrid that had been proposed. Arel’s response to the Gökalpists came most significantly in a series of 14 essays published under the title *Whose is Turkish Music (Türk Musikisi Kimindir?)* during 1939-1940 in the journal *Turkishness (Türklük)*, in which he fired a powerful salvo on behalf of Ottoman/Turkish art music.⁶⁷

In *Whose is Turkish Music? (Türk Musikisi Kimindir?)*, Arel attacks the Gökalpists by critiquing Gökalp’s formula. On the first page of the book he writes that “in our midst some people are of the opinion that the music known as Turkish music is not our national music. Although those holding that opinion are in unanimity on the point that Turkish music came from a foreign nation, they cannot agree on the matter of which nation: some attribute our music to the Iranians, some to the Arabs, some to the Greeks, and some to the Byzantines.”⁶⁸ These are the four foreign musics that Gökalp mentions in his formula. In sections titled “Iranian Music” (“*Iran Musikisi*”), “Arab Music” (“*Arap Musikisi*”), “Ancient Greek Music” (“*Eski Yunan Musikisi*”), and “Byzantine Music” (“*Bizans Musikisi*”), Arel counters claims that Turkish music was derived from any of these musics.

⁶⁶ Yılmaz Öztuna, *Büyük Türk mûsikisi ansiklopedisi* (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1990).

⁶⁷ See Walter Feldman, “Cultural Authority and Authenticity in the Turkish Repertoire,” *Asian Music* 22, No. 1 (Autumn, 1990 – Winter, 1991)

⁶⁸ Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel, *Türk Musikisi Kimindir* (Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Türk Musikisini Araştırma ve Değerlendirme Komisyonu Yayınları, 1969): 1: Aramızda bazı kimseler Türk musikisi denilen sanatın bizim milli musikimiz olmadığı kanaatindedirler. Bu kanaate sahip olanların hepsi Türk musikisinin yabancı bir milletten bize geçtiği noktasında birleşmekle beraber hangi milletten geçtiği hususunda ittifak edememişlerdir: musikimizi kimisi iranlılara, kimisi araplara, kimisi yunanlılara, kimisi de bizanslılara mal ediyorlar.

As John Morgan O'Connell has also noted, Arel's goal was to establish that Ottoman musical practices have an origin in Central Asia by drawing on the nationalist linguistic Sun Language theory in vogue at the time. Arel articulates his critique by first cutting the ties Turkish music was alleged to have with ancient Greek music. He argues that analysis of scale structures shows no relationship between Turkish music and ancient Greek music, and that despite "the great Farabi's efforts, Greek theories were never adopted and Turkish music almost stubbornly resisted their application," and that both the Arabs and Persians actually took *their* music from the Turks. He then proceeds to his linguistically derived theory of Turkish music:⁶⁹

"... what would you say if I claimed that, rather than giving their music to us, the ancient Greeks took their music from the east?"

There are a number of indications corroborating that thesis. I will now talk about just one of them:

According to the writings of the English expert Woolley, who has led excavations at the city Ur in Chaldea for the past seven years, it has been found that the Sumerian civilization in the Fırat Valley was in a highly developed and advanced condition when the Egyptian civilization—until recently thought to be the world's oldest—was still in a condition of savagery. The Egyptian, Babylonian, Assyrian, Hebraic, and Phoenician civilizations all relied fundamentally on the Sumerian civilization. Sumerian civilization is the predecessor of Occidental civilization. The ancient Greeks also borrowed from Sumerian civilization.

Furthermore, one of the big pieces of evidence that I have yet to talk about is the fact that the Turks didn't take their musics from just anywhere, but rather that it is a fact that they brought them all the way from Central Asia. That fact shines like the sun above all the other claims, arguments, and comparisons.

However, because I have been busy dealing with what will be deemed the negative side of whether or not we took music from the Iranians, Arabs, Greeks, and Byzantines, I want to consider the positive side of where Turkish music came from face to face, without mixing it in with this series of articles. At that time, it is my expectation that I will find the opportunity to scrutinize both the matter that Turks brought their music from Central Asia and the matter of which transformations Turkish music passed through to the present day"⁷⁰

⁶⁹ Arel, 156.

⁷⁰ Arel 162-163: Mesela eski Yunanlıların bize musiki vermedikten başka, doğudan musiki almış olduklarını isbat edersem ne buyurursunuz?

Arel's derived his argument from the "Sun Language Theory" in order to beat Gökalp in his own game of Turkish musical purism.⁷¹ This theory proposed that all world languages had evolved from a language that had developed among the Sumerians, who were themselves considered to be proto-Turks. Initially proposed by an Austrian linguist named Hermann Kvergiec during the 1930s, the theory was enthusiastically accepted by Atatürk, who went on to ghostwrite a series of front page newspaper articles on this topic.⁷² Arel's explicit reference to the Sumerians and assertion of the shining clarity of the fact that Turkish music came all the way from Central Asia draws on writings of contemporary "Sun Language Theory" proponents. Indeed, in the preface to the 1935 *Türkçeden Osmanlıcaya Cep Kılavuzu (Pocket Guide From Turkish to Ottoman)*, the author writes that it is "daily becoming more certain that 'the languages termed non-Turkish are equally of Turkish origin'" and that "there can be no doubt that the great truth we are referring to will soon reveal itself with the brightness of the sun."⁷³ That Arel was astute and well-read enough to strategically co-opt a linguistic theory favored by Atatürk is

Bu tezi teyit eden pek çok emareler vardır. Ben şimdilik yalnız bir tanesinden bahsedeceğim: Kalde ülkesindeki eski Ur şehrinin hafriyatını yedi sene idare etmiş olan İngiliz alimlerinden Woolley'in yazdığına göre, yakın zamanlara kadar dünyanın en eski medeniyeti sanılan ve bütün diğer medeniyetlerin anası sayılan Mısır medeniyetinden çok evvel (Milattan 3500 sene önce) henüz Mısır vahşet halinde iken Fırat vadisinde Sümer medeniyeti çoktan inkişaf ve terakki etmiş bir vaziyette bulunuyordu. Mısırlıların, Babillilerin, Asurilerin, İbranilerin, Fenikelilerin medeniyetleri esas itibarile hep Sümer medeniyetine dayanmaktadır. Şimdiki garp medeniyetinin öncüsü Sümer medeniyetidir; Yunanlılar da Sümer medeniyetinden iktibaslarda bulunmuşlardır. Henüz bahsetmediğim büyük delillerden biri de Türklerin kendi musikilerini şuradan buradan aşırılmayıp (to get something) ta Orta Asyadan birlikte getirmiş oldukları vakıasıdır. Ve bu vakia diğer bütün iddiaların, istidlallerin, münakaşaların, mukayeselerin üstünde güneş gibi parlamaktadır. Fakat şimdiki halde İranlılardan, Araplardan, Yunanlılardan, Bizanslılardan musiki alıp almadığımız şeklinde işin yalnız menfi adedilebilecek tarafı ile meşgul olduğum için Türk musikisinin nereden geldiği şeklindeki müspet tarafını bu makaleler sırasına karıştırmıyarak başlı-başına tetkik etmek isterim. O vakit Türklerin kendi musikilerini Orta Asyadan getirdikleri meselesini de Türk musikisinin şimdiye kadar ne tahavvüller geçirdiği meselesini de incelemeğe fırsat bulmak ümidindeyim.

⁷¹ O'Connell, *Alaturka*, 74-75.

⁷² Lewis, 58.

⁷³ Lewis, 58.

evidenced throughout *Türk Musikisi Kimindir* by his engagement with European orientalist such as Joseph von Hammer and Raphael Georg Kiesewetter, Jules Rouanety, and Egon Wellesz.⁷⁴

With *Türk Musikisi Kimindir*, Arel thus aimed at several goals. By arguing that the flow of influence was not into Turkish music from Greek, Byzantine, Arab, and Persian as Gökalp had argued but rather from Turkish music to these musics, he directly engages Gökalp's musical formula and turns it around on its head. His negation of Farabi's role as intercessor between Turkish and Arabic music further emphasizes his direct engagement with Gökalp. With his own geographical sleight of hand to mirror Gökalp's, he alludes to Turkish Art Music's origins in the Turkic Ur-civilization of the Sun Language Theory, thereby aligning himself with a highly influential theory of the time which had been endorsed and even to some extent developed by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk. Arel's goal was to enhance both his and Turkish Art Music's flagging positionality within the field of Turkish music-cultural production, and he later called on his former student and protégé Hasan Ferid Alnar to contribute to this goal by composing the *Kanun Concerto*.

Positions on the Battle Field

Musicians and scholars took a number of positions in reaction to the newly polarized and polarizing field of Turkish music-cultural production. Performers, scholars, and reformist ideologues grouped at the Gökalpian and Arelist extremes as well as between these two poles, with the radio emerging as a particularly effective site for advancing models of the proper Turkish music. These debates and the changes to Turkish music culture they wrought took place alongside a broader set of comprehensive reforms to Turkish society imposed by the Turkish state. Debates about the future of Turkish music themselves were heavily influenced by state

⁷⁴ John Morgan O'Connell notes that Ahmed Adnan Saygun argued that "[Atatürk's] interest in musical reform [was] profoundly influenced by energetic involvement in language reform," O'Connell 2013, 69.

manipulation of resources and cultural practices, and by attempts to interpret statements on music coming from Mustafa Kemal Atatürk himself.

In the first decades after the founding of the Republic, Turkish state agents worked to construct the categories of Turkish art and Turkish folk music along Gökaltın lines. These music reforms were conducted alongside other state-imposed reforms such as the closing of Mevlevi *Tekke*-s, the banning of Ottoman dress, the adoption of European law codes, and the 1928 imposition of the Latin Alphabet. Efforts to manipulate Ottoman musical traditions can be traced as early as 1924, when, as John Morgan O’Connell has demonstrated, the state began to cut funding for *Alaturka* music and increase funding for *Alafranga* music at the *Darül’elhan*—the sole conservatory extant at the time. By 1926 the *Alaturka* department had been reduced to the “Society for the Fixing and Classification of Turkish music” (*Alaturka Mûzikî Tasnif ve Tespit Heyeti*), which was charged with collecting and documenting Turkish music.⁷⁵ This effort was led by Rauf Yekta Bey from 1926 until his death in 1935, and included as members İsmail Hakkı Bey, Mesut Cemil, Ahmed Irsoy, Dr. Suphi Ezgi, A.R. Cağatay.⁷⁶

Having learned from masters at the Galata and Yenikapı Mevlevi *Tekke*-s, as well as from mathematician Zalih Zeki Bey, Yekta Bey is acknowledged alongside Dr. Şuphi Ezgi and Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel as an important reformer and theorist of Ottoman music.⁷⁷ In addition to various Turkish publications, Yekta Bey submitted pieces to the French *Revue Musical* and contributed an article, ‘*La Musique Turque*’, to Albert Lavignac’s 1913 *Encyclopédie de la Musique et Dictionnaire du Conservatoire*.⁷⁸ These French publications are characteristic of

⁷⁵ John Morgan O’Connell, “Fine Art, Fine Music: Controlling Turkish Taste at the Fine Arts Academy in 1926.” *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 32 (2000): 117-142.

⁷⁶ Öztuna, 169-170.

⁷⁷ Öztuna, 170.

⁷⁸ Öztuna, 170.

Rauf Yekta Bey's application of European analytical techniques to Ottoman music, evidenced by such efforts as his use of scientific instruments and mathematical calculation to illustrate the distinct interval structures of Ottoman music vis à vis Western music, and his application of European notation and European-derived accidental markings to Ottoman music.⁷⁹

In line with the Herderian thought of Gökâlp and others regarding the importance of folk song to national identity, the Turkish state also sponsored a number of folk-song collecting trips to the Anatolian countryside in the first years after the Republic was founded. The first of these was a folk song collecting trip made by the brothers Seyfeddin and Sezai Asaf which resulted in the 1926 volume "Melodies of Our Country."⁸⁰ Following this trip, the aforementioned Society for the Fixing and Classification of Turkish Music made a series of four trips between 1926 and 1929 to collect folk songs.⁸¹ Turkish musicologist Mahmut Ragıp Gazimihal promoted these folk song collecting efforts with his 1928 book *Anatolian Folk Songs and Our Musical Future* (*Anadolu Türküleri ve Musiki İstikbalımız*) and his 1929 book—written after his participation in the fourth collection trip— *Eastern Anatolian songs and dances* (*Doğu Anadolu Türküleri ve Oyunları*). In 1936, Béla Bartók came to collect and to test his theory on ties between Hungarian and Turkic folk songs.⁸²

Gazimihal straddled the Gökâlpian concern for the folk with a Sun-Language inspired theory along the lines of Arel, and called for a "Russian School" where folk melodies could be collected.⁸³ Trained in Germany and France, Gazimihal was one of the first Turkish musicologists, and spent the bulk of his career at the Ankara Conservatory and the Gazi Institute

⁷⁹ O'Connell, 76.

⁸⁰ See Süleyman Şenel, "Darülelhan Heyeti Tarafından 'Fonograf'la Derlenen İlk Türkü ..." *Musiki Dergisi*, <http://www.musikidergisi.net/?p=1218>.

⁸¹ Mahmut Ragıp Gazimihal, *Şarkı Anadolu Türküleri ve Oyunları. İstanbul Konservatuvarı Folklor Heyeti'nin dördüncü tetkik sehahtı münesebetıyla* (İstanbul: Evkaf Atbassı, 1929), 6.

⁸² O'Connell, 74; see also Ahmed Adnan Saygun, "Bartok in Turkey." *The Musical Quarterly* 37 no. 1 (1951): 5-9.

⁸³ O'Connell, *Alaturka*, 54.

in Ankara.⁸⁴ Though careful to point out that he was not a follower of Gökalp, as his ideas about folk song had developed simultaneously, Gazimihal likewise called for use of folk songs in the development of the new Turkish national music. He made this call via a theory reminiscent of the Sun-Language Theory yet distinct from Arel's approach that placed the origins of Turkish folk music, rather than Ottoman urban music, in Central Asia.⁸⁵ With this theory, Gazimihal argued that there were connections between Turkish folk songs and those in Central Asia, the Caucasus, Crimea, and the Balkans.⁸⁶ By emphasizing the unity of Turkic folk music across national boundaries, Gazimihal thus negatively emphasized its independence from the Greek, Armenian, and other musics within Turkish borders, which according to his (and Gökalp's) thinking were related to Ottoman music.⁸⁷ His position vis-à-vis Ottoman music becomes more clear when he criticizes Rauf Yekta Bey for focusing on "the classical music [the Turks] took from the Arabs and Persians."⁸⁸ Significantly in this regard, as Seeman points out, his use of the work "türkü" for the newly collected folk songs served to distinguish them from the Ottoman *şarki*.⁸⁹

The heavy-handedness of state music reforms is illustrated by the early history of the Turkish radio. In the late 1920s and early 1930s, programs with names such as "Suite Ensemble" (*Fasıl Heyeti*), and "Court Music" (*Divan Müziği*) evidence an unbroken link with Ottoman musical culture, while at the same time Western music was already granted a considerable

⁸⁴ "Mahmut Ragıp Gazimihal," Turkish Music Portal: Composers and Performers, accessed April 23, 2015, <http://www.turkishmusicportal.org/composer.php?id=18&lang2=en>.

⁸⁵ O'Connell, 55.

⁸⁶ Gazimihal, 3-5

⁸⁷ Seeman, "Exnominating Turk – Hyper-nominating "Çingene": Musical Representations of Ethnicity and Turkishness in the Early Republic," in *Sounding Roman: Representation and Performing Identity in Western Turkey* (New York: Oxford University Press, forthcoming): 13.

⁸⁸ Gazimihal, 3.

⁸⁹ Seeman, 13.

portion of radio air time.⁹⁰ In the early 1930s, taking state radios in the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany as models, reformers woke up to the potential of the radio for reforming Turkish culture.⁹¹ The day after Atatürk’s famous November 1, 1934 speech before parliament on the need for progress in Turkish music, the Turkish Minister of the Interior Şükrü Kaya called for the banning of all Turkish music from the radio, and a commission was formed to coordinate and enact musical reforms.⁹² For two years, only Western music—and especially Western popular music—was broadcast, with Turkish music being gradually reinstated after 1936—this time with the state in firm control of the radio.⁹³ The two year ban functioned as a reset button for reformers, who were then able to impose new categories on the music inherited from the Ottoman Empire.

The *türkü*-s gathered in state-sponsored folk song collecting trips could be put to work in the creation of Turkish Folk Music after the radio’s ban on Turkish music began to be lifted in 1936. Particularly influential in this regard was the radio program “Voices from the Countryside” (“*Yurttan Sesler*”), instituted in 1938, which presented songs from the different regions of Turkey. Muzaffer Sarısözen, director of the folklore archives at the Ankara State Conservatory, led this program. According to Seeman, the effect of “Voices from the Countryside” was to impose internal divisions on Gazimihal’s already established codification of Turkish Folk Music against the musics of other ethnic groups in Thrace and Anatolia which at the same time negated the music of these groups.⁹⁴ These were divisions within unity, for they reflected not the different ethnic and cultural backgrounds of communities within the Turkish Republic, but rather

⁹⁰ Seeman, 11; Bartsch, 229-244.

⁹¹ Seeman, 11.

⁹² Seeman, 12; O’Connell *Alaturka*, 65.

⁹³ Seeman, 12; Bartsch, 229-244.

⁹⁴ Seeman, 14.

the different regions of Turkey, which were represented on *Yurttan Sesler* by way of a “local color” instrument, such as *kemençe* for the Black Sea region, added to the base Turkish Folk Music ensemble. By categorizing and circulating folk songs over the radio and through notation according to region rather than ethnicity, the government was able to impose the desired Turkish unity over diversity left over from the Ottoman Empire, thus simultaneously forming Turkish Folk Music and Turkish national identity.

Cellist and choir director Mesut Cemil Bey’s career constitutes an Arelist response to Gökalpian reforms. As the son of *tanbur* virtuoso Tanburi Cemil Bey, Mesut Cemil Bey was born into Ottoman music royalty.⁹⁵ Mesut Cemil Bey began studying Ottoman music in Istanbul in his youth, and fell in with a now familiar crowd. He met Rauf Yekta Bey at the Mevlevi *tekke*, took *tanbur* lessons from Dr. Suphi Ezgi, and entered into Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel’s circle. With Arel’s encouragement and financial support, Mesut Cemil left his law studies and went to Berlin to study cello, resolving while there to found a new Turkish music. However, according to Yılmaz Öztuna—himself a student of Arel— “very violent opposition to the development of Turkish music” initially hindered this goal.⁹⁶ Mesut Cemil performed, studied, and worked in various locations—including at the *Darül’elhan* for the Society for the Classification and Correction of Turkish Music—until 1938, when he was appointed to a job at the Ankara Radio and founded the “Classic Chorus.”⁹⁷ With this choir, Mesut Cemil was able to develop his “new Turkish music.” Öztuna describes that this choir helped to “bring a modern, serious, and very musical understanding to the completely degenerate performance of Turkish music,” and further notes that music historians cannot help but recognize Mesut Cemil Bey’s tenure with the choir as

⁹⁵ Öztuna, 124.

⁹⁶ Öztuna, 124.

⁹⁷ Öztuna, 124-125.

the period in which “clean” performances of Turkish music began to replace the “degenerate” heterophony and improvisatory style of performances which had preceded.⁹⁸

Efforts such as Mesut Cemil Bey’s “clean” choir were an attempt to reclaim and re-fashion the urban musical traditions of the Ottoman Empire as a Turkish Art Music canon amidst the attacks of folk music proponents, and illustrate a muddling of Gökalpian views toward Ottoman urban music after Atatürk’s death.⁹⁹ With the founding of the Republic, the state had closed important centers of Ottoman art music production such as the court, the Mevlevi *tekke*, and the *Darül’elhan* but, as Seeman argues, the state was not able to shut down the urban musical entertainment in taverns (*meyhane-s*), nightclubs (*gazino-s*), restaurants and formal musical evenings (*meşk-s*).¹⁰⁰ The fact that these remained the only settings in which Ottoman musical traditions could be heard provided good fodder for the Gökalpists, who were thus able to paint Ottoman musical traditions as lowly market or commercial (*piyasa*) music, not only sick and disabled but also down-and-out. In a fight waged on the radio by figures such as Mesut Cemil Bey, and in print through the Turkish radio’s magazine *Radio (Radyo)* and the *Turkish Music Journal (Türk Müzik Mecmuası)*, musicians, musicologists, state agents, and journalists forged the category of Turkish Art Music (*Türk Sanat Müziği*) by a process of “alterity marking” in which *piyasa* music was labeled a “corrupt other” vis à vis Turkish Art Music.¹⁰¹ This despite the fact that many of the Turkish Art Music performers venerated by these agents also performed in *piyasa* settings.¹⁰² Proponents of Ottoman musical traditions thus sought to re-claim them from annihilation on the one hand and from the unfavorable cultural positions provided by

⁹⁸ Öztuna, 124.

⁹⁹ Bartsch, 229-244.

¹⁰⁰ Seeman, 23.

¹⁰¹ Seeman, 24; Sonia Seeman, “Orientalism/Occidentalism and Nesting Alterities: Refracting identities in “Turkish Art Music” 1930 – 1950,” delivered at Society for Ethnomusicology national conference, 2014.

¹⁰² Seeman, *Orientalism/Occidentalism*.

nightclubs and taverns on the other by re-fashioning them as a distinctly Arelian Turkish art music. A slippage in Republican music policy after Atatürk's death can thus be observed: though Atatürk and Gökalp had made clear calls for the elimination of Ottoman urban music, this task was not completed. Indeed, a 1948 radio poll indicated a continued widespread preference for Ottoman urban music over Turkish folk and Western music amongst listeners, its role in the Turkish music revolution continued to be debated in official circles throughout the 1940s.¹⁰³ As we shall see, Alnar capitalized on this ambivalent attitude toward Ottoman music during the 1940s to compose his Cello Concerto.

Alnar's Strategic Turn to Europe

The Dramatic changes in the field of music-cultural production in the years after the founding of the Turkish Republic described above threatened Hasan Ferid Alnar's favorable positionality in the Late-Ottoman field of music-cultural production and prompted him to reconsider his career path. The field of late-Ottoman music-cultural production for which Alnar was so well suited began to unravel during this period, which can already be seen in his above cited diary entry on the prospect of leaving the *Darüttalimi Musiki* and escaping the role of *piyasa* musician to study in Europe.¹⁰⁴ Alnar made this diary entry in 1924, so it is difficult to argue that he already perceived his participation in the *Darüttalimi Musiki* as degrading commercial activity—more likely that the position of professional musicians was simply not that high to begin with in the Ottoman Empire. Nonetheless, his statement is curiously prescient, for it is certain that had he continued as a *kanun* performer his positionality in the field of Turkish Republican music-cultural production would have been severely damaged. As is evident, however, Alnar's position at the center of the Late-Ottoman field of music-cultural production

¹⁰³ Bartsch, 215-229.

¹⁰⁴ Okyay, 35.

was likely to be problematic as well, closely allied as he was with Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel, the de facto leader of the defenders of Ottoman musical traditions in the Turkish Republic. In this light, it appears all the more likely that Alnar's decision to go to Vienna in 1927 for intensive study of Western music was a strategic move to maintain and improve his position in the shifting field of music-cultural production in the early Turkish Republic.

The Turkish Five, or, Four plus One

Once he had acquired the requisite European training, Alnar's position was shaped by his inclusion in the "Turkish Five" along with composers Necil Kazım Akses, Ulvi Cemal Erkin, Cemal Reşit Rey, and Ahmed Adnan Saygun. Membership in this prominent group enhanced Alnar's positionality within the field of music in the early Turkish Republic. However, this enhanced positionality and greater visibility in turn constrained the artistic choices available to him.

As its name suggests, the "Turkish Five" had a Russian precedent. In 1926 Gazimihal had called for a national school of music.¹⁰⁵ As in the Russian case, Gazimihal envisioned a school where folk tunes would be collected and adapted to the contemporary compositional needs of the Turkish Republic.¹⁰⁶ The "Turkish Five" designation itself was inspired by the name given by Vladimir Stasov to an emerging group of Russian nationalist composers after a concert in 1867. Through their extensive use of Russian melodies, "Russian Five," or "Mighty Handful," composers were instrumental in forging a path for Russian composers distinct from the German model that had previously dominated, and were thus important to a growing sense of Russian cultural identity in the late nineteenth century.¹⁰⁷ The Turkish Five designation was first given

¹⁰⁵ O'Connell, *Alaturka*, 54.

¹⁰⁶ O'Connell, *Alaturka*, 54-55.

¹⁰⁷ See Richard Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically: Historical and Hermeneutical essays* (Princeton University Press, 1997).

after a 1939 “Modern Turkish Music Festival” concert featuring music from each composer. After being coined in the press, the name caught on.¹⁰⁸ Though relations between the Ottoman and Russian Empires had traditionally been hostile, they improved significantly in the Republic’s early years, and Russian composers’ successful exploitation of their peripherality to gain a secure place in the European concert repertoire must have appeared an emulable model to Turkish music reformers likewise aiming for a blend of Turkish essence and European acceptance.¹⁰⁹

Not just any Turkish essence was acceptable, however. Due to his *habitus* in Ottoman music, Hasan Ferid Alnar’s career was significantly different from those of other Turkish Five composers. I take Cemal Reşid Rey’s early training and career as an example of the predominately European training and compositional oeuvre of the other four Turkish Five composers in order to illustrate this difference. Born in 1904, Cemal Reşid Rey enjoyed a privileged youth as the son of an Ottoman Minister of Foreign Relations. As a young child he first learned to sing with the harmonica. With lessons from his mother, Rey began reading music, playing the piano, and making first attempts at composition by age eight. Due to his father’s position as an Ottoman Minister, Rey’s family moved to Paris in 1913. There, Rey came into contact with Gabriel Faure, who set him up with piano lessons with Marguerite Long. With the outbreak of World War 1, Rey moved with his mother to Geneva, where he took up studies at the Geneva Conservatory. After a year back in Istanbul in 1919, during which he composed a short operetta, Rey turned back to Paris, where he resumed piano study with Marguerite Long and took composition from Raoul Laparra, music aesthetics from Faure, and orchestration with Henri Defosse. During these Paris years he also composed several operas. Returning to Istanbul in

¹⁰⁸ Aydın, 23.

¹⁰⁹ See Zeynep Kezer, *Building Modern Turkey: State, Space, and Ideology in the Early Republic* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2015): 68-73.

1923, where Rey taught piano and composition at the Istanbul Conservatory, he founded an orchestra and a polyphonic choir. Yılmaz Aydın notes that around 1925-1926, Rey began to feel his interest in Turkish folk music awaken, and composed the 12 Anatolian Folk Songs (*12 Anadolu Türküsü*) for piano and voice. Returning once more to Paris, he orchestrated these songs, and had them premiered by the Padeloup Orchestra. It is likely that the first folk song collecting trips made by Seyfettin and Sezai Asaf and the Society for the Fixing and Classification of Turkish Music influenced Rey's interest in folk music. It is also possible that, as a well-educated, cosmopolitan, and ambitious young man, Rey could see the writing on the wall with the founding of the Turkish Republic and strategized accordingly.¹¹⁰

Like Alnar, Rey and the other Turkish Five composers had opportunities for a good education, tutelage in foreign languages, and early experience and study of music. Both Alnar and Rey were thus both well-positioned in late Ottoman society and had the potential—which was ultimately realized—to occupy favorable positions in the field of Ottoman/Turkish music-cultural production. Despite the many commonalities between them, however, in terms of their early musical experiences Alnar and Rey were quite different. As I have demonstrated, Alnar had a *habitus* in Ottoman music derived from his mother and uncle's performance of Ottoman urban music at home and performing on the *kanun*. Neither Rey nor any of the other Turkish Five composers shared a similar experience. As a result, the other Turkish Five composers were better able to fit themselves to the field of music-cultural production in the Turkish Republic than Alnar.

From “Mighty Five” to Mtsensk: Musical Disabling in Russia

¹¹⁰ Aydın, 25-27.

Just as nineteenth-century Russian national music gave the inspiration to Turkish Republican reformers, a form of state-imposed musical disabling also occurred in the Soviet Union. There, the doctrine of socialist realism proscribed modernism, or “formalism,” as degenerate much as in the Austrian *Staendestaat* and Nazi Germany, and called on artists to produce works that glorified the working class and furthered the Soviet cause. The famous case of Shostakovich’s Fifth Symphony—written as an “apology” after the 1936 denunciation of Shostakovich’s opera *The Lady Macbeth of the Mtsensk District* in *Pravda*—illustrates the extent of Soviet musical disabling.¹¹¹ Given the threat posed by the Soviet “Great Terror,” during which many artists were killed, a case can arguably be made not only for musical disabling—though Shostakovich was thereafter forever wary of deviations from Soviet stylistic orthodoxy—but also for physical disabling: Shostakovich was badly shaken after the *Pravda* denunciation, and reportedly contemplated suicide.¹¹²

The Turkish case provides a valuable counterpart to disabling discourses about music in the Soviet Union, Germany, and Austria. Whereas these—albeit for different reasons—directed their ire toward musical modernism characterized as “degenerate,” Turkish reformers were ostensibly in favor of modernism, though in reality early Turkish Republican cultural policy bears strong resemblance to that of contemporary Socialist Realism and Fascism. Rather than toward modernism—the future—musically disabling discourse in Turkey was directed toward Ottoman music—the past.

Conclusion

¹¹¹ Richard Taruskin, “Public Lies and Unspeakable Truth: Interpreting Shostakovich's Fifth Symphony.” In *Shostakovich Studies*, ed. D. Fanning (Cambridge, 1995), 17–56.

¹¹² David Fanning, “Shostakovic, Dmitry: 1926-1936.” In *Grove Music Online*, accessed April 26, 2016, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/subscriber/article/grove/music/52560pg2#S52560.2>.

In the first decades after the founding of the Turkish Republic, Alnar strategically oriented his musical activity toward Europe and the musical future in order to maintain superior positionality in a changing cultural environment increasingly hostile to Ottoman urban music of the past. By way of Emile Durkheim and the prevailing eugenicist and Ottoman-orientalist trends of his time, Ziya Gökalp contributed to this hostility by establishing a framework for musical disabling in the Turkish Republic. Gökalp's influential musical formula established a field of Turkish music in which Ottoman music was understood not only as non-Turkish but also as deficient and sick, thereby laying the groundwork for the musical disabling of its practitioners. The adoption of Gökalp's formula by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk for implementation in his Westernization/modernization project in the newly founded Turkish Republic led to a systematic disabling of Ottoman musical traditions and their associated institutions by the state, though the state was unable effectively to counter the popularity of these traditions among the general population. Traditional centers of Ottoman musical practice such as the court and the Mevlevi *Tekke* having been eliminated, Ottoman musical traditions were relegated to the taverns and treated with a smear campaign designed to paint them as lowly 'commercial' (piyasa) music. At the radio, all Turkish music was first banned and then submitted to a process of control. In that process, Turkish folk music was codified according to the nationalist project by Muzaffer Sarisözen and Ottoman music recast as Turkish Art Music was purged of its degeneracy by Mesut Cemil Bey. These efforts by the "Gökalpists" to euthanize Ottoman music were met by the "Arelists" and Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel himself, who aimed to prove that Ottoman music was both rooted in Turkey and adaptable to modernity and the Turkish Republic.

I argue that, although his initial placement in both fields enabled him to maintain a favorable position in the field of music-cultural production, Alnar's participation in the field of

Ottoman music-cultural production was a disadvantage to him in the field of Turkish Republican music-cultural production. Rey's case as well as those of the other Turkish Five composers evidence the development of a strategic interest in folk music. The freedom to appropriate elements of Turkish music into a primarily Western style without having to negotiate two competing *habitus* put them in a better position to use politically expedient musical signs in their compositions. Alnar, on the other hand, had to negotiate a double-*habitus* in European and Ottoman music in a field of music-cultural production in which the latter was deemed sick and weak.

Chapter 4: Historical Symmetry and Transnational Strategy: Joseph Marx in Istanbul

Alnar's strategic decision to pursue intensive study of Western music took him to another young nation state attempting to negotiate national identity through music. Indeed, the transnational alliance between Hasan Ferid Alnar, Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel, and Joseph Marx was made feasible by the use of music to forge national identity in both the early Turkish and Austrian nation-states. In the wake of crumbling multi-ethnic and multi-confessional empires, both states saw the rise of an increasingly authoritative government which, in accordance with Anderson's theory of nationalism, sought to forge national identity by manipulating cultural, and especially musical, practices. Although opinions as to suitable national music were not unanimous, broadly it can be observed that while Austrian reformers aimed toward preserving a great past, those in Turkey aimed toward building a modern future. Alnar's teacher Joseph Marx was aligned with conservative political and musical forces in inter-war Austria eager to view Austria as cultural superpower. Marx was thus able to capitalize on Turkey's need for European musical advisors to serve his own goals, but his conservatism and connection to Alnar aligned him with the Arelian, rather than Gökalpian conception of the field of Turkish music-cultural production. Alnar gained from Marx training in European music essential to maintenance of his favorable positionality in Turkey, as well as access to Vienna as a site of prestigious premieres and concerts. By funding Alnar's studies with Marx, Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel gained a composer in Alnar able to meet the demand for Western-style compositional techniques in Turkey yet deeply rooted in Ottoman music threatened by Gökalpian reforms

***Musikland* Austria: Cultural Superpower**

Alnar launched a new phase in his musical life in 1927 when he went with Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel's financial support to study with Joseph Marx in Vienna.¹ It is telling that Alnar was apparently unable to win a state scholarship for musical study. Though more inquiry into Turkish state scholarship examinations is needed, it is likely that Alnar's Ottoman musical ties and his studies with Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel and the Armenian Edgar Manas tainted him in the eyes of state reformers. Alnar's misfortune was Arel's luck, however, for I argue that Arel's financial support was a strategic move serving his own interests. As I have noted, Arel was in a very favorable position, and yet was threatened by the turning tides around him. Musical revolutionaries were promoting Turkish folk music, rather than Ottoman music, as the vehicle with which Turkish music could travel to modernity and civilization, and the institutions in which Arel had educated, worked, and been a leader, his native Ottoman Turkish language, customs with which he was comfortable, were now being discarded. Arel likely saw in Alnar a young musician who could meet Western-trained musicians on their own terms while defending a tradition of Ottoman music.

Alnar met with considerable success in Vienna. Joseph Marx thought highly of him, writing in *Musik ist klingendes Leben (Music is Sounding Life)* that "During his studies at the Viennese Meisterschule [Alnar] wrote a national "talkie" ["The Streets of Istanbul" (*"Istanbul Sokakları"*) film which was completed in Paris, and composed the first Turkish Singspiel with national Oriental folk characters, which was premiered in Istanbul under his direction and was repeated twenty-five times, which for Istanbul, where such art did not yet exist, means a lot ... Ferit finished the Meisterschule with excellent success."²

¹ Öztuna 53

² Joseph Marx, "Musik ist klingendes Leben" in *Betrachtungen eines romantischen Realisten*, ed. Oswald Ortner (Vienna: Gerlach und Wiedling, 1947): Während seiner Studien an der Wiener Meisterschule schrieb er einen nationalen Tonfilm, der in Paris fertiggestellt wurde, und komponierte das erste türkische Singspiel mit nationalen

Alnar began his studies with Marx at the *Wiener Musikakademie* in 1927. After two years, he moved on to the *Musikhochschule*, where he continued his composition study with Marx.³ In addition to five semesters of composition with Marx, Alnar took two semesters of Philosophy of Music with Dr. Lach, and three semesters of conducting with Wunderer and Oswald Kabasta at the *Musikhochschule*.⁴ In 1932, he received his diploma in composition and conducting.⁵ Alnar evidently became very close to Marx and to Vienna, for he continued to maintain these connections for decades after his studies were finished, and they continued to play a central role in his musical career.

The context of Alnar's studies with Marx took place within the shifting fields of music in both Turkey and Austria and the struggles for the deployment of music for national identity formation in both nations. Just as the Republic of Turkey emerged from the ashes of the Ottoman Empire, the Austrian First Republic emerged out of the dissolution of the Hapsburg Empire after the First World War. Plagued with instability from its beginnings, this republic was governed in its early years by a coalition on the political Right, out of which emerged two different forms of fascism: the Austrian Nazis, who were oriented toward Germany and looked therefore toward an Anschluss with their large northern neighbor, and the *Heimwehr*, which aimed for an independent Austrian state. Despite the existence of the Austria-oriented Heimwehr, belief that Austria should belong to a Pan-German state was widespread in the First Republic. However, the rise of Nazi Germany and the realization that the Nazis did not envision a significant role for

orientalischen Volkstypen, das in Stambul unter seiner Leitung mit größtem Erfolg aufgeführt und über fünfundzwanzigmal wiederholt wurde, was für Stambul, wo es derlei Kunst noch nicht gab, viel bedeutet . . . Ferit hat die Meisterschule mit ausgezeichnetem Erfolg absolviert.

³ Aydın, 54.

⁴ Course listing for Hasan Ferid Alnar, 1932. Fachhochschule für Musik und Darstellende Kunst in Wien, Archive of the Universität für Musik und Darstellende Kunst Wien, Vienna, Austria.

⁵ Aydın, 54.

Austria or Vienna in a Pan-German Reich led to an increasing emphasis on a particular Austrian identity which painted the country as the “Center of the Occident.”⁶

In this turbulent political climate, both the Austrian Nazis and the *Heimwehr* “‘rejected democratic parliamentarianism,’ Marxism, and the ‘shaping of the economy by liberal capitalism,’” believing a stronger state necessary to stabilize Austria in the shifting political terrain in Europe.⁷ This increasing rejection of parliamentarianism led eventually to the abolition of the Austrian parliament in 1933 by right-wing groups and a brief civil war which ended with the abolition of the Social Democratic Workers Party (*Sozialdemokratische Arbeiterpartei* SDAP) and the removal of the SDAP Viennese government. In place of these institutions, the Austrian Ständestaat was established on May 1, 1933.⁸

The Ständestaat (Corporate State) was a dictatorship first under Engelbert Dollfuss and then, after his assassination, Kurt Schuschnigg. Elected institutions were abolished and replaced by “an impotent parliament and four advisory ‘councils’” which were all subservient to the executive.⁹ The only permitted political organization was the *Vaterländische Front* which, according to Tim Kirk, “adopted all the external paraphernalia of a fascist movement, and articulated the regime’s ideology.”¹⁰ With its staunch official Catholicism, the Ständestaat followed the Heimwehr ideology and sought to distinguish Austria from “Protestant Prussia and Protestant Germany” and, by extension, Nazi Germany.¹¹

⁶ Tim Kirk, “Fascism and Austrofascism.” In *The Dollfuss/Schuschnigg Era in Austria: a Reassessment*, ed. Günter Bischof, Anton Pelinka, and Alexander Lassner, 10-31. (New Brunswick: Transaction Press., 2003); Anita Mayer-Hirzberger *...ein Volk von alters her musikbegabt: der Begriff “Musikland Österreich” im Ständestaat* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2008): 246.

⁷ Kirk, 16.

⁸ Kirk, 16-22.

⁹ Kirk, 23.

¹⁰ Kirk, 23.

¹¹ Anton Pelinka, “Austrian Identity and the ‘Ständestaat’.” In *The Habsburg Legacy*, ed. by Ritchie Robertson and Edward Timms (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1994), 170-171.

In emphasizing a Catholic identity for Austria, the *Ständestaat* could look back on a significant Catholic Habsburg history, and “looking back” was emblematic of the *Ständestaat*’s conservative nostalgia and a significant means of distinguishing Austria from Nazi Germany. Nostalgia manifested itself in renewed use of symbols from the “glorious imperial [Habsburg] past” such as the Haydn-composed national anthem, as well as in idealization of a pre-modern time “not yet poisoned by modern ideas of enlightenment, capital accumulation, and class war.”¹² Although the *Ständestaat* was to be distinctly Austrian, it was still to be decidedly German—indeed, the “true Germany”. *Ständestaat* ideologues carved out a space for the new nation state as a true Christian German civilization, thus creating a state that was superior to—as well as distinct from—Germany. Indeed, Chancellor Dolfuss sought to arouse Austrian patriotism by citing the “historical mission of Austria in the German and Central European lands”—the mission being presumably the defense of true Germanness from the Nazis.¹³

Despite the best efforts of *Ständestaat* ideologues and politicians, however, public opinion never solidified around Austrian patriotism. Opposition came from groups on both sides of the political spectrum—leftists and Nazis—who had been suppressed by the *Ständestaat*. The tension between an Austrian identity and a Pan-German one also proved problematic, with many failing to see the necessity of a particularly Austrian identity if Austria was simultaneously to hold a German identity. Anton Pelinka attributes this failure to a conception in Central Europe at the time of the nation as a primarily ethnic and linguistic phenomenon—a conception problematic to those stressing an independent nation built on qualities other than these.¹⁴ The fact that the *Ständestaat* period ended with the *Anschluss* [annexation of Austria by Germany in

¹² Pelinka, 172.

¹³ Pelinka, 173-174.

¹⁴ Pelinka, 174-175.

1938] with the support of much of the Austrian population is a clear indication that Ständestaat supporters were premature in their conception of an independent, patriotic Austria.

A *Musikstadt* in a *Musikland*: Sounding Austrian National Identity

Prior to Austria's annexation onto Germany, there was a long tradition of using music to establish an Austrian national identity as cultural superpower. At the end of the nineteenth century The Recording Archive of the Imperial and Royal Academy of Sciences in imperial Vienna collected music from throughout the Austro-Hungarian Empire in an attempt to claim the empire's domains under one imperial umbrella.¹⁵ Prior even to the end of World War I, as the decay of empire seemed imminent, Austria's musical heritage was employed as a means of forging national identity by no less a figure than Guido Adler. Adler, the Viennese founder of the modern discipline of musicology, argued in his 1915 article "The Austrian musical art in the World War" ("Die österreichische Tonkunst im Weltkrieg") that "the Russian, the Frenchman, the Englishman could not force their musical works on us through their victory; rather, they would have to draw rather for centuries on our musical art."¹⁶ In the First Republic founded following World War I, the Austrian political and ideological leaders continued to view Austria's musical inheritance continued as a particularly effective means of conceiving Austrian national identity.¹⁷ During this time, however, the belief in Austria's belonging to a larger "Pan-Germany" was widespread. With the changing orientation toward Germany leading up to and during the Ständestaat, a need increasingly arose for a particularly Austrian identity distinct from Germany, and music again played a significant role in fulfilling this need.

¹⁵ Philip Bohlman, *Focus: Music, Nationalism, and the Making of the New Europe*, (New York, Routledge: 2011).

¹⁶ Mayer-Hirzberger, 34.

¹⁷ Mayer-Hirzberger, 36-37.

In the Ständestaat, Austrians and Viennese were conceived as a Volk defined by a particular Austrian history and landscape. In keeping with Herderian nationalist philosophy, folk music was of primary importance in Austria as in Turkey.¹⁸ As Monika Kröpfl succinctly claims, “In the Austrofaschistische Staendestaat cultural work counted among the most important methods for consolidating Austrian national identity. On the one hand, this was seen as the glorification of the Austrian past, whereas on the other side it was seen as an emphasis of the superiority of Austrian identity in the context of Germandom. Thus Austrian tradition and particularly Austrian music culture and the understanding of Austria as “Musikland” became a state-constituting legitimator.”¹⁹ Thus, the forging of a particularly Austrian music provided an efficient means of fulfilling the various needs of Austrian national identity.

Conservative musicians and ideologues led the charge in the use of music to define Austrian national identity, and they adopted disabling discourses to do so. This conservative conception was heavily oriented toward Catholicism, the great musical past, and especially the *Wiener Klassik*, as well illustrated by this call to action from a Ständestaat pedagogical book:

In the city of songs patriotic feelings will not be hard to wake with singing. Austria’s pulse is music, it rings from the songs of the Alps, from countless Viennese songs; it makes the Schubert or Haydn mass a ceremonial prayer for us. Our classics, Haydn, Beethoven, Mozart, Schubert, must ... be recognized and honored, just like the Prinz-Eugen song and the many songs that praise our fatherland Austria.²⁰

Conservative Ständestaat ideology attributed greater vitality to certain musics and rejected others on the grounds that they were threatening to the health of Austrian music. Here a

¹⁸ William A. Wilson, “Herder, Folklore and Romantic Nationalism.” In *Journal of Popular Culture* 6 (1973):819-835.

¹⁹ Kröpfl, 341.

²⁰ Mayer-Hirzberger, 72: In der Stadt der Lieder wird vaterländisches Gefühl nicht schwer zu wecken sein im Singen. Österreichs Pulsschlag ist Musik, sie tönt aus den Alpenliedern, aus unzähligen Wiener Liedern, sie macht uns die Schubert – oder Hayndmesse zum weihevollen Gebet. Unsere Klassiker, Haydn, Beethoven, Mozart, Schubert, müssen, der Altersstufe entsprechend, zu Worte kommen und gewürdigt werden, genau so, wie das Prinz-Eugen-Lied, die vielen Lieder, die Österreich, unser Vaterland preisen.

clear parallel to Gökalp and musical disabling can be drawn, but in reverse: modern tendencies in art music were generally condemned for being overly intellectual and out of touch with Austrian culture, with Arnold Schoenberg deemed “un-Austrian” by one author. Ernst Krenek accused the state radio of unofficially banning the works of modernist composers—a move that he and others likened to ostensibly undesirable cultural politics playing out in Nazi Germany.²¹ As in the case of Ottoman/Turkish Art cum Piyasa music in Turkey, conservative musicians and critics considered jazz and popular musics “shallow music” and vehemently rejected them. They called on folk music to fill their roles. The prevailing view among the Ständestaat musical ideologues and its underlying racism was succinctly expressed by Anton Konrath in a discussion about the role of “entertainment music” in the Vaterländische Front official magazine “New Life” (“*Neues Leben*”): “Traders in Negritude make jazz music, but we have to return to the origins of folk music.”²²

Accounts of the political and musical circumstances in the fledgling Austrian and Turkish nation nations are remarkably similar. In the wake of crumbling multi-ethnic and multi-confessional empires, both states saw the rise of an increasingly authoritative government which, as described by Benedict Anderson’s theory of nationalism, sought to forge national identity by manipulating cultural, and especially musical, practices. Though opinions were far from unanimous, broadly speaking Austrian reformers aimed toward preserving a great musical past, while those in Turkey aimed toward building a modern musical future. Extending Bourdieuan theory from the level of the individual to the level of empire, these positions can be understood in terms of a field of global power. Despite the fact that the Habsburg and Ottoman Empires had both lost the First World War, the Hapsburg Empire was part of the West which had labeled the

²¹ Mayer-Hirzberger, 254-257.

²² Mayer-Hirzberger, 266.

Ottoman Empire as the “sick man of Europe,” and Austria was at the center of that empire. As the remains of the sick man, Turkey needed to advance in the field, whereas it was in Austria’s best interest to preserve the cultural inheritance from its imperial past.

Dismembered as they were, both states grappled with defining a national identity in relation to a large “other.” In Austria, this struggle centered on the proper relationship between a Pan-German identity and a uniquely Austrian one. Likewise, in Turkey, the double challenge of joining Western civilization while remaining distinctly “Turkish” and negotiating the Ottoman past was played out in books and articles such as Arel’s *Whose is Turkish Music? (Türk Musikisi Kimindir?)*, on the radio in Muzaffer Sarısözen’s and Mesut Cemil Bey’s programs, and in institutions such as the *Darülelhan*.

An interesting historical symmetry can be observed in the emphasis of certain musics and the rejection of others for the task of forging a worthy national music in the early Austrian and Turkish nation-states. Moreover, this symmetry mirrors the orientations of the two states more broadly. Due to the relatively favorable position in the field of power which Austria had historically occupied, modernist, revolutionary, and popular musics were rejected. This reflects the conservatism of those who perceive that they are already able to determine the definition of a given field, and would therefore be unseated by revolutionaries attempting to re-define the field. Recognizing the unfavorable position in the field of power which the Ottoman Empire had held, revolutionary forces in Turkey strategized to usurp control of the fields of power and cultural production from those who had occupied favorable positions in the Ottoman Empire. Both states adopted a Herderian conception of the importance of folk music to nationalism that had been successfully applied in other states. As heirs to a Herderian concept of nationalism, prevailing forces in both states looked to the folk as the wellspring of national identity. The symmetry can

be simply explained thusly: prevailing forces in the Austrian nation state rejected the musical future and sought to preserve the musical past, while prevailing forces in Turkey sought to reject the musical past and look toward the musical future.

Joseph Marx: Locus of Music and Power

Alnar's Austrian teacher Joseph Marx occupied a dominant position in the field of cultural production in the Austrian nation state, and sought to preserve his positionality through music-cultural activity. Marx's post-war reputation has been colored to a significant degree by his apparent cooperation with the Nazis following the 1937 *Anschluss*. I contend that Marx was a strategist par excellence whose views on music and society aligned to a significant degree with Nazi cultural policies. Thus, Marx's career can arguably be understood in terms of the "banality of evil" line of argument—he was not himself a card-carrying Nazi, but took up the Nazi party line when it was advantageous for him to do so.

Though largely forgotten today, Marx was in many ways a poster child for Ständestaat music policies. Marx's conservative views on music were evident from his time as a student. Influenced by the 19th century Herderian and eugenicist forces outlined above, Marx sought in his 1909 dissertation at the *Karl Franzens Universität* in Graz to prove the "naturalness" of tonality. Marx held this position, along with its corollary that anything else was "'against nature,'" for the rest of his life.²³ In accordance with Herderian nationalism and in keeping with Ständestaat views on the right "ingredients" for national music, Marx considered folk music to be of primary importance: "Only art music which grew originally from folk origins and which in thought and expression corresponds to the complete spiritual attitude of the nature of its

²³ Andreas Holzer, "Joseph Marx als Lehrer," In *Marjan Kozina: International symposium about Marjan Kozina, on the occasion of the concert performance of his operetta Majda* edited by Primož Kuret, 37-42. Slovenia: Novo Mesto Press (2001): 40

homeland maintained its meaning through centuries and with lasting success...”²⁴ Also in keeping with both Austrian *Staendestaat* and Nazi cultural policy, Marx was a staunch opponent of jazz, avant-garde, and expressionist music.²⁵ Following romantic principles of musical form and 19th and early 20th century scientism, Marx aimed for a sense of “organic growth” in his music, which he composed in a folk-influenced late-romantic and at times impressionist style that his student and biographer Andreas Liess identified as providing “good points of contact” (“*gute Anknüpfungspunkte*”) to his students from Eastern Europe and Asia.²⁶ Marx admired Debussy in particular as a herald of positive possibilities for new music.²⁷

In contradistinction to Bourdieu’s conception of the opposition between symbolic and economic capital and the role of cultural agents as dominated members of the dominant class, conditions in the early Austrian nation state enabled Marx to be both an influential and popular composer and teacher in pre- and post- WWII Austria and an influential member of Austrian society. In other words, congruence between Marx’s conservatism, Austria First Republic and *Staendestaat* conservatism, and fascist cultural politics enabled Marx to become a dominant member of the dominant class. Thus, in contradistinction to Bourdieu’s formulation, Marx’s compositions were highly successful in his lifetime, but he was also a highly respected composer with high symbolic capital.

Statistical analysis confirms that Marx’s compositions were highly successful. Analysis of the frequency of playing of contemporary composers on the Austrian radio between 1934 and

²⁴ Mayer-Hirzberger, 252.

²⁵ Angelika Silberbauer, “Eine ‘führende Musikerpersönlichkeit der Ostmark’—Joseph Marx.” In *Eine Institution Zwischen Representation und Macht: Die Universität für Musik und Darstellende Kunst Wien im Kulturleben des Nationalsozialismus*, ed. Juri Giannini, Maximilian Haas, and Erwin Strouhal (Wien: Mille Tre Verlag, 2014), 328-330.

²⁶ Holzer, “Joseph Marx als Lehrer,” 40; Kröpfl, 338.

²⁷ Silberbauer, 326.

1937/38 revealed Marx to be the most played by a wide margin.²⁸ Marx's works were frequently performed during the Second World War, and after the war Marx was again the most performed German-speaking composer by a wide margin, followed by Paul Hindemith at a distant second.²⁹

Marx also held considerable political power, and used it to advocate for Austria and Austrian music conservatively conceived and to oppose musical modernism. Having been appointed the first rector of the newly founded *Hochschule für Musik* in 1925, Marx was, for example, one of twenty-four members drawn from the realms of politics, economy, and culture named to an honorary committee to oversee Austria's representation at the 1934 London World's Fair.³⁰ As a music critic for the *New Viennese Journal* (*Neue Wiener Journal*) and later the *Wiener Zeitung*, Marx advocated for Austrian music and musicians on the one hand, and railed against modernist contemporaries such as Bartók, Hindemith, Schoenberg, and Stravinsky on the other.³¹ Particularly interested in "musical exchanges" between Austria and other European lands, including France, Hungary, Poland, and especially Italy, his goal was: "systematic propaganda of Austrian music in foreign countries."³² As a teacher, Marx was known to be particularly generous toward students whose compositional ideas corresponded to his own, and particularly hostile toward those students whose style did not.³³ As will be seen in the case of Necil Kazım Akses, Marx was apparently even willing to interfere with the careers of his own students when they displeased him.³⁴

²⁸ Mayer-Hirzberger, 263.

²⁹ Silberbauer, 328: according to Daniela Candillari, Marx's works were performed on more than 50 concerts between 1939-1945 (see ; Silberbauer,

³⁰ Mayer-Hirzberger, 123; Holzer "Lehrer," 40. Among other offices and memberships, Marx was president of the Vereinigung der Musikerzieher Österreich, Österreichischen Komponistenbund, Mozartgemeinde Wien, Gesellschaft zur Herausgabe der Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich, and so on.

³¹ Holzer, "Joseph Marx als Lehrer," 37; Silberbauer, 326.

³² Mayer-Hirzberger, 120.

³³ Holzer, "Joseph Marx als Lehrer," 41.

³⁴ Silberbauer, 333-334.

As will be seen in his writings on music in Turkey and his exchange with Hasan Ferid Alnar, Marx also directed a curious mix of orientalism and generosity toward the diverse musical backgrounds of his students, as a description from his biographer Andreas Liess indicates:

The task [of teaching composition] was more difficult with the Turkish students. Here, the national character was in a different world from European feeling, even though modern Turkey—no different from the Far East—currently seeks to join Europe through progress and musical reconstruction ... What is right for the Turks, doesn't please the German at all. With an Egyptian who submitted an original work including a triumphal march, Marx said with appropriate humor during the run through to the German students: 'You may not write this way, only Menes whose forefathers went to the tavern with Ramses may do that!'.³⁵

Marx promotes a kind of cultural relativism in keeping with his fetishization of the nation and the national in music. At the same time, the mocking tone with which Marx seems implicitly to dismiss the Egyptian composer's music indicates a conflicting allegiance to the superiority of European and especially Germanic music and culture.

Marx's ambiguous views on non-Western music—the natural product of the nation versus the inferior product of deficient non-Europeans—is mirrored in his ambiguous relationship with Nazism. It is furthermore this relationship that has severely compromised Marx's post-war reputation. Conflicting accounts of Marx's Nazi associations ultimately point to Marx as first and foremost as a strategist more interested in maintaining positionality than principled ideological stands.

³⁵ Andreas Liess, *Joseph Marx. Leben und Werk*. Graz, 1947: 82, quoted in Angelika Silberbauer, "Eine führende Musikerpersönlichkeit der Ostmark"—Joseph Marx." In *Eine Institution Zwischen Representation und Macht: Die Universität für Musik und Darstellende Kunst Wien im Kulturleben des Nationalsozialismus*, ed. Juri Giannini, Maximilian Haas, and Erwin Strouhal (Wien: Mille Tre Verlag, 2014), 336: Schwieriger noch war die Aufgabe bei türkischen Schülern. Hier lag die nationale Eigenart bereits jenseits europäischen Fühlens, wemgleich die modern Türkei—nicht anders als der Ferne Osten—gerade um des Fortschritts und des musikalischen Neubaus willen den Anschluss an Europa sucht ... Das was für den Türken richtig ist, frommt keinesfalls dem Deutschen. Bei einem Ägypter, der ein originelles Werk mit einem Triumpmarsch vorlegte, sagte Marx bei der Durchnahme mit entsprechendem Humor zu den deutschen Schülern; 'So dürfen Sie nicht schreiben, das darf nur der Menasse, dessen Vorfahren mit Ramses zum Heurigen gegangen sind'.

A generous interpretation of Marx's relationship to Nazism is given by Monika Kröpfl, who has argued that, despite his conservative views on musical aesthetics, Marx was not a Nazi. Kröpfl points out that Marx never joined the Nazi party—indeed his affiliation with the anti-Nazi *Staendestaat* aroused suspicion in Nazi circles.³⁶ She argues that the Nazis adopted conservative musical views as part of Jewish racism and a reaction to “musical bolshevism,” while Marx's opposition to modernist musical trends was rooted in his belief in the unnaturalness of atonal music.³⁷ Kröpfl thus seems to paint Marx as a musical conservative through and through, but not a racist.

Angelika Silberbauer delivers a more damning account of Marx's flirtations with Nazism, though not one which indicates that Marx went out of his way to advance Nazi causes. Rather, Marx was at the ready to participate in Nazi discourses on music which corresponded closely to his own views, and to appeal to symbols of Nazi ideology to gain legitimacy. Like the Nazis, Marx was staunchly opposed to jazz, avant-garde, and expressionist music in accordance with pre-*Anschluss*, *Staendestaat* cultural policy, and had already outed himself as an admirer of fascism with a 1933 article on Respighi subtitled “Fascism Supports Art and Artists” (“*Faschismus fördert Kunst und Künstler*”).³⁸ Following quickly after the *Anschluss*, Marx publicly embraced Nazi rule with trips to Dresden, where he appeared to celebrate the reunification of Germany and Austria in a public presentation, and Düsseldorf, where he attended the famous Reich Music Days (*Reichsmusiktage*).³⁹ In a subsequent article on the *Musiktage* for the *New Viennese Journal*, Marx recounted the diversity of German music displayed and described the musics exhibited in the ‘Degenerate Music’ (*Entartete Musik*) exhibition which

³⁶ Kröpfl 346-348.

³⁷ Kröpfl 345.

³⁸ Silberbauer, 327.

³⁹ Silberbauer, 328-329.

“led far away from the goals to which every *healthy* music aspires ...”.⁴⁰ A reference in another presentation on the value of Richard Wagner’s infamous text *Jewishness in Music (Das Judentum in der Musik)*, a “heil Hitler” greeting at the end of a report on behalf of an “Aryan” composer, and the fact that Marx’s music continued frequently to be performed during the Nazi rule of Austria appear to embroil Marx yet deeper in Nazi circles.⁴¹

After the war, however, Marx resumed his position as defender of tradition and adopted the narrative that Austria had been the victim of German aggression.⁴² As will be seen in the Alnar case, he set about re-establishing his positionality once more in the new, post-war context and sweeping his Nazi affinities under the rug. In other words, just as Marx strategized during the *Staendestaat* period to align himself with conservative orthodoxy, and strategized during the period of Nazi rule to mold conservative views to Nazi ideology, he strategized after the war to re-establish his positionality once more. As will be demonstrated below, at various points his relationship with Hasan Ferid Alnar provided a vehicle for these strategies.

Was Marx a Nazi? As Angelika Silberbauer writes:

His views to actual events, as they can be sketched from his own writings, are characterized by a behavior which demonstrates neither a profession nor an explicit rejection of a political direction—exactly this brought Marx many advantages during his life, but he will thus all the more continue to raise questions in the future for the writing of music history.⁴³

⁴⁰ Joseph Marx. “Was Lehren die Düsselner Reichsmusikstage,” *Neues Wiener Journal* (Vienna, Austria), June 5, 1938: “weitweg von den Zielen führten, die jede gesunde Musik anstrebt ...”

⁴¹ Silberbauer, 330-331.

⁴² Silberbauer, 333.

⁴³ Silberbauer, 337: Seine ansichten zum aktuellen Geschehen, wie sie durch seine eigenen Schriften skizziert werden können, sind durch ein Verhalten gekennzeichnet, das weder ein Bekennen noch ein explizites Ablehnen einer politischen Richtung aufzeigt—genau diese brachte Marx zwar zu Lebzeiten viele Vorteile, für die Musikgeschichtsschreibung wird seine Person aber dadurch auch in Zukunft noch umso mehr Fragen aufwerfen.

Whether or not Marx “was” a Nazi—an essentializing question to ask of fluid human identity—remains unclear. What becomes increasingly clear, and perhaps more important, is that Marx was a strategist. Considering his actions in terms of Practice Theory thus provides an account of Marx’s checkered associations perhaps no less damning, but more nuanced, than that which had previously been given. Furthermore, insight into the extent of Marx’s strategizing lends support to the claim that his activity in Turkey was also strategically motivated.

Comparing Hasan Ferid Alnar’s and Necil Kazım Akses’ Studies with Joseph Marx

The strategic alliance between Marx and Alnar can be understood in greater depth through Marx’s contrasting relationship with Necil Kazım Akses, who also studied with Marx in Vienna. Given Alnar’s quasi-conservative positionality, Marx and Alnar were already fighting on the same side in terms of the field of cultural production broadly construed, as revealed by the intimacy of their correspondence. Marx had a difficult relationship with Akses due to the latter’s interest in modernist and avant-garde compositional techniques, and this caused Marx to favor Alnar both during and after his studies.

The cause of the rift between Marx and Akses was their opposing views on musical modernism. Akses’ interest in modernist compositional approaches was reflected in his attendance at a 1930 performance of Berg’s atonal/serial opera *Wozzeck* and his later explorations of atonal and aleatory procedures in works such as his Concerto for Orchestra (*Orkestra Konçertosu*) and the second and third symphonies.⁴⁴ From these interests I surmise that Akses may not have found appropriate instructional resources in Marx, and that Akses therefore decided to continue his studies in Prague where, notably, he studied quarter-tone harmony with avant-garde composer Alois Haba. Just as likely an explanation, however, is that

⁴⁴ Aydın, 154; Aydın, 160-161.

Marx's known hostility toward students whose style differed from his own prompted him to dismiss Akse from his studio.

Whatever the cause, by 1933 evidence indicates that Akse was estranged from Marx. In an April 4, 1933 letter from Alnar to Marx, Alnar writes that "concerning Necil [Kazım Akse's] situation, I have thus far not trusted myself to give the news to Saadeddin [Arel], and on the other hand I have heard from some friends who have visited Necil in Vienna that he plans to stay another year in Vienna. In this state of things, I have preferred to give an indication to Necil that he express or defend his situation to Saadeddin [Arel] himself"⁴⁵ Though the lack of context makes it impossible to determine which situation of Akse's Alnar is referring to, what is clear is that Akse and Marx are not in contact, despite the fact that they both live in Vienna. Their relationship had deteriorated to the point that they ceased communication, though it is difficult to determine from whose side this cessation might have been made. Again, however, given the respect and formality with which teachers are generally treated in both Turkey and Austria and in light of knowledge of Marx's dealings with students whose music he disapproved of, it seems likely that Marx instigated the split.

It is also evident from Alnar's account that there has been some exchange between Akse and Arel, and that relations between them had soured as well. It is possible that Arel had also supported Akse's studies in Vienna and was displeased by Akse's turn toward modernist tendencies. Given his conservative positionality, it is likely that Arel, like Marx, would not have approved of European musical modernism for Turkish students studying in Europe.

⁴⁵ April 18, 1933 Letter from Alnar to Marx, Packet 1): "Was die Lage Necil's anbelangt, habe ich mich momentan nicht getraut dem Sadettin Bey die Mitteilung zu machen, andererseits habe ich von manchen Freunden, die Necil in Wien besuchten, erfahren, dass er dem Plan habe, noch ein Jahr in Wien zu bleiben. Be diesem Stande der Dingen habe ich vorgezogen, dem Necil Andeutungen zu machen, dass er seine Lage dem Herrn Sadettin selbst äussert oder verteidigt ..."

Relations between Marx and Akses remained poor for at least several more years, for a February 4, 1935 letter for Alnar to Marx indicates that the latter was not interested in including Akses a “Turkish Evening” concert in Vienna. Responding evidently to a query from Marx about other Turkish composers who could be included on the program, Alnar writes that “in Ankara there is a certain Adnan [Saygun], who studied with D’Indy and is supposed to compose well. He is currently conducting the Ankara orchestra. However, so long as Necil [Kazım Akses] lives in Ankara and I am friends with him it could be difficult to make an offer just to Adnan. You will understand the difficulty of my situation.”⁴⁶ From Alnar’s reference to Akses we gain further indication that relations between Akses and Marx had soured, evidently to the point that Alnar takes it for granted that Marx is not interested in including Akses in his “Turkish Evening.”

Systematic Propaganda: Joseph Marx in Istanbul

After Alnar’s studies in Vienna but prior to the “Turkish Evening” concert, Marx worked as the first European musical advisor in the Turkish Republic. Marx’s work as advisor to the Istanbul Municipal Conservatory is evidence of a “strategic alliance” between Akses, Alnar, Arel, and Marx. Marx’s work in Turkey was coordinated by Alnar, who thus opened up Istanbul as a source of symbolic power for Marx in the context of the Austrian field of music cultural production. Marx used his work as musical advisor in Turkey at the Istanbul Conservatory between 1932 and 1934 as a strategy to maintain his own positionality in Austria and enhance Austria’s and Vienna’s reputation as cultural superpower. Marx’s plan for the development of Turkish music developed as part of his visits reveals an alliance with the Arel side of the Gökalp-Arel divide likely brokered by Alnar.

⁴⁶ Hasan Ferid Alnar to Joseph Marx, February 4, 1935, Manuscript Collection, Austrian National Library, Vienna, Austria.

As we learn from letters written from Alnar to Marx, Alnar played a key role in opening Turkey to Marx as a source of strategic gain. Alnar writes on March 31, 1931 that his uncle has met with the governor of Istanbul, and that the governor has decided to extend an invitation for Marx to come to Istanbul to advise in the construction of a new building for the Istanbul Municipal Conservatory. The governor has in mind “a modest school with a theater for 800 people inside... the Mr. Hofrat is to specify the general organization [of the building].”⁴⁷ This visit was evidently delayed several times from the Istanbul side, as over the course of several letters from Alnar begging for patience with various delays, it emerges that Marx first traveled to Istanbul from Vienna on October 1932.⁴⁸

During and subsequent to his bi-annual visits to the Istanbul Municipal Conservatory during the years 1932 to 1934, Marx gave several talks and published writings on the development of Turkish music that reveal his *Staendestaat*-influenced theories as well as an alliance with Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel.⁴⁹ In his article “Music is Ringing Life” (“Musik ist klingendes Leben”) chronicling his time in Turkey, Marx points out repeatedly on the one hand what he considers to be the mysterious Eastern qualities of Istanbul and its music, and on the other the striking modernity of (parts of) Istanbul: “Istanbul is becoming a thoroughly modern big city; that cannot be changed. But the dark, longing tones of Asia in art, the indescribably mysterious sounds of the origins of man should continue to sound in our time as the most valuable national possession of the Volk.”⁵⁰ In spite of the heavy exoticization, Marx indicates a charitable attitude toward the Turks and their potential musical horizons. Indeed, he describes

⁴⁷ Hasan Ferid Alnar to Joseph Marx, March 31, 1931, Manuscript Collection, Austrian National Library, Vienna, Austria.

⁴⁸ Hasan Ferid Alnar to Joseph Marx, September 15, 1932, Manuscript Collection, Austrian National Library, Vienna, Austria.

⁴⁹ Andreas Holzer, “Joseph Marx und Paul Hindemith also “Musikalische Botschafter” in der Türkei,” *ANKLAENGE, Wiener Jarbuch für Musikwissenschaft* (2009), 201.

⁵⁰ Marx, 9.

them as “musically gifted” and does not denigrate Turkish music in comparison to Western music. Marx’s charity can be understood in light of David Brodbeck’s writing on Dvorak reception in fin de siècle Vienna.⁵¹ Marx’s participation in Staendestaat Austria’s framing as cultural superpower along with his ambivalent relationship with the Nazis place him in a liberal camp per Brodbeck. This camp maintained that the dominance of German culture in the Austro-Hungarian Empire stemmed from a cultural superiority available in theory to all, as opposed to a German nationalist conception increasingly defined by ethnic nationalism. As noted above, however, at certain points Marx appears to align with Nazism and a more ethnicity-rooted approach. Marx’s chameleon-like changing of ideological colors indicates that the driving motivation of his actions was strategy.

Marx’s prescription for the new Turkish music appears to hearken back to Gökalp’s and Atatürk’s, but with an Austrian twist: “The bases of this new art are on the one hand old Turkish folk music, and the other hand formal harmonic achievements which are uniquely clear in the undying works of the Viennese Classic. One hopes that out of the union of both of these original elements a new musical art will develop.”⁵² Writing that, “Again, Vienna has a new musical sphere of interest which should contribute to the raising of its status in the world,”⁵³ Marx makes clear that his ambitions for Austrian cultural hegemony are a major motivating factor for his work in Turkey. Marx’s call for “old Turkish folk music” is fully in keeping with his own views on the importance of folk music and would appear to place him on the Gökalp side of the Gökalp-Arel divide. However, as we shall see, the likelihood is high that Marx was under the influence of Alnar—and by extension Arel—on this matter.

⁵¹ See David Brodbeck, “Dvorak’s Reception in Liberal Vienna: Language Ordinances, National Property, and the Rhetoric of Deutschtum.” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 60 (2007): 71-131.

⁵² Marx, 9.

⁵³ Marx, 4.

The first indication that Marx aligned with Arel is Marx's adoption of a framework resembling the "Sun-Language Theory" and the related view that all music originated with Turkish music. In a November 30, 1932 talk at the Eminönü People's House (*Eminönü Halkevinde*), Marx gave a talk outlining his views on the future of national music in Turkey.⁵⁴ Marx identifies the problem at hand thusly: "to draw Turkish music and Western music together, and to establish a bond between the two."⁵⁵ Taking a linguistic example that strongly resembles the "Sun-Language Theory," Marx posits that if all languages have the same Sanskritic roots, music must also share common roots and the same general rules. Though it is possible that Marx was aware of the "Sun Language Theory" prior to his association with Alnar and Arel, given that its originator Herman Kvergic was also Austrian, the inclination to apply this theory to the case of Turkish music would most likely have come from Alnar and Arel. Adhering to the evolutionary view of history outlined above, he proposes that:

In its own internal development, Turkish music resembles European music's development during the Middle Ages at some points. Such resemblances stem from the common feelings existent among the people. For example, there is a relationship between Turkish music's technical means, the manner and form of its sections and those of Western music. Why should it not be possible to draw national Turkish music and European music together by profiting from these relationships? If Turkish music moves toward the West, and Western music moves toward the East, closeness will easily be acquired, and in that event, without harming the character of national music, a firmer relationship between the two musics will come to the fore"⁵⁶

⁵⁴ Compiled from Joseph Marx's notes, "Ecnebinlerin Türk Musikisi hakkındaki görüşlerinden Profesör Joseph Marx'ın fikirleri" in *Cumhuriyet'in Sesleri* (Istanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 1999): 60-61.

⁵⁵ "Ecnebinlerin ...," 60: "Türk musikisile Batı musikisini birbirine yaklaştırmak ve aralarında bir rabıta tesis etmek."

⁵⁶ "Ecnebinlerin ...," 60: ... Türk musikisinin tecerüd ve inırad içinde gelişmesi, Avrupa musikisinin orta çağdaki gelişmesine bazı noktalardan bezemektedir. Bu türlü benzerlikler, insanlar arasında mevcut olan duygu ortaklığından ileri geliyor. Mesela Türk musikisinin teknik vasıtaları, Türk musiki parçalarının şekil ve kalıpları ile Batı musikisinininkiler arasında akrabalık vardır. Bu akrabalıklardan istifade edilerek milli Türk musikisi ile Avrupa musikisini birbirine yaklaştırmak niçin mümkün olmasın? Eğer Türk musikisi Batıya doğru, Batı musikisi de Doğuya doğru birer adım atarlarsa yakınlık kolayca elde edilir ve o takdirde milli musikisinin seçeyesi hiç bozulmadan iki musiki arasında şimdikinden daha sıkı bir münasebet meydana gelir.

Given this fantastically vague framework, Marx contends that it cannot be his job merely to establish a European conservatory in Istanbul, as this would damage the foundations of Turkish music. He further notes that, though some Turkish musicians have already learned Western music, this will also not be sufficient. Comparing art and music to a tree, Marx contends that music cannot be bent in any direction one chooses. Turkish music should therefore grow taking strength both from national and from European sources.⁵⁷

To further illustrate his point, Marx echoes Mahmut Ragıp Gazimihal by noting the case of Russia and its struggle for music understood to be truly national by Europeans. Marx claims that Russia achieved a truly national music only after Mussorgsky travelled to Russian villages to collect and analyze Russian national songs and then write music based upon these collected materials. Marx urges the Turks assembled before him to take a lesson from the Russians and benefit from European musical techniques without sacrificing national music's particular characteristics. He ends his talk by noting that, given that Turks are a musically capable nation, he is confident of significant musical progress in the near future.⁵⁸ Marx's use of Russian music as a model for the development of Turkish music strongly echoes Gazimihal's writings on this topic. As in the case of the Sun-Language Theory, Marx would have been aware of Russian national music prior to his visits to Turkey, but his mention of Russia in the Istanbul Conservatory talk was likely encouraged by Alnar and Arel to tie Marx's ideas into contemporary writings by Gazimihal.

As part of his duties as advisor to the Istanbul Municipal Conservatory, Marx also prepared a written report on the development of Turkish music culture. Though I have been unable to locate a copy of the full report, the "*Musiki Mecmuası*" ("Music Journal") published a

⁵⁷ "Ecnebilir ...," 60-61.

⁵⁸ "Ecnebilir ...," 61.

section of the report in its January and February 1949 issues.⁵⁹ The fact that this particular journal published a portion of Marx's report is a clear sign that Marx's approach to the development of the field of Turkish music had met with Arel's approval. The *Musiki Mecmuası* was the house journal of the *İleri Türk Musikisi Konservatuvarı* (Advanced Turkish Music Conservatory). Both the conservatory and the journal were founded by Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel in 1948, and were thus invested in a conception of modern Turkish music that placed urban Ottoman/Turkish Art Music at its core.⁶⁰

Other items in the two 1949 issues in which Marx's report was published reveal the orientation of both the *Musiki Mecmuası* and the *İleri Türk Musikisi Konservatuvarı*. The first page of the January 1949 issue features an article by Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel title "Niçin Türk Musikisine taraftarım?" ("Why am I on the side of Turkish music?"). The first page of the February 1949 issue features an article by Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel title "Atonal Musikisi Nedir?" ("What is Atonal Music?"). The final page of this issue features an advertisement for the *İleri Türk Musikisi Konservatuvarı*. It notes that, among other topics, the conservatory offers instruction in "complete solfej, musicianship, professional singing [of Turkish Classical Music], all kinds of pieces of Turkish Classical Music, new instrumental and vocal works, polyphonic works; Turkish music intervals, simple makams, modulation, compound makams, fixed makams, complete large and small usuls."⁶¹

In the first published excerpt, Marx reveals his allegiance to Arel's conception of Turkish music outlined in *Whose is Turkish Music?* Early in the excerpt, Marx notes that all civilized

⁵⁹ Thanks to the İstanbul Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü for providing access to this journal.

⁶⁰ Hakkımızda," İleri Türk Müziği Konservatuvarı Derneği, accessed October 26, 2015, www.ileriturkmuzigi.org/?pnum=2&pt=Hakkımızda.

⁶¹ "İleri Türk Musikisi Konservatuvarı," *Musiki Mecmuası*, February, 1949, 27: mükemmel solfej, sazandelik, hanendelik, her türlü klasik Türk musikisi eserleri, yeni saz ve söz eserleri, polifonik eserler; Türk musikisinde aralıklar, basit makamlar, geçki, mürekkep makamlar, şet makamlar, küçük ve büyük bütün usuller.

states strive for great music. In his view, among the factors weighing in Turkey's favor in its struggle for civilized national music are "its folk and art music that attract much interest and possess originality in both melody and rhythm" and "the successes worthy of recognition (even by European standards) of several Turks who have studied in Europe."⁶² This statement makes clear that Ottoman music re-labeled as Turkish Art Music is to be included in Marx's conception of Turkish national music. At the time that Marx submitted this report—presumably 1934—such a view was heretical in terms of Gökalp's/Atatürk's formula for Turkish national music. In the next paragraph, Marx asserts that "Turkish music developed for centuries free from the influence of foreign art; for that reason, the purity of its style in particular remained protected, and that is a big advantage."⁶³ Given that he has already made sure to reference both folk and art music, it is not possible that he is referring here to Gökalp's pure Turkish Anatolian rural music. Instead, Marx's "influence-free" development smacks of Arel's idea expressed some eight years later in *Türk Musikisi Kimindir?* that Turkish music gave but did not take in all of the musical relationships into which it was alleged to have entered.

In his discussion of the importance of musical propaganda, Marx reveals that he is influenced by both Austrian and Arelian thought:

As an intermediary between East and West from a cultural point of view Istanbul is in a rather favorable position; for that reason, it can profit from and quite nicely develop from both sides. That situation is particularly possible for music. The more one hears this national music and can attest again and again how extraordinarily suitable it is for being worked up with European techniques, one feels both sorry and astonished that until now so little work has been done in this area. In my opinion Turkish music, together with European expression, is undoubtedly capable of being developed into an important cultural agent.⁶⁴

⁶² "Tarihî Vesikalar: İstanbul Belediye Konservatuvarı hakkında Prof. Josef Marks'ın raporu," *Musiki Mecmuası*, January 1, 1949, 17: Pek ziyade alaka çeken ve hem lahin, hem de ritm itibarile orijinalliği haiz olan halk ve sanat musikisinde; Avrupada tahsil görmüş bir kaç Türkün (avrupal manasile dahi) takdire değer muvaffakiyetlerinde.

⁶³ "Tarihî Vesikalar" 1, 17: Türk musikisi asırlarca yabancı sanatın tesirinden azade olarak inkişaf etmiştir; o sayede bilhassa üslubunun halisiyeti mahfuz kalmıştır, ki bu büyük bir faydadır.

⁶⁴ "Tarihî Vesikalar" 1, 18: İstanbul doğu ile batının arasında mütevassıt olmak üzere kültür bakımından pek müsait bir durumdadır; bu sebeple her iki yandan istifade ve pek mükemmel inkişaf edebilir. Bu hal bilhassa musiki için de

In *Türk Musikisi Kimindir?* (*Whose is Turkish Music?*), Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel advocated for the cultural superiority of Turkey and the purity of Turkish music as source of Eastern music. In *Türkçülüğün Esasları*, on the other hand, Gökalp writes of the need to discard the Eastern civilization and music no longer suitable for the Turkish nation and to look toward Anatolian folk music and the West. Thus, no Gökalpist would have described Istanbul “as an intermediary between East and West.” An Arelist, however, would read from Marx’s statement that Turkish music was the source of the musical traditions of the East as later outlined in *Türk Musikisi Kimindir?* and infer the Ottoman orientalism that placed Turks at a higher civilizational and musical level than their Eastern subjects and neighbors. Putting a finer point on the need for music propaganda, Marx argues that “the time has come to carry out with vigor music propaganda in the form of a national music to be produced without harming the national essence and with European musical techniques,” and also points out the imperative of using radio as a means of spreading propaganda among the *halk/volk*.⁶⁵ As we have seen above, Marx’s goal was “systematic propaganda” of the Viennese classic in foreign countries. His calls for propaganda in Turkey using music with European compositional techniques can thus be understood not only as propaganda potentially useful to the Turkish nation-state but also, and perhaps more importantly in his eyes, as strategic propaganda for Austria as a cultural superpower. In this sense, Marx’s “systematic propaganda” begins to resemble a kind of cultural colonialism.

variddir. İnsan şu milli musikiyi sık işittikçe ve onun, avrupalı manasile işlenmeye ne kadar fevkalade elverişli olduğunu tekrar-tekrar tasdik ettikçe bu vadide şimdiye kadar bu derece az iş yapılmış olmasına hem teessüf ediyor, hem de hayrette kalıyor. Türk musikisi benim fikrimce, avrupalı manasile de, mühim bir kültür amili halinde terakki etmeye muhakkak ki kabiliyetlidir.

⁶⁵ “Tarihî Vesikalar: İstanbul Belediye Konservatuarı hakkında Prof. Josef Marks’ın raporu (Geçen nüshadan devam),” *Musiki Mecmuası*, February 1, 1949, 23: Lakin herhalde şunu da söylemeli ki milli özelliği pek bozmadan Avrupa musiki tekniğini millet maledecek surette musiki propagandasını kuvvetle yürütmenin tam zamanıdır.

In his report, Marx also indicates his *Staendestaat*-influenced belief in the importance of national purity in music and his opposition to popular music. Driving home the importance of Turkish musical elements in Turkish national music, Marx asserts that “There is no great art that is non-national; devotion to the fatherland’s soil and voice absolutely must exist. Otherwise, art *degenerates* into a valueless, bloodless imitation” (emphasis mine).⁶⁶ The musical agent of degeneracy is revealed amidst recommendations for the propaganda of the new national music, which include development of a strong conservatory orchestra to educate Istanbulers in music literature through regular concerts and construction of a conservatory theater to better accommodate such concerts. In addition to the lowering of taxes on organizations proffering “serious” music, Marx proposes that “there is value in the careful consideration of collecting a quantity of money to be of use in the forming of serious music establishments by slightly raising the taxes on light music entertainment sites (especially sites serving alcohol and with sound films).”⁶⁷ Moreover, he suggests that:

In the future, it will be fitting to behave somewhat cautiously while giving permits to cinemas and places that play bad modern dance music. Those are such places that a nation’s good taste and feeling for high art, in short its moral development, are infringed upon in a quite grave manner by the altogether lifeless forms and vulgar excitabilities of entertainment.⁶⁸

Here, the symmetrical relationship discussed above between the alignment of particular genres of music against others in Turkey and Austria emerges in the field. Marx rejects the forms of contemporary music and entertainment that had begun to emerge in Istanbul, just as Gökalp and

⁶⁶ “Tarihî Vesikalar” 1, 18: Milliyetsiz büyük sanat yoktur; vatan toprağına ve vatan sesine bağılık mutlaka lazımdır. Yoksa sanat kımsiz, kansız bir özentiye yozlaşır.

⁶⁷ “Tarihî Vesikalar” 2, 23: Hafif musikili eğlence yerlerinin (bahusus sesli sinemalarla içki yerlerinin) vergilerini azıcık yükseltmek suretile ciddi musikili müesseseler teşkiline yarayacak bir miktar paranın elde edilmesi mütalaa edilmeye değer.

⁶⁸ “Tarihî Vesikalar” 2, 24: Sinemalara ve kötü modern dans musikisi çaldıran öteki eğlence yerlerine ileride ruhsat verilirken biraz ihtiyatlı davranmak uygun olacaktır. Bunlar öyle yerlerdir ki bir milletin zevki (good taste), yüksek sanat duygusu, elhasıl manevi inkişafı oralarda eğlencenin büsbütün ruhsuz şekilleriyle ve adi teheyüçlerle pek ağır bir surette ihlal edilir.

the prevailing Turkish revolutionary forces rejected the music of the Ottoman court and the Mevlevi *tekke*-s long present in Istanbul. As Gökalp and Atatürk, among others, point to the sickness and weakness of those Ottoman musics and their negative effect on the listener's health, so too does Marx deem contemporary popular music "lifeless" and "vulgar" and argues that it will retard the moral development of the Turkish people.

Marx perceived his activities as advisor in Turkey as propaganda of the *Wiener Klassik* through which to shore up his own favorable positionality in the Austrian field of music-cultural production and contribute to the acquisition of symbolic capital at the international level for the Austrian nation-state. I have demonstrated that Marx was well placed in the field of music cultural production in inter-war Austria. Nevertheless, his conservative musical views, which opposed him to "unnatural" modernist composition, also made his position vulnerable to progressives seeking to gain control of the field. Given his age, success, and the limitations of his own compositional outlook, Marx was in no position to challenge the progressives at their own game. The continual acquisition of influence gained through such means as advising the fledgling Turkish nation state on musical matters and shaping its future composers was a strategy deployed by Marx to maintain his prominent position.

It is necessary, however, to contextualize this strategy. Were Marx to have employed it in post-WWII West Germany, with its strong support for new music, it would have failed. In the objective conditions Marx encountered in inter-war Austria, however, the strategy was a good fit. Marx found himself in a nation state building its national identity on a conservative conception of symbolic capital amidst tremendous loss of material capital. He therefore was strategically able to use the congruence between his subjective inclinations and the objective conditions he encountered to acquire and maintain a favorable position in the field of music-cultural

production through such measures as his work in Turkey. Furthermore, his statements on the enhancement of Austria's position within the field of power indicate that he viewed his activity in Turkey as propaganda for Austria as cultural superpower.

Due to the site of his work and his conservatism stemming from favorable positionality, Marx's advising in Turkey was overshadowed by that of later European musical advisors. Among other musicians invited to Turkey during the 1930s shortly after Marx such as Hungarian composer and musicologist Bela Bartok and German composer Paul Hindemith, Marx is considerably less known. There are several possible reasons. First, his marginalization may be due to the fact that Hindemith guided the establishment of the Ankara State Conservatory which, given Ankara's role as the symbol of Turkish Republican modernity, was ultimately a more impactful institution than the Istanbul Conservatory. Indeed, in his report, Marx appears oblivious to contemporary developments in the capital Ankara when he comments that it is good that Istanbul is not yet totally Europeanized. We have seen in the case of radio that the state was not able to gain decisive control of the field of music-cultural production until the mid-1930s. Thus, while Hindemith's invitation was extended by the Turkish state for the founding of a new conservatory, Marx's was extended by an Ottoman hold-over conservatory. In this way, his activity may have been tainted by Ottomanness in much the same way that Alnar's was.

Differences in Marx's and Hindemith's positionalities in their relative fields of music-cultural production, however, are also important for understanding the disparity in their recognition. Just as Marx's activity in Turkey has been forgotten, so have he and his oeuvre, while historians and performers have granted Hindemith a secure position in the canon of twentieth-century music. In contradistinction to Marx's favorable conservative positionality, Hindemith was a progressive who found himself on the wrong side of the ideological divide in

Nazi Germany, where his music began to be suppressed in 1934.⁶⁹ Hindemith's music was ultimately included in the famous "degenerate music" (*Entartete Musik*) exhibit in 1938 upon which Marx reported.⁷⁰ As Zimmerman-Kalyoncu indicates, it is likely that Hindemith used the Turkey position as a strategy both to (literally) distance himself from problems in Berlin and to improve his image in the eyes of the Nazi government.⁷¹ Hindemith may therefore have approached his work in Turkey with a greater urgency befitting its direct relation to his continued well-being. For Marx, work in Turkey was more a means of increasing Austrian international prestige and maintaining an already privileged position in Austria. Similarly, Marx's Ständestaat-influenced conservative musical thought may have rendered him a less dynamic advisor than Hindemith, who with his well-defined views on the moral and political roles of art brought a great zeal and insight to the Turkish project. In other words, as Marx was only aiming to preserve the status quo and his own favorable position, he did not perceive in the Turkey visits a strategy useful beyond the prestige and gains in symbolic capital he gained from them. Hindemith, seeking as a progressive composer to gain control of the definition of the field of music-cultural production and struggling to negotiate Nazi cultural politics, would have seen a significant opportunity in Turkey. Through work as music advisor to the Turkish state, Hindemith identified a potentially powerful strategy for improving his position in the field of music-cultural production and defending his life and livelihood from the Nazis.⁷² Hindemith's five-chapter manual well known in Turkish musical circles, *Proposals for the Building of Turkish Musical Life, Given to the Turkish Ministry of Education (Vorschläge für den Aufbau*

⁶⁹ Cornelia Zimmerman-Kalyoncu, "Paul Hindemiths Türkei-Jahre—oder: Wie organisiert man Atatürks Musikreformen," *Hindemith Jahrbuch*, 15 (1986): 31.

⁷⁰ Dieter Rexroth, "Paul Hindemiths Beitrag zum türkischen Musikleben," *Hindemith Jahrbuch* 15 (1986), 40.

⁷¹ Zimmermann-Kalyoncu, 31; Rexroth, 41.

⁷² See Joel Haney "Slaying the Wagnerian Monster: Hindemith, Das Nusch-Nuschi, and Musical Germanness after the Great War," *JAMS* 25, no. 4, for insight into Hindemith's opposition to Wagnerism.

des türkischen Musiklebens, dem türkischen Unterrichts-Ministerium eingereicht), is an indication of the seriousness of his approach to his duties as advisor.⁷³

Alnar, Marx, and Exchange of Symbolic Power

In Vienna, Alnar found in his teacher Joseph Marx another conservative cultural actor aiming to maintain already established favorable positionality in his field of music-cultural production. Due to the conservative, nostalgic cultural field in pre-WWII Austria, Joseph Marx was favorably positioned in terms of symbolic capital yet, in contradistinction to Bourdieu's conception, simultaneously a producer of cultural products with widespread popular appeal. As has been demonstrated, his compositions were popular and he was widely respected as a musician in the Austrian First Republic and *Staendestaat* fields of music-cultural production. Through his numerous and undoubtedly financially lucrative academic, cultural, and political appointments, his positionality in terms of material capital was also favorable, arguably making him a dominant member of the dominant class. Marx's dominance was threatened, however. Though a successful composer, Marx perceived in musical modernism a threat to his positionality, his conservative theories on the naturalness of tonality, and his Herderian belief in the importance of folk-infused art music. Politically, the looming and subsequently realized absorption of Austria into Nazi Germany threatened his significant cultural and material capital in the post-WWI Austrian field. As a result, he strategically fashioned a role for himself as propagator of Austrian musical and cultural superiority, though he was prepared to re-evaluate this role following the annexation of Austria onto Nazi Germany. As spreader of the good news of the *Wiener Klassik*, Marx thus accomplished several goals. First, he defended his own positionality by implicitly emphasizing the superiority of the tonal Austrian music of the past

⁷³ Rexroth, 39.

over the atonal, modernist, and popular music threatening his control over the field of music-cultural production. Second, he worked to defend Austria's superior cultural positionality and compensate for its loss of material capital in emerging global fields of cultural and material production organized by nation-state. Finally, in so doing, Marx attempted to defend Austria from its aggressive northern neighbor, Germany.

In Hasan Ferid Alnar, Marx thus found a student whom he could use strategically to maintain his positionality in the *Staendestaat* field of music-cultural production as well as establish Austria's position as global cultural superpower. At the same time, we will see in the next chapter that Alnar found in Marx a teacher suitable to enhancing his positionality in the shifting field of music-cultural production in Republican Turkey. Given Alnar's quasi-conservative positionality, the two shared a similar positionality in their respective fields of music-cultural production, as revealed by the intimacy of their correspondence. That Marx did not develop such a relationship with his other Turkish Five student Necil Kazım Akses, who exhibited more progressive musical inclinations, also indicates the importance of a shared conservative positionality to Marx's strategic relationship with Alnar. Marx was able to use this relationship to arrange a site for his "systematic propaganda" of Viennese music in Turkey, thus defending and enhancing his and Austria's positionality as holders of significant reserves of symbolic capital to be distributed to the nation-states of the world.

Chapter 5: Strategy Performed on Stage and Hiding in Plain Sight: Hasan Ferid Alnar's Concerts and Joseph Marx's Reviews

After their relationship had been cemented by Alnar's studies in Vienna and Marx's work as advisor in Istanbul, Hasan Ferid Alnar and Joseph Marx continued for several decades to call upon each other for access to the particular symbolic capital each could gain from the other. For Alnar, the 1935 Viennese premiere of his first major work, *Prelude and Two Dances*, on a "Turkish Evening" concert, was a significant boost in symbolic capital which likely enabled the next phase of his career as a conductor and teacher in Ankara. Alnar's reflections on that concert indicate its significance to him, but also reveal a sense of unease as a composer that I argue stems from the opposition between Alnar's *habitus* in Ottoman music and the Gökalpian trajectory of the Turkish Republican field of music. Alnar's emphasis on conducting as opposed to composition, I propose, constituted a means of avoiding that opposition through non-compositional musical service to the Turkish nation. Alnar's next major work—the 1942 cello concerto—met with success, but also manifested Ottoman musical characteristics more prominently. Ultimately, beyond a source of symbolic capital, Vienna became a site for Alnar to escape from the polarized field of music-cultural production in Turkey.

For Joseph Marx, events such as the "Turkish Evening" were useful as evidence of his "systematic propaganda" of the *Wiener Klassik* in foreign countries. The success of Hasan Ferid Alnar thus allowed Marx to gain both symbolic and material capital in the Austrian *Staendestaat* field of music-cultural production. However, in order to reap maximum profits, Marx had to ensure that Alnar was recognized as a proper musician. He thus penned an anonymous review of Alnar's *Prelude and Two Dances* ensuring readers that the piece was far from dreaded atonality, and was in fact deeply rooted in Turkish national music. Likewise, in another anonymous review

of Alnar's cello concerto that I attribute to Marx, Alnar's legitimacy as an authentic Turkish national composer was emphasized. Finally, Marx came out into the open with a 1948 article titled "Turkish Music in Vienna," in which he re-called his work with Turkish musicians and again defended against any who might question the healthy, tonal normalcy of Alnar's music.

Thus, it is during the roughly two-decade period after Alnar completed his studies with Marx in Vienna that we see a long-term strategic exchange in symbolic capital between Hasan Ferid Alnar and Joseph Marx. On the one hand, this exchange was made possible by the objective conditions of inversional congruence of the fields of music in the Turkish and Austrian nation states. On the other hand, the particular subjective experiences of Alnar and Marx as musical agents trying to acquire and maintain favorable positionality while caught between conservatism and progressivism made the exchange both possible and necessary.

"Turkish Evening" Concert and Overlapping Strategies

Alnar's first major success after his studies with Marx was the premiere of his orchestral work *Prelude and Two Dances*, given on an April 3, 1935 "Turkish Evening" concert organized in Vienna by Joseph Marx. I argue that the "Turkish Evening" concert was the product of Alnar's and Marx's overlapping strategies. For Alnar, the concert provided the platform for a prestigious European premiere of a major orchestral work, and thus a means to gain symbolic capital in the Turkish Republican field of music-cultural production. For Marx, the concert provided a forum in which to advertise his activities as music advisor in Istanbul in his own field of Austrian music-cultural production, as well as to advance the career of his student Alnar, whose success would in turn contribute to an increase in Marx's own symbolic capital. I argue that a subsequent review of the concert that appeared in the *Wiener Zeitung* was a piece of propaganda either penned by Marx or written under his influence.

Letters written from Alnar to Marx during the winter and spring of 1935 reveal that Alnar composed the *Prelude and Two Dances* specifically for the “Turkish Evening,” indicating that both Alnar and Marx saw the concert as an important step in Alnar’s career. From a letter written from Alnar to Marx on January 14, 1935, we first learn of a concert to be given in the spring in Vienna on which several of Alnar’s pieces are to be performed, among them an orchestral “overture” still in the works.¹ A February 4, 1935 letter yields further insight into the genesis of Alnar’s *Prelude and Two Dances*. In this letter we first learn that the concert will be a “Turkish Evening” (“*Türkischer Abend*”). Alnar also offers a description of the orchestral piece he is composing, the score for which he intends to have complete by March 15. He describes the work in progress as follows: “an introduction (improvisation) that lasts five minutes, and another movement, (two dances) that are based on sonata form, but, instead of a secondary theme in the exposition, with a second dance that appears without transition and contrasts with the first theme/dance in meter and movement. The entire piece will come to about 14-15 minutes.”²

In the February 4, 1935 letter, Arel’s strategy is also revealed as a continuing influence upon Alnar. Alnar mentions Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel’s desire that Joseph Marx write to the governor of Istanbul (*Vali*) requesting funds for a young cellist to study in Europe. As demonstrated in the previous chapter, Arel and Marx likely became acquainted during Marx’s visits to Istanbul, and their relationship provided each party with opportunities for strategic gain. For Arel, Marx was a contact in an important European musical center to whom he could send students in order to advance his own conception of Turkish music. For Marx, Arel provided a

¹ Hasan Ferid Alnar to Joseph Marx, January 14, 1935, Manuscript Collection, Austrian National Library, Vienna, Austria.

² Hasan Ferid Alnar to Joseph Marx, February 4, 1935, Manuscript Collection, Austrian National Library, Vienna, Austria.

potential source of foreign students through whom he could continue to spread Austria's reputation as cultural superpower and shore up his own superior positionality.

No Un-Real Atonality Here: Response to Alnar's *Prelude and Two Dances*

The "Turkish Evening" concert was given on April 3, 1935 by the Vienna Symphony Orchestra (*Wiener Symphoniker*) under the direction of Alnar's former conducting teacher Oswald Kabasta. I argue that a subsequent review titled "Turkish Orchestral Music" ("*Türkische Orchestermusik*") in the *Wiener Zeitung*—according to Mayer-Hirzberger the paper most directly under the influence of the Ständestaat government—was a further component of Marx's program of music propaganda, and was indeed likely written by Marx himself. The review's anonymous author notes that the "Turkish Evening was one in a series of 'Austauschkonzerte'—presumably results of the aforementioned cultural exchanges. This concert was, however, a bit unusual: "Now one heard an orchestral concert with new Turkish music. For most of us it was something completely new, because until now we did not have any opportunity to hear anything from Turkish music."³ Fortunately for the concertgoers, Joseph Marx was present to give an introduction: "an informative presentation from State Councilor Dr. Marx, who, it is well known, set up the conservatory in Istanbul after the pattern of the Wiener Musikakademie."⁴

The program opened with Cemal Reşit Rey's "Concerto Chromatique," for which Rey was also the soloist. The critic for the *Wiener Zeitung* found the themes used in the work easily recognizable as "Turkish." It was also noted that Rey studied in Paris, and his orchestration was heard to be reminiscent of Debussy and Ravel. The program was concluded with Rey's "Fünf Türkische Stimmungsbilder, to which the reviewer attributes a "pleasant simplicity."

³ H.E.H., "Türkische Orchestermusik," *Wiener Zeitung*, April 6, 1935.

⁴ H.E.H.

Alnar's "Prelude and Two Dances" was performed between the two works by Rey. The critic makes much of Alnar's work, and gives Alnar a clean bill of health in terms of Austrian *Ständestaat* musical conservatism:

It is different with Hasan Ferid Alnar. He is much more beholden to the folk song than his previously mentioned colleague [Cemal Reşit Rey]. But harmonically he attempts to go his own way in the sense that he listens into these unique melodies and lays harmonies under them that are probably inexplicable by the rules of our music. Nonetheless one feels overall an urgent and enrapturing logic—not for a moment does one have an impression of un-real tonality. In short, one hears again after a long time a thoroughly new music which—what perhaps speaks the strongest for it—will motivate many musicians to imitation.⁵

Several aspects of the review of Alnar's work are unusual and point to Marx's influence. The first curious aspect is the absence of any word on Alnar's background. Joseph Marx, whose activities in Istanbul the critic notes, was at the concert and gave a lecture, and it is difficult to conceive that he would not have mentioned the fact that Alnar had only a few years prior studied with him in Vienna. Nor can it be argued that the reviewer was not interested in the composers' backgrounds, for they make much of Rey's Parisian studies and their influence on his music. In addition to this curious omission, two other aspects of the review stand out: the critic notes that Alnar is even more dedicated to folk music than Rey, and that, in spite of his exotic harmonies based on folk melodies, there is "not for a moment a hint of un-real atonality."

All of these elements indicate the probability that Marx wrote or directly influenced the writing of the 1935 review in order to advance both his and Alnar's positionality. Marx gave the lecture and Oswald Kabasta conducted; not only had these men been Alnar's most important teachers, they were also both involved in *Ständestaat* music propaganda, as has already been

⁵ H.E.H: Anders ist es um Hassan Ferid Alnar bestellt. Er ist dem Volkslied noch mehr verfallen als sein früher genannter Kollege [Cemal Reşit Rey]. Aber harmonisch versucht er eigene Wege zu gehen, indem er in diese eigenartige Melodie hineinhört und ihr Harmonien unterlegt, die nach den Regeln unserer Musik wohl kaum erklärbar sind. Nichtsdestoweniger fühlt man überall eine zwingende und hinreißende Logik, es entsteht nicht einen Augenblick lang der Eindruck unechter Atonalität, kurz, man hörte hier nach lange Zeit wieder eine durchaus neuartige Musik, die—was vielleicht am stärksten für sie spricht—viele Musiker zur Nachahmung anregen wird.

demonstrated in Marx's case. We have already seen that Joseph Marx's concept of folk music does not consider the particulars of the Turkish case—he uses “folk music” as a blanket term for all Turkish music. Nonetheless, the assertion that Alnar was particularly dedicated to folk music writ large would have been a high complement in Marx's eyes and in conservative *Staendestaat* musical circles generally. Likewise, the seeming inevitability of the absence of “un-real atonality” is readily understandable, for Marx would never praise a student's work which emphasized principles of musical organization that he did not recognize as legitimate.

Anxiety and Competitions: Alnar's Reflections

Alnar's recollections of the “Turkish Evening” concert, drawn from his memoirs and an April 27, 1935 letter written to Marx, reveal a continuation and deepening of Alnar's and Marx's relationship, as well as the beginnings of difficulties for Alnar in the Turkish Republican field of music as a result of his *habitus* in Ottoman music. Alnar's recollection from his memoirs reveals the importance that Joseph Marx ascribed—seen in the review above and subsequent Marx writings discussed below—to national purity in music:

In 1935 I was invited together with Cemal Reşit Rey to Vienna. After the successful premiere of “Prelude and Two Dances” under the direction of my professor Kabasta, Universal Edition decided to print the sheet music of the work. From that point on I knew how thankful I was to my composition teacher Professor Marx. He had said to me then: you are on the way to becoming educated as a national composer. You should be careful that you don't fall under the influences of Western musical styles.⁶

Marx's exhortation not to “fall under the influences of the Western musical styles” seems out of place, given the significant work undertaken by him with Alnar intended to accomplish rather the opposite. Marx's views conform to a Herderian conception of folk music and the nation state

⁶ Aydın, 58: 1935 wurde ich mit Cemal Reşit Rey zusammen nach Wien eingeladen. Nach der erfolgreichen Uraufführung von „Präludium und zwei Tänze“ unter der Leitung von meinem Professor Kabasta beschloß die Universal Edition, die Noten des Werkes zu drucken. Von diesem Zeitpunkt an wußte ich, wie dankbar ich meinem Kompositionslehrer, Professor Marx, war. Er hatte mir damals gesagt: Sie sind auf dem Weg, zum nationalen Komponisten ausgebildet zu werden, Sie sollten darauf achten, daß Sie nicht unter die Einflüsse der westlichen Musikstile geraten.

which prevailed in the *Staendestaat*, and he thus saw the only legitimate Turkish national music as one heavily based upon Turkish musical foundations. He might have feared that his student might slip over to dark side of internationalist modernism, or might begin to write predominately European music only occasionally peppered with Turkish elements. In this way, Marx's advice could be interpreted as a warning to stay on the "healthy" side of the divide and avoid internationalist purveyors of "un-natural" music.

Alnar's reflection on the "Turkish Evening" concert in an April 27, 1935 letter to Marx from Istanbul yields insight into the intimacy of their relationship, as well as the dissonance Alnar was already feeling as a composer with a *habitus* in Ottoman music in the Gökaltipist Turkish Republican field of music-cultural production. After emphasizing how wonderful the concert and the time in Vienna had been for him, Alnar shares with Marx his very personal reflections on his difficulties as a musician:

Although I am not very advanced in age, I have unfortunately—or thank God, perhaps it depends—come so far that I (at least according to outward appearances) react less than a normally feeling person or artist to the successes and losses in life—particularly in my artistic life. Whether this is the result of my first childhood years, where I had to play the role of an adult, or whether it lies in my nature, which occupies itself much more with the subjective and the interior, I seldom feel great child-like joy.

But on April 3, 1935, which will certainly count as one of the most important milestones of my life, I learned that there can be such joyful moments in the life of an artist, which can compensate for and perhaps even surpass the worries and pains of the artist's life. I naturally expected a good performance from the Vienna Symphony, and a satisfactory interpretation from Professor Kabasta, but how pleasantly surprised I was when everything was more than I had expected and imagined!

The feeling of inferiority that I have when composing ... receded with such a good performance; a performance in which one isn't disappointed is the most rewarding thing there is. And more than anything else an orchestral performance, in so far as it is the product of a large mass. I must admit that the orchestra will be my favorite instrument.

To come again to the momentary disappearance of the feeling of inferiority: it doesn't just have a beneficial significance for my artistic life, but also for all areas of my life ... Yes, in the last two years when, for familiar reasons, I couldn't establish myself very

easily, so that for example I couldn't say, I live here or there, and then due to the military service, I haven't been very active as a composer. Though one certainly couldn't say that I haven't done anything. And despite all of this, the well-wishing competition considered me unproductive, or at least lazy. It wasn't so long ago that I answered one of the main representatives of the competition, who couched his analysis in a friendly tone: "Trust me, my life will not always be like this!"

This time, thanks to my musical instructor, who I am proud to call my friend, the opportunity came, and my words weren't empty ... Now the only thing to do is to work to bring my complete satisfaction with the results of this concert trip to expression.⁷

The immediate impression gained from this letter is its intimacy; Alnar writes freely of personal life circumstances and emotions to his teacher, indicating that he and Marx had discussed these matters before. Particularly significant in this regard are Alnar's references to what seem to be psychological and emotional difficulties relating specifically to his activity as composer. I argue

⁷ Hasan Ferid Alnar to Joseph Marx, April 27, 1935, Manuscript Collection, Austrian National Library, Vienna, Austria: Obwohl ich noch in keinem fortgeschrittenen Alter bin, kam ich leider—oder vielleicht auch Gott sei Dank jenachdem—so weit, dass ich den Erfolgen und den Fehlgehen im Leben, vielmehr aber in meinem Künstlerleben, weniger als ein normal fühlender Mensch oder Künstler (mindestens nach äusseren Empfinden) ragierte. Sei es die Folge meiner ersten Jugendjahre, wo ich die Rolle eines erwachsenen Menschen spielen musste, oder läge es in meinem Wesen, das sich mehr mit dem Innerlichen und Subjektiven befassen will, ich empfinde selten eine kindisch grosse Freude.

Aber am 3. April 1935, der bestimmt zu einem der allerwichtigsten Marksteine meines Lebens zählen wird, lernte ich, dass es doch so glückliche Momente im Künstlerleben geben kann, wo wieder von ihm längere Zeit resultierenden Sorgen und Schmerzen glatt ausgeglichen, sogar überboten werden können. Ich erwartete von den Wiener Symphonikern schon ein sehr gutes Spiel und von Prof. Kabasta zufriedenstellendes Einleben in die Sache. Aber wie angenehm überrascht war ich als sich alles mehr als erwartet und vorgestellt gut repräsentierte!

Das Minderwertigkeitsgefühl, was ich beim Komponieren, wenn nicht bis zu einem aufhaltenden Grad habe—tritt im Laufe und im Umfang einer so guten Aufführung zurück; Ein Spiel, bei welchem man nicht im geringsten enttäuscht wird ist das Dankbarste unter allen anderen. Und am meisten das Orchesterspiel, insofern es auch das Zusammenarbeiten einer grösseren Masse ist. So gab ich auch zu, dass das Orchester mein beliebtes Instrument sein wird.

Und wieder um den momentanen Verschwinden des Minderwertigkeitsgefühles zurückzukommen: ES hat für mich nicht nur eine künstlerische, sondern eine für mein ganzes Leben und für mein eigentliches Ich sehr wohltuende Bedeutung: Ich bin wieder der Mensch, der keine Skrupeln mehr hat und der den nicht immer sehr sachlich kritisierenden Kollegen und Bekannten was zu antworten im Stande ist. Ja, in den letzten zwei Jahren, wo ich erstens aus familiären Gründen—ich konnte mich nicht sehr leicht etablieren, so dass ich z.B. sagen konnte, ich wohne da oder dort—dann wegen des Militärdienstes habe ich also Komponist nicht sehr aktiv sein können. Damit war aber noch lange nicht gesagt, dass ich gar nichts gemacht habe. Und trotz dieser Konstellation wollte mich die wohlwollende (!) Konkurrenz und seine Umgebung als nicht produktiv, mindestens als nicht fleissig erkennen. Es ist aber nicht lange her, ich antwortete einem der Hauptrepräsentanten der Konkurrenz, welcher diese Analyse in einem freundschaftlich gutgemeinten Tone machte: "Trösteten Sie sich, mein Leben wird nicht immer dasselbe bleiben!"

Diesmal, Dank meinem musikalischen Ausbilder, auch auf dessen Freundschaft ich stolz sein kann, ergab sich die Möglichkeit, und wenn meine Worte blieben nicht bloss gesagt ... Es bleibt mir jetzt nichts anderes als mich zu bemühen, den sehr dankbaren Ergebnissen dieser Konzertreise mit neuem Schaffen meine restlose Befriedigung zum Ausdruck zu bringen ...

that these difficulties are the product of his *habitus* in Ottoman urban music in the Gökalpist, folk-oriented field of Turkish music-cultural production, and constitute musical disabling. As discussed in chapter three, no less important a figure than Atatürk had publicly voiced his support for a Gökalpist field of Turkish music and his disdain for Ottoman urban musical traditions around the same time that Alnar was laying the foundations for his career as Turkish national composer.

Alnar's references to "the competition" in the letter furthermore reveal the lines of the Gökalp-Arel divide in Alnar's professional circles. Although it is difficult to draw firm conclusions on the basis of the April 27, 1935 letter, references to his colleagues in the letter above and a December 21, 1933 letter at the Istanbul Conservatory—particularly Cemal Reşit Rey and Seyfettin Asal—indicate that Alnar perceived animosity between himself and some of his colleagues. In the December 21, 1933 letter to Marx, Alnar recounts an incident in which he had a hostile altercation with Rey. As Alnar recounts, Rey had composed an operetta to be performed at the Municipal Theater. Alnar had understood that he would conduct while Rey played piano in the pit orchestra. Rey attempted a takeover of the conductor's podium, leading to an intervention by Muhsin Ertuğrul and a tensing of relations between Alnar and Rey.⁸ In the April 14, 1935 letter, Alnar writes of Rey that he is "not a particularly good conductor, and doesn't even play piano very well."⁹ In the same letter, he writes that Seyfeddin Asal is gifted "neither as conductor nor as a chamber musician."¹⁰ As demonstrated above, Rey was for all intents and purposes a European art musician who only began to work with Turkish folk music

⁸ Hasan Ferid Alnar to Joseph Marx, December 21, 1933, Manuscript Collection, Austrian National Library, Vienna, Austria.

⁹ Hasan Ferid Alnar to Joseph Marx, April 14, 1935, Manuscript Collection, Austrian National Library, Vienna, Austria.

¹⁰ Hasan Ferid Alnar to Joseph Marx, April 14, 1935, Manuscript Collection, Austrian National Library, Vienna, Austria.

after the founding of the Republic. Seyfeddin Asaf had studied with Marx, among other teachers, in Vienna in the 1910s, but had also made the first folk music collecting trip on behalf of the Society for the Fixing and Correction of Turkish Music with his brother in 1926.¹¹ Alnar's disparaging remarks reveal that, among others, Cemal Reşit Rey and Seyfeddin Asaf constituted the "competition" insofar as they represented the Gökalpian side of the field of music-cultural production in Turkey, while Alnar and by extension Marx were aligned with the Arelian side.

Conducting Avoidance: Hasan Ferid Alnar in Ankara

One means of side-stepping challenges presented by musical disabling available to Alnar was to turn toward conducting and teaching, a route that Alnar emphasized in the next phase of his career. When Alnar did produce his next major work—a cello concerto in 1942—it was in a period of relative opening toward the canon of Turkish Art Music then being formed. The Cello Concerto met with success, but the critical response to this work emphasizing the degree to which Alnar relied upon an Ottoman musical foundation nonetheless reveals the problematicity of Ottoman/Turkish Art Music in the context of the Turkish music revolution. As we will see in chapter seven, later critics pointed to this approach as an example of Alnar's musical backwardness and deficiency. One critical evaluation that strongly praised the work—a review that appeared in the German Language Turkish newspaper *Turkish Post (Türkische Post)*—exhibits a considerable familiarity with Alnar's oeuvre and a nationalist take on Turkish music composition peppered with by now familiar turns of phrase. I argue that this anonymously published review was also the product of Joseph Marx's strategizing to boost his student's—and by extension his own—reputation.

¹¹ Ahmet Say, "Seyfettin Asaf," Kemancılar.net, <http://kemancilar.net/seyfettin-asaf/>.

Following the successful premiere of *Prelude and Two Dances* in Vienna, Alnar moved to Ankara—the center of Republican modernity—to work as teacher and opera conductor. It is likely that Alnar was able to “finance” this move with the symbolic capital he had gained from the prestigious Viennese premiere of *Prelude and Two Dances*. In Ankara, Alnar taught composition and piano accompaniment at the newly founded Ankara State Conservatory, and worked as assistant conductor of the Presidential Symphony Orchestra under the German conductor brought by Hindemith, Ernst Praetorius.¹² With Praetorius’ death in 1946, Alnar became the head conductor of the Presidential Symphony. In 1940, Alnar began an association with the nascent Ankara State Opera ultimately leading to his being named General Music Director in 1955. Writings such as his 1938 “Phonetic Accents in Text and Music” (“*Söz ve Müzikte Vurgu*”) and “Song and Opera Adaptations” (“*Şarkı ve Opera Adaptasyonları*”) indicate that Alnar had been thinking about opera in Turkish.¹³ Indeed, he began his tenure at the opera with a Turkish-language performance of Mozart’s opera *Bastien und Bastienne*. Turkish-language performances of the second acts of *Madam Butterfly* and *Tosca* under Alnar’s baton quickly followed.¹⁴ These conducting and teaching positions allowed Alnar to develop his career at the center of the Turkish music revolution without being completely reliant on negotiating his conflicting *habitus* as a composer.

Alnar did manage to successfully negotiate between his Ottoman and Western *habitus* in his next major work, however. His 1942 cello concerto written for Presidential Symphony Orchestra cellist David Zirkin met with considerable success—including a Republican People’s Party Art Prize (*CHP Sanat Ödülü*).¹⁵ In this work, Alnar relied heavily on the Ottoman urban

¹² Aydın, 59.

¹³ Rizeli, 18-25.

¹⁴ Aydın, 59

¹⁵ Aydın, 73.

music tradition, foreshadowing style features that later become more prominent in the *Kanun Concerto*, and which were later emphasized by reviewers as evidence of Alnar's inferiority in comparison with his fellow Turkish Five composers. Nevertheless, one reviewer pointing to the obvious presence of Ottoman makams such as *nikriz*, *suzinak*, *maye*, and *hicaz* noted that these made a positive impact on the audience and that the piece "once again proved that in order to create national music previous knowledge of Turkish music is indispensable," while also noting that the instrumentation was a bit thin.¹⁶ As Patrick Bartsch has demonstrated, the increased openness toward the music of the Ottoman past exhibited by this work and its reception were part of a relaxing of the initial hardline reforms of the Gökalpian Turkish music revolution after Atatürk's death in 1938.¹⁷ However, as later reception of Alnar's *Kanun Concerto* and oeuvre will demonstrate, this relaxation did not mean that field of Turkish music was completely open to Ottoman/Turkish Art Music at all levels, nor that Alnar was able completely to reconcile his deviant *habitus*.

Another review in the German-language paper *The Turkish Post* (*Türkische Post*) places considerable emphasis on the "Turkishness" of the cello concerto, likening the work to "an oriental tree grown in European soil," and comparing the high cello register to "the falsetto singers of the *Alaturka* musical tradition." This reviewer, I argue, was Joseph Marx, who continued to maintain an interest in developing his student's career:

The work shows, generally overviewed, the composer on the way to a purely musically as well as psychologically very interesting amalgamation of Turkish and Central European style elements. From being one next to the other, as was characteristic in some of his earlier works, there is nothing left here to notice. One may well have felt the urge in one or two motives to say, this is totally in European style, but then immediately thereafter—what is essential—follow motives of Turkish national imprint that develop themselves imperceptibly and that grow organically from that imprint. (One could

¹⁶ Aydın, 72-73: milli musikimizi yaratabilmek için evvela Türk musikisi çok iyi bilmenin elzem olduğunu bir kere daha ispat etti.

¹⁷ Bartsch, 246-247.

perhaps best describe the relationship between the two style sources if one said that Alnar's new work is not so much to be compared with a structure made of European and Turkish material joined together as with an Oriental tree grown in European soil). This is repeatedly demonstrated in all movements—including the third, though this movement is built on a pure Turkish theme and a real Turkish rhythmic structure. This is demonstrated harmonically in the development of a novel variety of triad built out of fourths (which according to the composer counts as a consonance to the Turkish music perception) instead of thirds, though this "Turkish triad" is then employed in a totally European sense in the construction of the musical form. It is demonstrated just as much in the melodic and rhythmic course of the themes.¹⁸

A comparison of this review to earlier writings by Marx reveals numerous similarities.

The reviewer's claim that "the composer [is] on the way to a purely musically as well as psychologically very interesting amalgamation of Turkish and Central European style elements" is very similar to Alnar's recollection of Marx's assertion that Alnar was "on the way to becoming educated as a national composer." The reviewer's claim that "there is nothing left here to notice" of the previous bifurcation of style in Alnar's works appears to resolve Marx's warning to Alnar that "[he] should be careful that [he doesn't] fall under the influences of the Western musical styles." This statement furthermore indicates that the reviewer has a high degree of familiarity with Alnar's previous works, which Marx more than anyone else would have had. The reviewer observes that "One may well have felt the urge in one or two motives

¹⁸ Dr. ---, "5. Philharmonisches Konzert," *Türkische Post*, 13 January 1943: Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin Preussischer Kulturbesitz Digitalisierte Ausgaben: Das Werk zeigt, ganz allgemein überblickt, den Komponisten auf dem Wege zu einem rein musikalisch wie Psychologisch überaus interessanten Verschmelzung türkischer und mitteleuropäischer Stilelemente. Von einem nebenander derselben, wie es für manche seiner früheren Werke charakteristisch war, ist hier nichts mehr zu merken. Wohl mag man sich in ein oder zwei Teilmotive lang versucht fühlen, zu sagen, dies sei doch ganz in europäischem Stile, aber gleich darauf und, was das wesentliche ist, unmerklich sich daraus entwickelnd und organisch daraus hervorgewachsen folgen Motive von Türkisch-nationalem Gepraege. (Man könnte vielleicht das Verhaeltnis der beiden Stillquellen am besten damit bezeichnen, wenn man sagte, dass Alnars neues Werk nicht so sehr einem aus europäischem und türkischem Material zusammengefügt Bauwerke als einem auf europäischem Boden gewachsen orientalischen Baume zu vergleichen waere). Dies zeigt sich immer wieder, in allen Saetzen, auch im Dritten, obwohl dieser auf einem rein Türkischen Thema und in einer echt Türkischen Taktart aufgebaut ist. Es zeigt sich harmonisch in der Entwicklung eines neuartigen Dreiklangbegriffes, naemlich mit einer Quarte (die nach Aussage des Komponisten dem Türkischen Musikempfinden als Konsonaz gilt) statt der Terz, wobei aber diese "Türkischen Dreiklange" dann im ganz europäischem Sinne zum Aufbau der musikalischen Form eingesetzt werden. Es zeigt sich aber ebenso im melodischen und rhythmischen Verlauf der Themen.

to say, this is totally in European style, but then immediately thereafter—what is essential—follow motives of Turkish national imprint that develop themselves imperceptably and that grow organically from that imprint.” This emphasis on internal organic coherence rooted in Turkish music is remarkably similar to the “Turkish Evening” concert review, which claimed that “harmonically [Alnar] attempts to go his own way in the sense that he listens into these unique melodies and lays harmonies under them that are probably inexplicable by the rules of our music. Nonetheless one feels overall an urgent and enrapturing logic—not for a moment does one have an impression of un-real atonality.” The reviewer’s contention that the cello concerto is “not so much to be compared with a structure made of European and Turkish material joined together as with an Oriental tree grown in European soil” echoes Marx’s proposal that, like a tree, Turkish music cannot be bent in any direction one chooses, but rather should derive strength both from national and from European sources. Finally, the reviewer’s mention that “according to the composer [quartal harmony] counts as a consonance to the Turkish music perception” echoes the respect for the internal coherence of Turkish musical structures exhibited in the 1935 review and in Marx’s essay “Music is Ringing Life.”

After noting that Alnar avoids traditional virtuosic figures and techniques frequently found in cello concertos, the reviewer concludes by praising Alnar’s cello concerto as a uniquely Turkish contribution to the cello repertoire:

Its themes and the virtuosity that develops out of them remains true to an overwhelming portion to a markedly Turkish national stage, and we would certainly not be in error if we were to see in the frequent preference of the instrument’s highest register a counterpart in a certain sense to the falsetto singers of the *alaturka* musical tradition. The orchestral part is exceedingly transparent, even almost thin; however, the composer consistently handled the instruments appropriately and in so doing won some pastel-fine colors of particular beauty from them ... as a [lyric concerto], Ferid Alnar’s new work can take a place as interesting and valuable contribution to the international violoncello literature.¹⁹

¹⁹ Dr. ---I: Seine Thematik und auch die daraus entwickelnde Virtuosität haelt sich zum überwiegenden Teil ausgesprochen Türkisch-nationalen Bühnen und wir werden bestimmt nicht fehlgehen, wenn wir in der haeufigen

The reviewer's likening of Alnar's use of the cello to the "falsetto singers of the *alaturka* musical tradition is reminiscent of Marx's orientaling characterization of the "dark, longing tones of Asia in art" in "Music as Ringing Life." The reviewer's final reference to the "international violincello literature" likewise echoes Marx's conception of a global field of music—with Austria at the center as cultural superpower. In this review, however, Marx would not have made reference to Austria, for by 1942 Austria had already been part of the Nazi *Reich* for five years. Indeed, if he was indeed the author, Marx may have seen this review as a means of gaining cultural capital in the eyes of the Nazis, whom, as Silberbauer has argued, he was eager to please.

Marx Writes Back

It may appear implausible to ascribe the previous two reviews to Joseph Marx. Would Marx really have continued to involve himself so closely in his former student's career? Had he continued so to do, would he have insisted on harping on the national authenticity and tonal legitimacy of Alnar's music? A 1948 article "Turkish Music in Vienna" ("*Türkische Musik in Wien*") that appeared in the *Wiener Zeitung* after Alnar conducted a concert including his *Prelude and Two Dances* in Vienna indicates that Marx did do both of these things.²⁰ As in the previous cases, I argue that this concert and Marx's review that followed were the product of Alnar's and Marx's overlapping strategies. For Alnar, Vienna continued to be a source of symbolic capital in the Turkish field. For Marx, his successful Turkish student continued to provide a means of bolstering his own positionality in the Austrian field of music cultural

Bevorzugung der höchsten Lage des Instrumentes in gewissem Sinne ein Gegenstück zu den Falsettsängern der alaturkischen Musikpflege erblicken. Der Orchestersatz ist ausserordentlich durchsichtig, ja fast dünn zu nennen; jedoch hat der Komponist die Instrumente durchwegs artgemaess behandelt ihnen dabei manche pastellfeine Farbe von eigenartiger Klangsönheit abgewonnen ... als [lyrischer Konzerte] darf sich auch Ferid Alnars neues Werk als interessanter und Wertvoller Beitrag in die internationale Violoncelloliteratur einreihen.

²⁰ Joseph Marx, "Türkische Musik in Wien," *Wiener Zeitung*, September 18, 1948.

production, though in this case Marx was likely trying to re-establish himself and his career after the chaos of the Second World War. Marx's 1948 article furthermore provides retroactive evidence that the 1935 and 1942 reviews were in fact written by Marx.

This time, Marx claims Alnar as his own student and mentions that Austrian musicians were active in Turkey. At this point, Marx was likely trying to remind readers of the cultural exchange between Austria and Turkey that he had spearheaded prior to the Nazi annexation in order to re-establish his positionality after the war. After noting that Turkish music had enjoyed much development and that gifted musicians “aus Stambul” were educated in Vienna and Austrian musicians were active as teachers in Turkey, Marx recounts Alnar's musical background in some detail: “Of the Turks who studied with us in Vienna, Ferit Alnar, who a few days ago conducted his own works in the Ravag, is one of the most gifted. He began as a virtuoso on the Turkish zither ... later he studied the theory of European music ... learned conducting, was totally at home in our music.”²¹

Marx again attempts to justify the harmonic language employed in *Prelude and Two Dances* using wording that closely resembles that of both the 1935 and 1942 reviews. I place excerpts from all three articles next to each other in reverse chronological order:

1948: Perhaps some of it seems so foreign—some will say ‘atonal’—for our European musical sense that we will not make sense of these strange music fantasies easily. However—this ‘problem’ is just sensibly grown in the soil of a musically gifted Volk.²²

1942: One may well feel have felt the urge in one or two motives to say, this is totally in European style, but then immediately thereafter—what is essential—follow motives of Turkish national imprint that develop themselves imperceptably and that grow organically from that imprint.

²¹ Marx, “Türkische Musik”: Von den Türken, die bei uns in Wien, studierten, ist Ferit Alnar, der vor einigen Tagen in der Ravag eigene Werke dirigierte, einer der begabtesten. Er begann als Virtuose auf der türkischen Zither . . . später studierte er die Theorien europäischer Musiken . . . lernte Dirigieren, war ganz zu Hause in unserer Musik.

²² Marx, “Türkische Musik”: Vielleicht wirkt einiges so befremdend—manche werden sagen ‘atonal’—für unser europäische Musikempfinden daß wir uns nicht ganz leicht in diesen seltsamen Musikphantasien zurechtfinden. Aber—diese ‘Problematik’ ist eben sinnvoll auf dem Boden eines musikbegabten Volkes gewachsen . . .

1935: ... harmonically he attempts to go his own way in the sense that he listens into these unique melodies and lays harmonies under them that are probably inexplicable by the rules of our music. Nonetheless one feels overall an urgent and enrapturing logic—not for a moment does one have an impression of un-real tonality.

The fact that Marx attached his name to a 1948 article on Alnar as authentic national musician and used language similar to the 1935 and 1942 articles on Alnar discussed above strongly indicates that Marx maintained an interest in his former student Alnar's career for decades after Alnar's studies in Vienna, and that Marx was in fact the author of the earlier articles. Marx's motivation for continuing to promote Alnar's career prior to World War Two was to advance his own positionality in the *Staendestaat* field of music-cultural production by advancing the career of his student. Thus, he takes care to emphasize the tonal and national orthodoxy of Alnar's music in accordance with the *Staendestaat* field of music. During the Second World War, Marx likely sought to promote his former student in order to gain favor with the Nazi German government. Finally, after the war, Marx publicly claimed Alnar as his student, and again preemptively countered any accusations of atonality made against Alnar's music. In this post-war context, Marx was likely attempting to re-establish his former favorable positionality via an explicit reminder of his pre-war work spreading Austrian cultural capital in foreign countries.

Escape to Vienna

Just as Marx strategically called upon Turkey as a source of symbolic capital for decades after his initial work with Alnar, Alnar also continued to use Austria and especially Vienna as a source of symbolic capital. Initially, Vienna supplied Alnar with the symbolic capital he needed to establish himself as an orthodox Turkish Republican composer. Increasingly, however, Vienna emerged as a means for Alnar to escape the musical disabling he experienced in Turkey. Events such as the 1935 premiere of *Prelude and Two Dances*, the publication of that work by *Universal Edition*, and subsequent conducting activity in Vienna served Alnar as a means of legitimizing

his positionality as a modern Turkish composer and advancing his positionality in the Turkish Republican field of music-cultural production. Likewise, his activity as conductor in Ankara provided him with a means for enhancing his positionality without being forced to fully confront the challenge posed by his *habitus* in Ottoman music and its potentially negative effect on his positionality in the Turkish field. Alnar's next major work after *Prelude and Two Dances*—the cello concerto—was successful, but was also heavily reliant on the Ottoman urban music tradition. Though this aspect of the cello concerto did not hamper its initial reception, the Ottoman elements in the work were later used by some critics to characterize Alnar as backward vis à vis the other Turkish Five composers. In the next chapter, I will demonstrate that Alnar's engagement with his Ottoman *habitus* in the *Kanun Concerto*—his next major work—gives the work a subversive quality that limited its circulation in Turkey for decades after its initial completion. The increasing conspicuousness of Alnar's *habitus* in Ottoman music and his attempt to “pass” using conducting make manifest Alnar's experience of musical disabling as a non-normative musician in the Turkish Republican field of music cultural production.

Alnar's experience of musical disabling—possessing a characteristic not fully accommodated by the Turkish Republican field of music-cultural production—led him increasingly to view Vienna not as a source of symbolic capital to bring back to Turkey, but rather as a means of escape from the disabling field of music-cultural production in Turkey. During the 1950s, Alnar experienced various personal upheavals and subsequently moved to Vienna where he worked as guest conductor. In 1952, he was divorced from his first wife, the Turkish opera singer Ayhan Aydan. Experiencing health problems after the divorce, Alnar resigned the conductorship of the Presidential Symphony Orchestra and began to concentrate

more on his duties as teacher at the Ankara State Conservatory.²³ In 1957, Alnar married the Austrian Hilde Hussl (subsequently Sevin Alnar), whom he had met while conducting in Salzburg.²⁴ In 1961, Alnar gave up his post at the opera due to declining health and moved to Austria for two years with Sevin.²⁵ There, he guest- conducted the Vienna Symphony, Vienna Radio Orchestra, Munich Philharmonic Orchestra, Stuttgart Symphony Orchestra, and others.²⁶ In Vienna, where we have seen from Marx that Turkish elements in Alnar's music were received indiscriminately, Alnar was freed from the divisions imposed on Turkish music and his own musical identity. His move to Austria can therefore be considered an escape by Alnar from in a musical field built upon the violent negation of the Ottoman music that he embodied. In the next chapter, I examine Alnar's sonic critique of that negation in the *Kanun Concerto*.

²³ Aydın, 59.

²⁴ Okyay, 109.

²⁵ Okyay, 113-115.

²⁶ Aydın, 59.

Chapter 6: The Subversive Other Behind a Virtuositic Veil: Hasan Ferid Alnar's *Kanun*

Concerto

Alnar's final major work, the *Kanun Concerto*, was also his most provocative. During his studies in Vienna and the first part of his career as composer and conductor in Turkey, Alnar did not overtly emphasize his background in Ottoman music, though, as we have seen, his *habitus* in Ottoman music became increasingly evident in works such as the cello concerto. Indeed, de-emphasizing his background in Ottoman music appears to have been a strategic move by Alnar to gain symbolic capital in the field of Turkish music-cultural production initially defined in opposition to that music. However, with the *Kanun Concerto*, Alnar overtly foregrounds his Ottoman *habitus* both through use of the *kanun* and Ottoman *makam* scale structures. In this chapter, I consider the *Kanun Concerto*'s genesis as a product of Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel's strategizing and analyze the concerto by drawing upon both Ottoman *makam* theory and Western music theory. My analysis reveals the concerto's productive mediation between "disabled" Ottoman and "healthy" Western musical materials. I draw out the use of this mediation in the *Kanun Concerto* to challenge the suppression of the Ottoman past and its music by Republican reformers and to imagine alternative forms of social and musical organization in the Turkish Republic. This challenging of the Republican Turkish status quo also constitutes a strategy by Alnar to reclaim the *habitus* in Ottoman music that he had suppressed and to confront the reformist forces that had brought about his musical disabling.

Turning his Back Back: Alnar and the Genesis of the *Kanun Concerto*

Alnar's *Kanun Concerto* constituted a return to his *habitus* in Ottoman urban music. From the time of Alnar's departure for study in Vienna, the *kanun* had not figured prominently in his compositions and performances. During the 1940s, however, alongside his posts at the

Presidential Symphony, the opera, and the conservatory, Alnar returned to the *kanun*, and it was Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel who prompted him to do so. According to musicologist Ayhan Sarı, Arel expressed to Alnar his wish that he think of innovations for Turkish music, and along those lines write a work using *kanun*.¹ Alnar began work on the concerto in the mid-1940s.² According to Sarı, Alnar first worked out the parts on piano in Rome before applying them to the *kanun* after returning to Turkey, finishing composition in 1947.³ Erdoğan Okyay gives an interesting account of Alnar's decision to compose the *Kanun Concerto*:

It is true that Alnar had turned his back on monophonic traditional Turkish art music. He showed the success he won at that music and made his name known at home and abroad with the modern-universal Turkish art music to which he turned. But he knew the value of the legacy that he brought, and used that legacy as a cornerstone of his works. Now with the *Kanun Concerto* he pays his debt to [those who] won him that legacy. He therefore showed unusual fastidiousness ...”⁴

Okyay's account indicates that Alnar had made an effort to keep the *kanun*—a concrete symbol of his *habitus* in Ottoman music—out of his public activity as composer and conductor during the first decades of his post-Vienna career. As I have argued above, this effort was likely a strategy by Alnar to advance his positionality in the early Turkish Republican field of music cultural production, which disabled the Ottoman musical tradition represented by the *kanun*.

It was also strategy that prompted Alnar to bring the *kanun* back to the forefront of his career. In my analysis of the *Kanun Concerto*, I argue that the *Kanun Concerto* provided a strategic space for Alnar to negotiate between his two competing musical *habitus* amidst the

¹ Ayhan Sarı, “Evrensel Müzik Yaşamında ilk Kanun Konçertosu.” *Orkestra Aylık Müzik Dergisi* 19 (1988): (“Türk Müziği için yenilikler düşünmesini, bununla beraber kanunla ilgili bir yaratı yazması dileğini...”)

² Okyay, 93.

³ Sarı, 43. .

⁴ Okyay 93: Alnar gerçi tek sesli geleneksel Türk sanat müziğine sırtını dönmüştür. O müzikte kazandığı başarıyı, yüzünü döndüğü çoksesli çağdaş-evrensel Türk sanat müziğinde de göstermiş, adını yurt içinde ve yurt dışında duyurmuş ve ünlenmiştir. Ama getirdiği mirasın değerini bilmiş ve bu mirası eserlerinin yapı taşları olarak kullanmıştır. Şimdi ona bu mirası kazandıranlara vefa borcunu, kanun konçertosuyla ödemektedir. Onun için olağanüstü bir titizlik göstermiştir ...

partial opening toward Ottoman/Turkish Art Music during the 1940s. However, the fact that Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel provided the impetus for the *Kanun Concerto*'s composition indicates that the *Kanun Concerto* was also the product of Arel's strategizing. Arel apparently continued to exert an influence over Alnar, and continued to use Alnar strategically as a means through which to enhance the battered positionality of Turkish Art Music in the field of Turkish music production. It is possible that Arel envisioned a new piece for kanun from a prominent Turkish composer such as Alnar as part of a larger project of raising the profile of Ottoman/Turkish Art Music, for only a few years later he founded the *İleri Türk Musikisi Konservatuvarı* and launched the *Musik Mecmuası*.

Analysis:

Hasan Ferid Alnar had a *habitus* in both Ottoman urban music and Western art music, enabling him in the *Kanun Concerto* to move beyond mere combination of characteristics of both traditions in bricolage to an exploitation of both traditions to create new compositional possibilities. In this section, I first consider the challenge that the *Kanun Concerto* and works like it present to traditional disciplinary boundaries in music scholarship. I then outline some general issues of structure, pitch content, and harmonic language in the concerto before delving into deeper analysis. In my analysis of the concerto's first movement, I focus on Alnar's strategic combination of *makam* characteristics and tendencies with Western formal conventions. My analysis of the concerto's second movement draws on Phillip Bohlman's theorization of the B section as site of othering in Western music and Jacques Attali's theory of music as channeler of violence and herald of social change. I argue that mediation between *makam* and Western form are strategically employed in the *Kanun Concerto* to sonically challenge Republican reformers' violent repression of the Ottoman past and Ottoman music. The third movement, I argue, presents

a virtuosic opacity which appears to negate the second movement's bold challenge, but may in fact sonically elaborate upon that challenge in its own B section.

Challenging Disciplinary Boundaries

The *Kanun Concerto*'s musical mediation between Alnar's two musical *habitus*—Ottoman *makam* music and Western music—points to the inadequacy of current disciplinary boundaries in music studies. The global structure of the piece is determined by a form taken from European art music, while local-level structure is determined to a significant degree by the system of modes associated with Turkish Art Music, *makam*. More than a mere combination, however the *Kanun Concerto* mediates productively between the two musical systems by exploiting the expressive possibilities opened up by their combination. Therefore, analysis which is limited to a reading of the *Kanun Concerto*'s *makam* material as purely thematic within the context of a Western form will miss many salient details. This is because the *makams* cannot be conceived of as scales or pitch collections from which themes are drawn in a European analytical sense, but rather as modes containing within themselves certain melodic and modulatory tendencies. With a *habitus* in Ottoman music, Alnar exploits these tendencies, and thus analysis which fails to give them primacy will be limited in insight. At the same time, analysis must consider the ways in which Alnar exploits the capabilities of the *makams* to achieve structural coherence and expression in the context of Western formal structure.

In their present configurations, neither ethnomusicology nor musicology alone provide the training necessary for such analysis. Students of ethnomusicology are likely to be better equipped than their counterparts in musicology, for they are often required to demonstrate facility in Western formal analysis. Ethnomusicology's field-oriented approach, however, does not tend to orient students toward archival work and score analysis. This is in and of itself not

necessarily a caveat, but nevertheless fails readily to grant a disciplinary home to musicians such as Alnar and works such as the *Kanun Concerto*.

Musicology's traditionally European geographical and music-theoretical foci limit its suitability for study music such as the *Kanun Concerto*. Though musicology students are generally expected to conduct archival work and analysis, the likelihood that they would develop deep familiarity with non-Western music theories is low, as demonstrated by German-trained musicologist Yılmaz Aydın's limited analysis of *makam* in the *Kanun Concerto*. This too is not necessarily a caveat, for it would be unfeasible to train music historians comprehensively in the various world music theoretical traditions. More generally, it is not fair to criticize the fields of music scholarship for limited applicability to musical materials with which they have not been previously confronted. Instead, I propose that works such as the *Kanun Concerto* can prompt a productive re-evaluation of the means by which music scholarship imposes divisions on its fields of study. This re-evaluation might point toward the elimination of disciplinary boundaries that place constructed and reified chronological and geographical boundaries on the study of culture and its products.

Reconciling *Comma* and *Concerto*

Alnar structured the concerto according to a standard classical concerto form. The first movement is in a moderate tempo in sonata form with a tonal center on F. This movement includes a cadenza for the soloist at the end of the recapitulation. The second movement is in a slow tempo in ABA form with a tonal center on A. The final movement is in a fast tempo sonata form, again with a tonal center on F, and features a reprise of the opening movement's first theme at its end. It should be noted that I have not been able to acquire the concerto's original third movement included in the 1951 Viennese premiere, nor is its potential location known to

me.⁵ The absence of this original movement thus remains a problematic element of the study of the *Kanun Concerto*.

Alnar's treatment of the *makams* constitutes a strategic mediation between Ottoman and Western music. He attempted to fulfill Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel's wish "that he think of innovations for Turkish music, and along those lines write a work using kanun" while at the same time creating a piece that is defensible within the outlines of the Gökalpist approach broadly construed as music incorporating Turkish elements into a European frame using European polyphonic techniques.

In order to accomplish this mediation, Alnar altered the *makams* to suit Western tuning. Given that the Turkish makams are composed of intervals built out of the Pythagorean comma—roughly 1/9th of a whole step—using them in their original forms would have raised several issues. First, a piece using the makams would require performers familiar with them, thus significantly curtailing non-Turkish performances such as the *Kanun Concerto*'s Vienna premiere. Similarly, reconciling the microtonal modes in their original forms with a harmonic system would have demanded a harmonic system likely outside of mainstream vocabularies. The decision that Alnar reached was to take the scalar profile of the makams but express it in terms of European whole- and half-steps, though, as we shall see, it is likely that this approach was not satisfying to Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel.⁶

The *makams* and Alnar's *habitus* in Ottoman music inclined him toward harmonic sparseness and use of a quartal system of harmony. I contend that the tendency toward harmonic

⁵ I have discussed this issue with *Kanun Concerto* performer Tahir Aydoğdu. Mr. Aydoğdu is acquainted with Alnar's wife in Ankara, and has discussed with her possibilities for storing Alnar's archives after her death. He is also not aware of the existence of a copy of the original version of the *Kanun Concerto*'s third movement.

⁶ According to performer Tahir Aydoğdu, in a few sections of the piece—most prominently the first-movement cadenza—there is space for some use of makam tuning.

spareness exhibited in the *Kanun Concerto* is a product of Alnar’s dual musical *habitus*—his *habitus* in monophonic/heterophonic Ottoman music likely led him toward an interest in melodic rather than harmonic interest, even in a polyphonic context. In addition to use of unison and lightly imitative textures, Alnar draws heavily on a system of quartal harmony for Turkish music articulated most notably by Alnar’s student Kemal İlerici.⁷ Quartal harmonic elements appear already in the 1935 *Prelude and Two Dances*, indicating that İlerici likely took inspiration for his system from Alnar. According to the system, in “root position” chords the makam pitch being accompanied by the chord is encircled symmetrically by perfect fourths.⁸ In other words, the chord appears as two stacked perfect fourths with an ambitus of a minor seventh. The chords can be inverted in the same manner as triadic chords. Alnar’s *habitus* in Ottoman/Turkish Art Music, which by using Pythagorean tuning emphasizes the primacy of perfectly tuned perfect intervals, may have inclined him toward a system of harmony for the makams that emphasized these intervals. Alnar also uses triadic chords at various points in the concerto, though they rarely take on a functional quality.

Productive Mediation: First Movement

In the introduction to *Sounding Off: Theorizing Disability in Music*, Lerner and Strauss note the “special fluidity of music” and refer to Marianne Kielian-Gilbert’s argument for “the potentially transformative impact of music, particularly its power to disrupt the seemingly hard and fast distinction between ability and disability.”⁹ The first movement of Alnar’s *Kanun Concerto* reflects this ability through its productive mediation between Ottoman *makam* music coded as disabled and Western European music coded as supremely abled. In this way, the

⁷ See Attila Sağlam, *Türk Müziğinde Çoksesselik Uygulamaları ve İlerici Armonisi*, (Istanbul, Pan Yayıncılık: 2001).

⁸ Aydın, 69-72.

⁹ Lerner and Strauss, 10.

concerto constitutes a strategic means of negating Alnar's musical disabling. The *Kanun Concerto* not only disrupts the distinction between Ottoman and Western music, but through its mediation between them draws on the characteristics of each to open up new compositional possibilities for Alnar and for Turkish music.

Of particular interest in the first movement is Alnar's use of those characteristics of the makams congruent with elements of Western structure and harmony. The first theme of the exposition provides several good examples. The unison, four-measure first phrase of the first theme is in the makam *Rast* pentachord on F, and begins with a prominent scale degree 5-1 (C, F) movement. The prominent 5-1 melodic movement that opens the piece and establishes tonal center alludes to standard cadential patterns in tonal music. At the same time, this motion is characteristic of the *Rast* pentachord. In the four measure second phrase the cello and bass sustain a tonic F while the violins and viola reveal the makam *Buselik* tetrachord which constitutes the upper portion of the *Acemli Rast* makam--differentiated from the standard *Rast* makam by its fully-flattened seventh degree. Alnar uses the *Buselik* tetrachord of *Acemli Rast* to provide contrast and delineate the second phrase from the first. In this way congruencies between the characteristics of *makam Rast* and Western melodic and formal conventions converge to create an emergent music mediating between musics previously constituted against each other by modernist reformers.

KANUN KONÇERTOSU

Score

1. Bölüm

Ferid ALNAR
Roma, 1946-Ankara, 1958

Moderato (♩ = 88)

The score is written for a symphony orchestra. The piano part begins with a four-measure introduction. The main section starts at measure 6. The Violin I and II parts play a rhythmic pattern of eighth notes, starting with a forte (f) dynamic. The Viola and Cello parts also play a similar rhythmic pattern, with the Cello part starting with a forte (f) dynamic. The Contrabass part plays a bass line with a forte (f) dynamic. The Violin II and Viola parts have a marcato (marc.) dynamic marking. The Cello and Contrabass parts have a mezzo-forte (mf) dynamic marking. The score is written in 4/4 time and Moderato tempo (♩ = 88).

Score written by Selçuk BİLGİN, revised and edited by Seyit YÖRE

Figure 1

In the exposition, Alnar mediates between patterns of modal movement characteristic to the *makams* and the Western double exposition concerto form. In the first phrase of the solo exposition, the *kanun* embellishes the first period melody with virtuosic runs. In the solo exposition second phrase beginning at measure 13, Alnar shifts to makam Nikriz on B-flat. *Makam Nikriz* combines a *Nikriz* pentachord on the bottom with a *Rast* tetrachord on top. This means that *Nikriz* on B-flat is congruent with the initial *Rast* on F. This *Nikriz* on B-flat is re-interpreted by measure 20 as makam *Nev' eser* on F. *Nev' eser* and *Nikriz* share the same augmented second interval between the third and fourth scale degrees in the lower pentachord (when expressed via Western sharps and flats). Unlike *Nikriz*, *Nev' eser* repeats this interval between the sixth and seventh scale degrees with the addition of the *Hicaz* tetrachord. Through drawing upon the characteristic movements of the *makams*, Alnar lends interest to the first movement's solo exposition.

The musical score for Figure 2 is a page from a score, likely for a concerto. It features a solo exposition with piano accompaniment and string quartet. The score includes staves for Piano (Pn.), Violin I (Vln. I), Violin II (Vln. II), Viola (Vla.), Violoncello (Vc.), and Contrabass (Cb.). The key signature is B-flat major, and the time signature is 3/4. The score begins at measure 12. The piano part features a melodic line with a trill and a run, marked 'mf'. The strings play a rhythmic accompaniment with various dynamics including 'p', 'p marc.', and 'pp'.

Figure 2

3

15

B

Vln. I

Vln. II

Vla.

Vc.

Cb.

18

Vln. I

Vln. II

Vla.

Vc.

Cb.

mp

mf

mf

mf

p

f

f

f

p

mf

mf

Figure 3

Alnar's treatment of the B theme in the exposition and recapitulation provides particularly strong evidence for a process of compositional mediation between the *makams* and conventions of Western tonal harmony and form. The B theme of the first movement begins in measure 24 with a theme in makam *Nihavent*—which resembles the Western natural minor scale—on B in the solo kanun. Significantly, though the melody is in *Nihavent* on B, the overall pitch center of the B theme is clearly E, as indicated by 5-1 (B-E) pizzicato figures in the cello and bass. The *Nihavent* material thus “fits” into an overall tonal center of E. The two pitch centers in this section—E and B—are respectively one half-step and a tri-tone removed from the overall pitch center, F. Considered in a tonal context, these pitches are as far as possible from the pitch center in C, and thus effectively imply a “secondary key area.” However, in the recapitulation, moving the melodic pitch center of the second theme up one half step to makam *Nihavent* on C and the overall pitch center of this section up one half step to F allows for a proper sonata form recapitulation in which all themes are in the home key, for pitch C is already a primary component of the opening F pitch area.

Figure 4 shows a musical score for measures 23 to 25. The score is arranged in a system with six staves: Piano (top), Violin I (Vln. I), Violin II (Vln. II), Viola (Vla.), Violoncello (Vc.), and Contrabasso (Cb.). Measure 23 is marked with a circled 'C'. The Piano part features a complex rhythmic pattern starting in measure 24. The Violin II part begins in measure 23 with a *mf* dynamic. The Viola, Violoncello, and Contrabasso parts start in measure 24 with a *p* dynamic. The Violoncello and Contrabasso parts include *pizz.* (pizzicato) markings in measures 24 and 25. The Violin I part is mostly silent, with a *pp* dynamic marking in measure 25.

Figure 4

Figure 5 shows a musical score for measures 16 to 18. The score is arranged in a system with six staves: Piano (top), Violin I (Vln. I), Violin II (Vln. II), Viola (Vla.), Violoncello (Vc.), and Contrabasso (Cb.). Measure 16 is marked with a circled 'C'. The Piano part is silent until measure 17, where it begins with a *mf* dynamic and a tempo change to *a tempo*. The Violin I part starts in measure 16 with a *pp* dynamic and a tempo change to *a tempo*. The Violin II part starts in measure 17 with a *pp* dynamic. The Viola, Violoncello, and Contrabasso parts start in measure 17 with a *ppp* dynamic. The Violoncello and Contrabasso parts include *arco* (arco) markings in measures 17 and 18. The Violin I part includes *pizz.* (pizzicato) markings in measures 16 and 17.

Figure 5

In the exposition's closing theme, Alnar draws upon *makam* pitch material to develop the use of the tri-tone as a stand-in for the dominant in a manner reminiscent of Bela Bartok's structural use of the tri-tone.¹⁰ The closing theme is in makam *Hüseyni* on G. The exposition closes in G with a tri-tone cadential figure composed of chords built on C-sharp and G derived from *Hüseyni* pitch material and forcefully articulated via double-stop string chords. The closing theme leads into the development section, in which the makam-based themes are subjected to procedures characteristic of sonata form such as circle-of-fifths progressions, melodic fragmentation, and virtuosic passages.

The image shows a musical score for the closing theme of the exposition. It consists of five staves: Piano (Pn.), Violin I (Vln. I), Violin II (Vln. II), Viola (Vla.), and Cello/Double Bass (Cb.). The piano part features a dense texture of sixteenth-note runs. The string parts (Vln. I, Vln. II, Vla., and Cb.) play sustained chords, with some parts marked with *f* (forte) and *p marc.* (piano marcato). A box labeled 'F' is placed above the piano staff in the final measure, indicating a tri-tone cadential figure.

Figure 6

The first movement's recapitulation begins with a hesitant approach to the B theme that emphasizes Alnar's clever mediation between makam and Western form via two aborted "sighing" gestures that descend in pitch to the home key area. These sighing gestures are

¹⁰ See Elliot Antokoletz, *The Music of Béla Bartók: A Study of Tonality and Progression in Twentieth-Century Music* (University of California Press, 1984).

characteristic of makam *Hüseyni*, and thus pre-figure the movement's close in *Hüseyni*. At the end of the development, the second phrase of the A theme stays in *Rast* and, passed back and forth between strings and kanun with quartal accompaniment, fragments until a rhythmically augmented variation on the descending second phrase of the B theme in makam *Nişaburek* emerges in the strings accompanied by ascending arpeggio-like figures in the kanun. The first phrase of the B theme which will begin the recapitulation follows in *Nihavent* on E in the first violin accompanied by a second-inversion quartal chord with root B-flat (E-flat, B-flat, D-flat), but this statement is in the wrong key and breaks down in a sighing motion. The first violins make a second attempt on an implied tonal center one semi-tone lower on D-sharp, but this is again in the wrong key and breaks down with a sighing motion. Finally, the third time the kanun takes the theme with a tonal center of C and it gets off the ground. As in the exposition discussed above, a harmonic tonal center a fifth below—this time with the tonal center of the movement of pitch F—is clearly implied by 5-1 figures in the bass and cello. This approach to the recapitulation has the effect of emphasizing the processes by which Alnar mediates between makam structures and Western sonata form by using a gesture characteristic to makam. The cadenza for kanun follows this section. After the cadenza the closing theme in *Hüseyni* on F pre-figured by the sighing gesture parallels the ending of the exposition with a tri-tone cadence (B-F) derived from *Hüseyni* articulated via double-stopped string chords and kanun flourishes, thus ending the movement.

In the first movement of the *Kanun Concerto*, Alnar opens up new possibilities for Turkish music through mediation between characteristics of Turkish *makams* and conventions of Western harmony and form. As a result of the “special fluidity of music,” Alnar is able to mediate between musics that, on the basis of their ostensible health/sickness, had been placed in diametric opposition to each other by Turkish modernist reformers. By adapting Ottoman and Western music to each other, Alnar places these musics on an equal footing in order to develop an emergent musical language.

Subverting Violence: Second Movement

In the *Kanun Concerto*'s second movement, the emergent musical language established in the first movement provides the material for sonic depiction of an alternative conception of Turkish Republican society based upon inclusion of sonic and social elements violently eliminated by Republican reformers through attributions of sickness. Because Alnar's own musical identity embodies this exclusion, the movement can also be interpreted as a reflection of Alnar's own threatened positionality, and therefore as a strategy by Alnar to mediate between the conflicting *habitus* of his own musical identity. While Alnar's 1942 cello concerto arguably constitutes a similar mediation, the concerto for *kanun* constitutes a literal foregrounding of Alnar's *habitus*, and thus a more radical approach to mediation.

I rely on two additional theoretical frameworks in order to make this interpretation. The first is Phillip Bohlman's contention in the 2013 collection *Music, Place, and Space* that development and bridge sections in Western music have historically provided a space for representation of the “other.” The second movement of Alnar's three movement concerto can itself be considered a B section, and I contend that the second movement's own B section explores an alternate conception of Turkish social structure through mediation between Ottoman

urban and Western musical materials. While the outer movements give more space to displays of technical bravura, the comparatively technically simple second movement constitutes the expressive core of the piece.

The second theoretical framework is derived from Jacques Attali's conception of music as channeler of violence and herald of social and cultural change in his 1977 book *Noise: The Political Economy of Music*.¹¹ Attali posits that, originating as "an attribute of the sacrificial ceremony," music operates as "a simulacrum of the monopolization of the power to kill, a simulacrum of ritual murder."¹² Music therefore operates in society—albeit in diverse configurations—as channeler of violence as represented by noise. In this capacity, music operates as creator, legitimator, and maintenance of order. Because music in its immateriality offers an opportunity to imagine alternative configurations of society and alternative social orders, Attali contends that "it is prophetic of a new form of relations with knowledge and of new powers."¹³ In Susan McClary's interpretation, "music announces changes that are only later manifested in the rest of culture and ... it is in terms of the noise/order polarity that styles define themselves ideologically against predecessors or contemporaneous rival practices."¹⁴

Alnar's mediation between the *makams* of Ottoman music and the procedures of Western music—between degenerate Ottoman "noise" and supreme Western "order"—imagines a new social order in the Turkish Republic through productive deployment of noise. In the Turkish Republican field of music, whether in terms of Gökalp's privileging of Western music or the construction of *Turkish Art Music* (*Türk Sanat Müziği*) defined stylistically and ideologically

¹¹ Jacques Attali, *Noise: The Political Economy of Music*, trans. Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1985).

¹² Attali, 28-30.

¹³ Attali, 30.

¹⁴ Attali, 156.

against *piyasa* music, Ottoman music stands in as the “sick” other against which modernist order is defined. Ottoman music is noise and the victim of violence by modernist reformers. However, in the Turkish case Ottoman music is not noise which is to be sonically controlled, as in Attali’s formula, but rather noise which is to be euthanized. This is because Ottoman music is itself alleged to be a perpetrator of violence—modernist reformers consider Ottoman music disabling to Turks, causing them to become languorous and fatalistic. Alnar’s mediation between Ottoman music and Western music, his juxtaposition of Ottoman “noise” and Western “order,” therefore envoices the violence of silencing/disabling in order to combat the violence of silencing that justifies its violence through delivering accusations of violence. In other words, Alnar’s mediation does not use the control of dissonance to re-inforce social order through channeling of violence, but instead uses the role traditionally occupied by dissonance as a platform from which to express violence committed against a musical repertoire labeled as sickly “noise.” In this capacity, the “noise” of Ottoman music proclaims the unsustainability of a Turkish social order dependent upon the abrupt and violent silencing of Ottoman music and social configurations, and heralds the inevitability of the breakdown of the state’s imposed order. Indeed, the period in which the *Kanun Concerto* was composed is the same period in which the hold of authoritarian single-party rule in Turkey was broken and a cycle of conflict was begun between religious populism receptive to the Ottoman past and its periodic and violent suppression by secular, modernist elites. This is why, as we shall see, reception of Alnar’s music evinces a pervasive unease.

The site of othering in Western music according to Bohlman’s theorization, the second movement as B section becomes the site of resistance in Alnar’s *Kanun Concerto*. Within the second movement’s ABA form, the B section gives a view into an alternative realm—an

alternative social formation. The return of the A section thus signifies the unreality of that realm. More than that, however, Alnar's mediation between characteristics of the *makam Saba* and Western harmony expresses the instability and unease of Turkish society built upon the violent repression of Ottoman social formations. In this way, the movement foreshadows the social and political instability that has characterized Turkish society since the nineteen-fifties. In addition, Alnar's use of *saba* represents Alnar's threatened positionality as embodied representative of Ottoman culture and music through his *habitus* in Ottoman music. In this way, the *Kanun Concerto* in general and its second movement in particular can be considered a strategy by Alnar to mediate between his two musical *habitus* as a means of side-stepping threats to his positionality.

Alnar's use of *makam Saba* also brings to the fore the limitations of analysis of works such as the *Kanun Concerto* conducted according to the traditional divisions of music scholarship. Yılmaz Aydın asserts that the movement's first theme is in makam Saba on A. However, this analysis fails to account for the descending movement from A to G and F-sharp with which the movement begins. The makam *Bestenigâr*, which is closely related to Saba but includes a makam *Segâh* tetrachord extending down from the Saba tonic by a minor third, accounts for this discrepancy. Beginning in *Bestenigâr*, the movement begins with a taksim-, or improvisation-, like duet between makam and solo cello. Moving through hints of *Hicaz* on G—a move included within the possibilities provided by makam *Bestenigâr*—the taksim-like section finally leads by measure 23 into the A melody in the first violin accompanied by strings and kanun.

KANUN KONÇERTOSU
2. BÖLÜM

Ferid ALNAR
Ankara 1946

Score

Lento non troppo (♩=60)

KANUN

Violin I

Violin II

Viola

Cello

Contrabass

Figure 9

17

18

19

20

21

pp

mf espr.

pp

pp

p

B

B

Figure 10

A trill figure and three musical “peaks” in the B section of the second movement form the heart of my analysis of the second movement as site of resistance. The trill figure accompanies the first two “peaks” of the B section, and its absence is notable at the third peak. The trill arguably is among the most “nervous” of musical elements in the European composer’s toolbox. Its historic use at the end of cadenzas and in other contexts anticipating cadential satisfaction illustrate well its ability to convey in the most concentrated means maximum instability and desire for resolution. I interpret the trill figure as a tense limitation imposed on musical themes from which they must break free in order to represent alternate musical and social configurations.

The A section began with an improvisatory taksim section with the A theme emerging only 22 measures into the movement in the first violin. The B theme, on the other hand, begins decisively. Through use of perfect 4ths and 5ths and an arrival of makam Hicaz on D in which the tonic D is alluded to but not stated, the bridge section leads into the B section in makam Hicaz on D. This section begins with an austere, determined-sounding theme in a lower register of the kanun accompanied by quartal chords with root A (A, D, G) in first inversion (D, G, A) at measure 41. These chords anticipate the theme’s landing in the fourth measure by way of a trill figure on a prominent pitch A at measure 44 that then descends back down through Hicaz to the tonic D. The melody is repeated in the kanun with the same quartal harmonies now emphasized by a preceding sixteenth-note figure.

Figure 11

Figure 12

The kanun then leads a modulation that, again via a trill, leads into a variation on the B melody in makam *Uşşak* on D in measure 48. This section is accompanied by the same quartal chord (A, D, G) in first inversion (D, G, A). In *Uşşak*, the melody gains an element: an ascending thirty-second note figure followed by a dotted sixteenth and thirty-second note and a dotted eight

and sixteenth note before ending with a trilled, dotted eighth and sixteenth figure (see kanun in measure 51). This figure, including the trill, is repeated in the strings in the next measure, and then taken up again by the kanun, where it now reaches from D to G and is punctuated by a new quartal chord (D, G, C, F) in second inversion (C, D, F, G).

The image shows a musical score for a section of a piece. It consists of six staves: Kanun (Ka), Violin I (Vln. I), Violin II (Vln. II), Viola (Vla.), Violoncello (Vc.), and Contrabass (Cb.). The Kanun staff is marked with a box containing the letter 'E' above the first measure. The score includes various dynamics such as *p*, *mf*, *pp*, and *marc.* (marcato). The Kanun part features a trilled, dotted eighth and sixteenth figure. The strings (Vln. I, Vln. II, Vla., Vc., Cb.) play a rhythmic pattern of eighth notes, with some trills and accents. The overall texture is complex and layered.

Figure 13

The three musical “peaks” follow. The first of the B section’s three musical “peaks” is approached and accompanied by trills and then quickly dissipated. Two measures before the first peak, the strings take up the second part of the B melody, including its trill. In the next measure the three beats preceding the first peak feature trills in the first violin. At the peak, the kanun lands on a prominent F-G-sharp trill and the cello on a forte-pianissimo held F, but the other instruments exhibit less certainty. They respond with nervous gestures that undermine the point of arrival and dissipate the accumulated energy.

The image shows a musical score for a chamber ensemble. The staves are labeled from top to bottom: Ka (Kanun), Vln. I, Vln. II, Vla. (Viola), Vc. (Violoncello), and Cb. (Contrabasso). The score is in 3/4 time and consists of six measures. The Kanun part features ascending tremolos. The Violin I part has a melodic line with dynamics *mf* and *fpp*. The Violin II part starts with a *p* dynamic and has a *senta word* marking. The Viola part has a *p* dynamic and a *fpp* dynamic. The Violoncello part has a *p* dynamic and a *fpp* dynamic. The Contrabasso part has a *p* dynamic. The score includes various musical notations such as slurs, accents, and dynamic markings.

Figure 14

The second “peak” exhibits more stability, but it is dissolved when the kanun points the way to a yet higher peak. At measure 58, the viola takes up the charge with a variation on the trill melody in makam *Nihavent* on E-flat. The cello, viola, and second violin converge on a measure of unison trills that lead to a prominent unison B-natural (*Nihavent*’s C-flat re-spelled) that constitutes the second peak (measure 64). The second peak is accompanied in the kanun by ascending tremolos—the tremolo being arguably the trill’s cousin in terms of nervousness. These tremolos elaborate on the second peak with an ascending re-spelling (C-sharp, D-sharp, E-sharp, F-sharp) that breaks with *Nihavent* when it reaches G natural rather than G-sharp/A-flat. The break with the *makam* indicates that there is another, yet higher peak to come.

6 **F**

Ka

Vln. I *senza cord.* *pp*

Vln. II *senza cord.* *pp* *mf*

Vla. *mf esp.*

Vc. *senza cord.* *pp* *mf*

Cb. *senza cord.* *pp* *mf*

pp

Figure 15

67 **G**

Ka **G**

Vln. I **G** *mf esp.*

Vln. II *p dim* *pp*

Vla. *p dim* *pp*

Vc. *p dim* *mf esp.* *p*

Cb.

Figure 16

Figure 17 shows a musical score for measures 59-65. The instruments are Kanun (Ka), Violin I (Vln. I), Violin II (Vln. II), Viola (Vla.), Violoncello (Vc.), and Contrabasso (Cb.). The Kanun part has a melodic line with trills and slurs. The string parts have dynamic markings such as *p*, *mf*, and *f*.

Figure 17

Figure 18 shows a musical score for measures 66-72. The instruments are Kanun (Ka), Violin I (Vln. I), Violin II (Vln. II), Viola (Vla.), Violoncello (Vc.), and Contrabasso (Cb.). The Kanun part has a melodic line with a trill figure. The string parts have dynamic markings such as *ppp* and *mf*.

Figure 18

The ascent to the third peak features the “trill” figure stripped of its trills, and a kanun response devoid of both trill and tremolo. The violin takes up the lead at measure 66 with the same variation on the trill melody, this time in makam *Çargah* (which resembles the Western major scale) on E. The trill figure is repeated in the cello and then in the first violin, but this

time—importantly—without the trill. The first violin iteration leads to the third and final peak of the movement at measure 71 when it lands on a held D—which breaks with makam *Çargah*—accompanied by a root position G major triad held in the strings and cascading downward in the kanun. A turn of the screw in the next measure leads to a held E in the violin supported by an E minor triad in the strings and its perfect fifth outline in the kanun. The absence of both trill and tremolo indicates the absence of nervous hesitation induced by violent repression and a glimpse from the peak into an alternate realm. Indeed, the third and final peak exhibits sufficient stability that it is able to achieve harmonic development and briefly “occupy” that realm—the prominent major triads serving to further the sense of entrance into a kind of “other” realm characterized by a conception of Turkish identity not contingent on the violent repression of the Ottoman past and its music. However, this third peak too breaks down with a seeming inevitability, indicating the instability of the Turkish Republican social formation and of Alnar’s positionality.

The process by which this alternate B realm is dissolved and the reality of the A realm is re-imposed sonically expresses the violent repression of the Ottoman past. After the third peak is reached and development to E major achieved, the first violin gears up again and returns with a scale to the high E at measure 75, but the kanun drops out and the other strings respond with a set of two alternating chords (C-sharp, A-sharp, F, G-sharp; D, A, E, G) that have the effect of rapidly dissipating the energy built up in the third peak. We land on the second of these chords (C-sharp, A-sharp, F, G-sharp) before proceeding into the recapitulation. The violin holds the high E, but it cannot prevent the return of the A section at measure 77—this time with the A melody in the kanun. The combination of the familiarity of the tune and its categorically opposite pitch material vis-à-vis the final chord of the B section (A, G, F-sharp in the A theme vs. C-sharp, A-sharp, F, G-sharp or, re-arranged for purposes of illustration, C-sharp, A-sharp, G-

sharp, F) produce the effect of a forced entering into a fundamentally different world based upon the violent suppression of the world of the B section. At the same time, this A world is familiar as the repeat of the initial A section. In this way the return of the A section can be interpreted as a representation of the violent suppression of all conceptions of Turkish society other than that imposed from above by Kemalist reformers.

Alnar's mediation in the return of the A section between the characteristics of makam *Saba* and Western harmony—between his two musical *habitus*—represents the instability of the regime that is re-imposed in the return of the A section. The first violin had first taken up the A theme after the A section's twenty-two measure *taksim*, but the kanun takes it up immediately in the A section's return, giving a sense of inevitability. This time, however, the melody lands in a new location—the *güçlü*, or dominant—of the *Saba* portion of *Bestenigâr* (see measure 84). Makam *Saba*'s *güçlü* is on the third degree, giving it a characteristic unstable feel that translates into the Kanun Concerto's hybrid medium. After the inconclusivity of a melodic cadence on the third degree, the kanun and first violin take up a move to *Hicaz* on G—as noted earlier a component of *Bestenigâr*. This section again ends prominently on the *Saba güçlü* pitch, C. Echoing the opening *taksim*, the texture in the final section of the piece grows thinner, and the music more halting. The kanun having all but dropped out by this point, asserting itself only via occasional arpeggiated interjections, the first violin and cello lead back to *Bestenigâr*, and the movement ends with the *Saba güçlü* C held in the first violin and cello, with a plucked A-E perfect fifth in the strings and kanun.

As the *Kanun Concerto*'s “B” section, its second movement is the space in which deeper questions about Ottoman music constituted as a disabled “other” by Republican reformers are explored. By exploiting the characteristics of the Ottoman *makams*, this movement depicts the

tenuousness of a Turkish Republican order built upon violent suppression of the Ottoman past and its music. The Second Movement's B section gives a glimpse sonically of an alternative realm that I take to be representative of an alternative organization of Turkish society not based upon the violent suppression of the Ottoman past and its music. The departure from this realm and the return to the A section are then achieved through violent imposition of A pitch materials completely unrelated to those which close the B section. I take this imposition to be representative of the process by which the Ottoman past and its music were eliminated by Republican reformers. However, the A section's return sonically depicts the instability of the Turkish Republican conception of Turkish society built upon the repression of the Ottoman past through exploitation of the characteristic instability of *makam Saba's* dominant on the third scale degree. Thus, the *Kanun Concerto's* second movement acts as a herald of the instability of Turkish society during the second half of the twentieth century torn between conservatives sympathetic to the Ottoman past and modernists strongly—even violently—opposed to it. In this way, the concerto's second movement constitutes a strategic attempt by Alnar to mediate between his own musical *habitus* in both Ottoman and Western music. The movement is thus a provocative statement from a composer given to anxiety. As we shall see, the provocativeness of this statement opposed to the violently modernist principles on which the Turkish Republic was founded prompted Alnar to avoid open performances of the work for decades after its composition.

Oppressive Virtuosity, or Covert Freedom? Third Movement

This interpretation raises anew the question of the third movement. In its second form, the Allegro poco moderato third movement is a virtuosic showpiece featuring the *kanun*. What kind of music did Alnar write for the first version of the third movement, and why did he feel the

need to replace that music? Is it possible that Alnar deemed it too personal, too revealing? Was it a kind of Turkish “music for the drawer” repressed by Alnar in favor more innocuous music which partially redeem Alnar’s otherwise problematic questioning of the modernist forces that had violently suppressed the Ottoman past and its music? In this role, does the second version serve as a kind of “Band-Aid” intended to distract listeners from the second movement’s subversiveness through dazzling displays of technical bravura on the *kanun*? Alternatively, is the third movement an example of a modern Turkish music that employs European techniques while giving pride of place to an Ottoman instrument and Ottoman *makam*-s—in other words, the type of music and society that might be possible in the absence of Republican violence? Is it both? In the absence of the original version third movement, the available second version does not yield firm answers to these questions. Thus, what follows is primarily a brief analysis of the third movement’s virtuosic treatment of the *kanun* and corollary spare use of the strings. However, a return of the trill as structural device in the third movement’s B section gives a clue as to the possible role of the third movement as covert exemplifier of a Turkish music set free from Republican strictures.

The third movement’s exposition privileges fast passage work in the *kanun* and spare, mostly quartal, accompaniment in the strings. The movement opens and closes with unison statements of the first movement’s first theme. The third movement’s first theme which follows is made up of the makam *Hüseyni* pentachord on D and makam *Kürdi* tetrachord on A—together comprising makam *Acem’li Hüseyni*. The first theme is given in the *kanun* and accompanied by spare, quartal chords.

KANUN KONÇERTOSU

3. BÖLÜM

Ferid ALNAR
Ankara, 1958

Score

Allegro poco moderato $\text{♩} = 126$

The musical score is written for Kanun, Violin I, Violin II, Viola, Cello, and Contrabass. The Kanun part begins with a series of rapid sixteenth-note passages, followed by sustained notes. The string accompaniment consists of rhythmic patterns in the left hand and sustained notes in the right hand. The score includes dynamic markings such as *mf*, *f*, and *pp*, and articulations like *pizz.* and *arco*.

Figure 19

The second theme likewise consists of rapid *kanun* passage work accompanied by spare, punctuating chords in the strings. After a brief bridge that prepares a tonal center on F, the second theme emerges in makam Nikriz on F in the kanun with sustained notes and a countermelody in the accompaniment. The second theme is then taken up in the first violin. The second theme's second period at measure 49 is composed of fast passage work in makam Saba on B in the kanun with very spare off-beat quartal punctuations separated by full-measure rests in the strings.

Figure 20 shows a musical score for measures 44 to 54. The score is arranged in a system with six staves: KA (Kanun), Vln. I, Vln. II, Vla. (Viola), Vc. (Violoncello), and Cb. (Contrabasso). Measure 44 is marked with a 'C' in a box. The KA part features a complex rhythmic pattern. The string parts (Vln. I, Vln. II, Vla., Vc., Cb.) play a melodic line with dynamics ranging from *mf* to *p*. Performance instructions include *pizz.* (pizzicato) for the strings.

Figure 20

Figure 21 shows a musical score for measures 54 to 64. The score is arranged in a system with six staves: KA (Kanun), Vln. I, Vln. II, Vla. (Viola), Vc. (Violoncello), and Cb. (Contrabasso). Measure 54 is marked with a '4' above the staff. The KA part continues with a complex rhythmic pattern. The string parts (Vln. I, Vln. II, Vla., Vc., Cb.) play a melodic line with performance instructions including *arco* (arco) for the strings.

Figure 21

A short reprise of the second theme's A period in the kanun leads into a lengthy closing theme beginning in measure 69. The expansive theme wells up through the unison strings until it finally emerges in its full form in makam *Nihavent* on B in measure 85 first in the strings with

virtuosic embellishment in the kanun. Again, the *kanun*'s rapid passage-work is accompanied simply by sustained perfect-fifth and quartal harmonies.

Figure 22 shows a musical score for measures 6 through 11. The score includes parts for Kanun (KA), Violin I (Vln. I), Violin II (Vln. II), Viola (Vla.), Violoncello (Vc.), and Contrabasso (Cb.). The Kanun part features a rapid, virtuosic passage-work. The string parts provide sustained perfect-fifth and quartal harmonies. The score includes dynamic markings such as *ppp* and *arco*.

Figure 22

Figure 23 shows a musical score for measures 12 through 17. The score includes parts for Kanun (KA), Violin I (Vln. I), Violin II (Vln. II), Viola (Vla.), Violoncello (Vc.), and Contrabasso (Cb.). The Kanun part continues with rapid, virtuosic passage-work. The string parts provide sustained perfect-fifth and quartal harmonies. The score includes dynamic markings such as *ppp*.

Figure 23

The third movement's development section combines the expected *kanun* virtuosity with spare accompaniment and exploitation of the modulatory possibilities of *makam* with a re-appearance of the trill from the second movement. The development begins with the first theme in the kanun in makam *Hüseyni* on A with quartal (D, G, C) accompaniment in the strings. Extracting a fragment of this theme, Alnar passes it back and forth between the kanun and the strings and through makam *Hüzzam* on C-sharp and A and cleverly moving through Hicaz on A before arriving back at the original first theme, this time in makam *Hüseyni* on D-sharp. Then, a five measure long passage of sustained quartal harmony and trills in the violins and kanun beginning in measure 173 builds tension that is then released in a 7 measure long descending and then ascending virtuosic kanun line made up of pitch material similar to that of the trilled chords. After an appearance by the second theme in makam *Nikriz* on F, the lengthy closing theme emerges in makam *Nihavent* on G with virtuosic passage work in the kanun accompanied by sustained quartal harmonies in the strings

The image displays a musical score for measures 173 through 180. The score is arranged in a system with six staves: Kanun (KA), Violin I (Vln. I), Violin II (Vln. II), Viola (Vla.), Violoncello (Vc.), and Contrabass (Cb.). The Kanun part features a prominent trill in measures 173-175, followed by a descending and then ascending virtuosic line in measures 176-180. The string parts provide accompaniment, with the Violins playing a rhythmic pattern and the lower strings playing sustained quartal harmonies. Dynamic markings include *mf* (mezzo-forte), *pp* (pianissimo), and *f* (forte). The score is written in a key signature of one sharp (F#) and a 2/4 time signature.

11

The musical score for measures 10 and 11 shows the following details:

- KA (Kanun):** Measures 10 and 11 contain a continuous, intricate rhythmic pattern of sixteenth notes.
- Vln. I & Vln. II:** Enter in measure 10 with a unison melodic line, marked *f*.
- Vla. (Viola):** Enters in measure 10 with a unison line, marked *f*. In measure 11, it has a *p* marking.
- Vc. (Violoncello):** Enters in measure 10 with a unison line, marked *f*. In measure 11, it has a *p* marking.
- Cb. (Contrabass):** Enters in measure 10 with a unison line, marked *f*. In measure 11, it has a *p* marking.

The recapitulation begins with a variation on the first theme first in the strings and then in the kanun. This recapitulation is followed by the variation on the opening theme of the first movement that began the third movement, which then leads into the recapitulation in unison strings of the first theme of the first movement, punctuated by kanun flourishes. The piece concludes with a two-measure long ascending thirty-second note kanun flourish leading to an F-C perfect fifth.

Figure 24 shows a musical score for measures 274-283. The score includes parts for KA (Klavier), Vln. I, Vln. II, Vla., Vc., and Cb. The KA part features a complex melodic line with many accidentals and a dynamic marking of *ff*. The string parts provide a rhythmic and harmonic foundation.

Figure 24

Figure 25 shows a musical score for measures 283-292. The score includes parts for KA, Vln. I, Vln. II, Vla., Vc., and Cb. The KA part features a complex melodic line with many accidentals and a dynamic marking of *rit*. The string parts provide a rhythmic and harmonic foundation.

Figure 25

The third movement's virtuosic opacity limits a deeper analysis, and the questions posed at the beginning of this section therefore must remain for the most part unanswered. However,

the re-emergence of the trill in the development section offers a tantalizing hint. There—again in a B section—the trill is expanded to considerable dimensions, until it explodes into a lengthy and virtuosic run in the *kanun* which shares pitch material with the sustained trills. The effect is that of the carefully controlled tension of the trills being released into a *kanun*-led efflorescence.

Other than its relationship to the preceding trill and its situation in the B section, this efflorescence is in keeping with the virtuosic bombast of the rest of the movement, including the *kanun* flourish that gets the last word at the end. Thus, the listener is left to wonder whether this particular trill is simply part of a virtuosic third-movement “cover-up” of the second movement’s subversiveness, or whether it perhaps gives fleeting voice to the alternate realm hinted at in the second movement’s B section.

Conclusion

The *Kanun Concerto* mediates productively between Ottoman *makam*-s and Western form and harmony, and breaks down the boundaries of sickness and health attributed to these two musics by state reformers. In this way, the concerto constitutes a strategic mediation between Alnar’s two musical *habitus*. I have argued that, through its mediation, the *Kanun Concerto* provides a sonic challenge to the existing Turkish Republican order and a glimpse into an alternate social order receptive to the repressed Ottoman past and its music. How much validity can be attributed to this interpretation? As we will see in the final chapter, Alnar’s own dissemination of the concerto—or lack thereof—is strongly indicative that he was aware of the concerto’s provocative content and believed that it could be potentially damaging to his positionality in the field of Turkish music-cultural production. Furthermore, reception of Alnar’s oeuvre after his death focused especially on the *Kanun Concerto*, and exhibits a prevailing need to account for the “problem” of Alnar’s use of Turkish music.

Chapter 7: Hopelessly Sick, or Lonely Visionary? Hasan Ferid Alnar Reception in Turkey

An analysis of Alnar's own performances of the *Kanun Concerto* and of articles on Alnar that appeared predominately after his death reveals two primary threads of reception, both of which are concerned with Alnar's *habitus* in Ottoman music. The first thread of reception of Alnar's oeuvre and the *Kanun Concerto* reveals an othering thread characterized by unease over Alnar's affiliations with Ottoman music. Actors in this vein consider Alnar's Ottoman *habitus* to be at best a neutral quality, and at worst a marker of musical disability. They point to Alnar's *habitus* in Turkish music as a root cause of problems in Alnar's career and music. I interpret this sense of unease in part as a response to the representation of state violence embedded in the *Kanun Concerto*'s second movement. Another thread of reception, however, reveals the productive quality of Alnar's *habitus* in Ottoman music instantiated most prominently in the *Kanun Concerto*. Actors in this vein interpret the *Kanun Concerto* and its use of Ottoman music as developing an emergent musical language, and employ the concerto strategically to advance their own positionalities and visions for Turkish music. In this way, the *Kanun Concerto* acquires a productive agency stemming from—yet independent of—its creator, Hasan Ferid Alnar.

Due to the artistic agency that it has offered to subsequent actors in the Turkish Republican field of music-cultural production, the *Kanun Concerto*'s reception indicates a need to re-think Pierre Bourdieu's implicit conception of the role of the cultural product in the field of cultural production as the result of but not an agent it strategizing. My re-consideration continues to view cultural products as the results of their creators' strategic actions in the field, but it also recognizes the "agency" embedded in cultural products that can be called upon by subsequent actors to strategize in fields of cultural production. This approach does not call for a return to the days of autonomous works of art; on the contrary, it proposes a means for analyzing the

productive power that cultural products can wield as audiences, musicians, and composers situated within changing fields of cultural production consume and respond to cultural products and the codes that they encode, which are themselves the products of *habitus* and strategy in a particular field of cultural production.

Silent and Belated Premieres: Initial Reception of the *Kanun Concerto*

The first thread of reception takes us back to Alnar himself, and his own reception of the *Kanun Concerto*. The premiere of the *Kanun Concerto* in Vienna indicates that Alnar was aware of the *Kanun Concerto*'s subversive content, and was wary of revealing the concerto in Turkey. The concerto's Turkish premiere given at the Austrian Embassy in Ankara arguably did not constitute a Turkish premiere at all. In both cases, Alnar continued to use Austria strategically as both a source of cultural capital and an escape from the musically disabling field of cultural production in Turkey.

The circumstances of the *Kanun Concerto*'s premiere strongly suggest that Alnar wished to avoid a public performance of the work in Turkey. Alnar gave the first public performance of the concerto on Sunday, October 14, 1951 between 12:05 and 2:05 am with the Vienna Radio Symphony Orchestra. Given that the premiere of the *Prelude and Two Dances* had been given in Vienna, the fact that Alnar also chose to premiere the *Kanun Concerto* in Vienna is not unusual. However, the gap between the date of the *Kanun Concerto*'s completion and its premiere indicates a deliberate effort by Alnar to avoid a Turkish premiere. Alnar completed work on the first version of the concerto by 1947, meaning that there was a four-year gap between the point of its completion and its premiere in Vienna. This gap prompts several questions: (1) Did Alnar search in vain for performing forces in Turkey before finally securing an after-hours Viennese premiere? (2) Was Alnar aware of the *Kanun Concerto*'s subversive quality, and did he thus

hesitate to expose it in the field of music in Turkey? (3) Did Hüseyin Saadeddin Arel reject the work, thus precluding an otherwise logical performance at the *İleri Türk Musikisi Konservatuari*? If the first possibility was in fact the case, the seemingly undesirable time slot in which the premiere was finally given can be more easily understood as a left-over performance slot perhaps secured for Alnar by Joseph Marx after a fruitless search for interested performers in Turkey. However, the fact that between 1947 and 1951 Alnar was the conductor of the Presidential Symphony Orchestra seems to indicate that the second possibility—that Alnar wished to suppress a public performance of the concerto—is more likely. Had Alnar wanted to give the premiere of his *kanun concerto* in Ankara, nothing other than his own hesitation would have prevented him from doing so. Perhaps he felt that by giving the premiere in Vienna he would gain the symbolic capital of a Viennese premiere without the damage to his reputation that could be done by music opposed to the still strong Gökalpist current of the Turkish music revolution. The third possibility is also conceivable. Emre Aracı notes that Arel criticized Ahmed Adnan Saygun for failing to use makam tuning in his internationally successful oratorio *Yunus Emre*.¹ Alnar did not manage to use makam tuning either, indicating that Arel may not have approved of the *Kanun Concerto*.

After the *Kanun Concerto*'s 1951 premiere, Alnar was dissatisfied with the third movement, and set about re-composing it. In a 1978 article in the Turkish newspaper *Milliyet*, Alnar explains that after a visit to Konya where he visited Mevlana's tomb and prayed, he became inspired and melodies started to enter his dreams. After first trying them at the piano, he applied them to the kanun and was able to finish the new third movement.² After this re-composition, the Turkish premiere of the *Kanun Concerto* was given in 1958 in a private concert

¹ Aracı, 151.

² "Alnar Anlatıyor," *Milliyet Gazetesi*, August 3, 1978; taken from Safinaz Rizeli Thesis "Hasan Ferid Alnar."

at the Austrian Embassy in Ankara with Alnar as soloist and a string quintet accompanying.³ It is likely that the work was not performed again until Alnar's Jubilee concert in 1970.⁴

The *Kanun Concerto*'s 1958 Turkish premiere also indicates Alnar's reticence to reveal the work in Turkey. First, it is debatable to what extent the 1958 premiere can be called a Turkish premiere at all, as that performance was given on a private concert at the Austrian Embassy in Ankara. Despite the fact that Alnar had resigned the conductorship of the Presidential Symphony Orchestra by this point, his work at the Ankara State Opera and the Ankara State Conservatory would have made a public premiere in a larger venue possible. In addition to being private, the fact that the premiere was given in the Austrian Embassy places it as far away from Turkey as possible while still technically being on Turkish soil. Again, it seems that Alnar intentionally avoided a large-scale public performance of the *Kanun Concerto* in Turkey, and that Austria provided a means for gaining symbolic capital while avoiding the Turkish public's eye.

Other than Alnar's own uneasy reception of the *Kanun Concerto*, I have been unable to gain any insight into the work's initial reception in either Turkey or Austria. In the case of the initial Austrian premiere, this silence can perhaps be attributed to the unusual time-slot in which the premiere was given. In the case of the 1958 Turkish premiere, silence reflects the fact that the performance was given privately and in a relatively small venue. Thus, by exercising control over the 1958 audience, Alnar likely avoided inviting any members of the press who might comment publicly on the concerto's strong reliance on attributes of Ottoman music. In so doing, Alnar paradoxically managed to keep the Turkish public ignorant of the *Kanun Concerto* for more than a decade after its Turkish premiere.

³ Okyay, 134.

⁴ Okyay, 93.

Indeed, the first available document pertaining to the *Kanun Concerto*'s reception followed an April 17, 1970 "Jubilee Concert" organized by several of Alnar's former students in his honor, and tellingly took that concert to be the concerto's Turkish premiere.⁵ Etem Ruhi Üngör's May 1970 review of that concert in the *Music Journal (Musiki Mecmuası)* provides strong evidence that Alnar kept the concerto's ostensible 1958 Turkish premiere under wraps, and that the concerto's many virtuosic passages successfully concealed its subversive content. Üngör observes that "With his Kanun Concerto, whose Turkish premiere he saved until the Jubilee concert, Alnar showed in front of the orchestra both that he has not lost the virtuosity that he won at a young age and particularly what an important role the kanun can play in polyphonic music."⁶ Üngör goes on to further emphasize the *Kanun Concerto*'s virtuosity:

The Kanun Concerto constituted the program's center of gravity and originality; it was performed with great success by its composer. In the performance of this piece which demands virtuosity, together with its impossible [technical] attributes—particularly serial plectrum throws, ascending and descending jumps, continuous repetition of *mandal* lifting and lowerings—the performance of the piece with orchestra provides a separate performance value⁷

It is notable that, amidst his detailed description of the *Kanun Concerto*'s technical demands, Üngör mentions neither the work's technically un-demanding yet politically subversive second movement nor Alnar's extensive use of elements drawn from his *habitus* in Ottoman music. Indeed, Üngör is more-or-less silent on the issue of Alnar's place in Turkish music history. Üngör's silence on these issues can perhaps be attributed to the fact that he was writing a review

⁵ Okyay, 116-117.

⁶ Musiki Mecmuası, Mayıs 1970, No. 258, s. 9, E.R. Üngör—taken from Rizeli thesis "Hasan Ferid Alnar": Alnar, Türkiye'deki ilk icrasını jübilesine sakladığı Kanun Konçertosu eseri ile genç yaşta kazandığı virtüozluğunu kaybetmediğini göstermekle beraber özellikle kanunun çoksesli musikide nasıl önemli rol oynayabileceğini orkestra önünde göstermiştir.

⁷ Üngör: Programın sıklet merkezi olan ve orijinalitesini teşkil eden Kanun Konçertosunu; bestecisi Ferid alnar tarafından büyük başarı ile icra edilmiştir. Virtuozite isteyen bu eserin icrasında bilhassa seri mızrap atışlar, inişli ve çıkışlı atlamalar ile mütemadi mandal kaldırıp indirmeler taklidi gayrikabil özellikler olmakla beraber, eserin orkestra ile birlikte icrası da ayrı bir icra değeri sağlamaktadır.

of an elderly composer's jubilee concert, and thus wished to avoid ideologically and politically sensitive topics. Technical virtuosity thus provides for Üngör as it did for Alnar a means of distraction, of looking away from the subversive other hiding in plain sight in the middle of the piece.

Ottoman Contamination: Reception Thread One

In the Introduction to *Sounding Off*, Lerner and Strauss describe the critical reception of certain disabled musicians as a “process of enfreakment” in which the musician “is engulfed by the stigmatic trait of his disability.”⁸ Articles appearing in the Turkish press after Alnar's 1978 death focus on Alnar's *habitus* in Ottoman music as a problematic characteristic casting a shadow over Alnar's oeuvre and positionality in the field of Turkish music-cultural production. In this way, actors in this group perform a posthumous musical disabling of Alnar, seeing his every musical action as colored by his *habitus* in “sick” Ottoman music.

The first article in this thread negatively emphasizes Alnar's musical disabling, pointing to his involvement with “national” music as a lack which prevented him from enjoying greater renown during his life. In an August 3, 1978 article titled “Our first film composer was Ferid Alnar” (“*Ferid Alnar ilk Film Müzikçimizdi*”) in the *Nation (Milliyet)* newspaper, Halit Refiğ posits that Alnar's neglect is a product of over-emphasis on Western music in Turkey at the expense of “national” music:

When the works that Alnar left behind are compared with the other famous composers of his generation, they may not carry the same weight as the others' works in terms of quality and quantity. The ‘Prelude and Two Dances,’ one of the first successful Turkish compositions for orchestra, will guard its place close to the heart of our music history. As the arrival of the flavor of the fine sensitivity found in the relatives of the music of our past increases, the Cello Concerto may also be performed. But at our conversation Alnar reported that the tape recording made during the Vienna performance of the Kanun Concerto—his most important work—was erased. His life-span wasn't sufficient for a record. It is very sad, in an environment dominated by a cultural mentality that thinks that

⁸ Lerner and Strauss, 8.

the music revolution is some of our ladies playing the Rachmaninoff concerto, and that caused national music to remain alive in taverns, that Ferid Alnar—one of the greatest kanun virtuosos of our recent history—left our midst without the making of a recording of proper quality of this interesting and valuable work performed by he himself having been provided for. What a pity!⁹

Refiğ's critique initially appears to be directed at the disabling of Ottoman music in the Turkish field of music which in turn was musically disabling to Alnar. However, Refiğ's first sentence indicates that he, too, might be counted a participant in the "enfreakment" camp of reception: "[Alnar's works] may not carry the same weight as the others' works in terms of quality and quantity." Refiğ praises Alnar, even calling him "one of the greatest kanun virtuosos of our recent history," but this opening sentence indicates a disabling subtext. Again, virtuosity is granted, but Alnar's productivity and the viability of his music has been negatively affected by the sickness of Ottoman music.

In a September 11, 1978 article titled "We Lost Hasan Ferid Alnar" ("*Hasan Ferid Alnar'ı Yitirdik*") which appeared in the *National Art Journal (Milliyet Sanat Dergisi)*, Faruk Yener cites Alnar's physical and mental disability in a discussion that casts Alnar's works as "far from progress and innovations." In this way, Yener revives the early Republican conflation of Ottoman music with sickness seen in Ziya Gökalp's writings and the negative framing of Turkish Art Music in order to disable Alnar as a composer. Yener describes Alnar as an artist who was shy, introverted, and immediately perceivable as closed off.¹⁰ Relating the outlines of Alnar's

⁹ Halit Refiğ, "Ferid Alnar İlk Film Müzikçimizdi," *Milliyet Gazetesi*, August 3, 1978: Ferid Alnar'ın geride bıraktığı eserler kendi kuşağının öbür ünlü bestecileri ile kıyaslandığında, özellikle senfonik alanda, nitelik ve nicelik bakımından onlarınkı kadar ağırlık taşımayabilir. Senfonik orkestra için başarılı ilk Türk bestelerden biri olan 'Prelüd ve İki Dans' müzik tarimizdeki ccana yakın yerini koruyacaktır. Geçmiş musikimizle akrabalığındaki ince duyarlılığın tadına varan çıktıkça 'Viyolonsel Konçertosu'da seslendirilebilir. Ama ya eserlerinin en önemlisi 'Kanun Konçertosu' Alnar konuşmamızda Viyana'daki seslendiriliş sırasında yapılan band kaydının silindiğini bildirdi. Plak için ömrü vefat etmedi. Ulusal musikinin meyhanelerde yaşatıldığı, müzikdevrini bazı hanımlarımız Rahmaninof konçertosu çalması sanan bir kültür zihniyetinin egemen olduğu ortamda, yakın tarihimizin en büyük kanun ustası olan Ferid Alnar'ın bu ilginç ve değerli eserinin bizzat kendisi tarafından doğru dürüst bir kaydının yapılması sağlanmadan aramızdan göçüp gitmesi çok acıdır. Yazık!

¹⁰ Faruk Yener, "Hasan Ferid Alnar'I Yitirdik, *Milliyet Sanat Dergisi*, 11 Eylül 1978: 288.

biography, he notes that after assuming the head conductorship of the Presidential Symphony Orchestra in Ankara “He stayed in that position from 1946 to 1952, then left in that same year due to damaged health, in 1955 moved to Vienna and led concerts in various Central European cities”¹¹ After he returned to Turkey, Yener writes, Alnar “continued his life in Ankara and participated in concerts as a guest conductor, however due to increasing neural and psychological discomforts he increasingly limited those efforts in his last years.”¹² Again referring to Alnar’s health situation, Yener compares Alnar somewhat unfavorably to the other Turkish Five composers:

Hasan Ferid Alnar, who lost his not particularly happy life at 72 years, was one of the five first composers of the ‘Polyphonic Turkish Music’ initiative, which began with Atatürk’s wish after the beginning of the Republican period in our country. However, different from his four friends C.R. Rey, A. Saygun, N.K. Akses and U.C. Erkin, Alnar first made skillful use of the ‘monophonic’ repertoire and used his modal experience. Due to his health situation, the artist’s inspiration was not always fertile, and that limited the number of his works. The architectural organization of those works relies on ordinary plans, while the majority of their melodic and rhythmic elements rely on national colors. His orchestration is easy, open, and spare. All of those aspects are sufficient to show the distance of his oeuvre from progress and innovations.¹³

Yener complements Alnar for his “skillful use of the ‘monophonic’ repertoire” and his reliance on “national colors,” but these weak concessions to Alnar’s abilities would have been necessary to the writing of an appropriately respectful response to Alnar’s death. The primary thrust of Yener’s article casts Alnar’s works as the primitive products of a compromised body and mind.

¹¹ Yener: 1946’da 1952 yılına dek bu görevde kalmış, aynı yıllar bozulan sağlığı nedeniyle ayrılmış, 1955’te Viyana’ya yerleşerek Orta Avrupa kentlerinde konserler yönetmiştir.

¹² Yener: Alnar, yurda döndükten sonra yaşamını Ankara’da sürdürmüş, konuk olarak konserlere katılmış, ancak giderek artan sinirsel ve ruhsal rahatsızlığı son yıllarda bu çabalarını da engellemiştir.

¹³ Yener: Pek mutlu sayamayacağımız yaşamı 72 yaşında yiten H.F. Alnar, yurdumuzda Cumhuriyet döneminden sonra Atatürk’ün isteğiyle başlayan ‘Çok Sesli Türk Müziği’ girişiminin ürünü beş öncü bestecimizden biridir. Ancak başka dört arkadaşı C.R. Rey, A. Saygun, N.K. Akses ve U.C. Erkin’den ayrı olarak önce ‘Tek Sesli’ veriminde ustaca yararlanmış, modal deneylerinde kullanmıştır. Sanatçının esini biraz da sağlık durumu nedeniyle her zaman bereketli olmamış, bu yönü yapıtlarının sayısını sınırlandırmıştır. Bu yapıtların mimari kuruluşu alışılmış planlara, ezgisel ve ritmik elementleri ise çoğunlukla ulusal renklere dayanır. Orkestralaması kolay, açık ve yalındır. Bütün bu yönleri dağarının atılım ve yeniliklerden uzaklığını göstermeye yeterlidir.

In Yener's view, Alnar's association with Ottoman music made him literally unfit for the task of producing a modern and progressive Turkish national music.

Even Alnar's wife, Sevin Alnar, contributed to the "enfreakment" thread of Alnar reception in a 1999 interview by Arzu Haksun titled "Sevin Alnar, his Wife, Explains our Composer and Conductor Hasan Ferid Alnar that we Lost Twenty-one Years Ago, Hasan Ferid Alnar." In the interview, Sevin Alnar states that the cause of Alnar's neglect was his roots in Turkish music. The substitution of the term "Turkish" for "Ottoman" or "*Alaturka*" is notable:

No matter how much they worked together, no matter how much they were seen together, some articles always mention that next to the other 'Turkish Five' H. Ferid Alnar stayed on the third or fourth plane. Sevin Hanım explains the situation thusly: 'That originates somewhat from Alnar's being a composer rooted in Turkish music. His mother Saime Hanım played kanun, and his uncle played oud. I listened to his mother a few times. Her voice was very beautiful and Ferid grew up with those voices and melodies. Consequently, perhaps because of that Ferid always fell to the fourth plane.'¹⁴

It is clear that Sevin Alnar does not mean to denigrate her husband's music. Nor does she regard Ottoman music with contempt, given her comments on Alnar's mother's music making. Indeed, it her use of the term "Turkish" seems to turn the attribute that injured Alnar's positionality into a positive in the context of Turkish nationalism. Nonetheless, Sevin Alnar clearly points to Hasan Ferid Alnar's affiliation with this music as the cause of his neglect in the Turkish Republic. In this way, her comments make manifest the dynamics of accommodational disabling. Alnar and his music were not intrinsically lacking or deficient. Rather, the Turkish Republican context in which Alnar and his music existed was not accommodating to the *habitus* in Ottoman music that Alnar embodied, and thus his opportunities in that context were limited.

¹⁴ Okyay, 112: Ne kadar ortak çalışsalar yada ne kadar birlikte görülseler de, bazı makedeler H. Ferid Alnar'ın diğer Türk Beşleri'nin yanında üçüncü dördüncü planda kaldığından söz eder hep. Sevin Hanım ise durumu şöyle anlatıyor: "Ferid'in Türk müziği kökenli bir besteci olmasından kaynaklanıyor bu biraz da. Annesi Saime Hanım kanun, amcası ud çalarmış. Birkaç kez ben den dinledim annesini. Çok güzel sesi vardı ve o seslerle, melodilerle büyümüş Ferid de. Dolayısıyla belki bu nedenle hep dördüncü plana düşmüş Ferid."

Turkish Mediation: Reception Thread Two

A second thread of Alnar reception has seen Alnar and his music in a different light. Writers and musicians in this thread do not consider Alnar's music to be deficient, nor do they consider his *habitus* in Ottoman music a liability. On the contrary, in this thread of reception Alnar's *habitus* in Ottoman music emerges as a source of productive compositional mediation. In this sense, I posit that this positive thread of reception is akin to the analyses of disability studies scholars who re-evaluate difference as a source of compositional voice for composers ranging from Francesco Landini to Bedrich Smetana.

However, my analysis in this section moves beyond an examination of Alnar's embodied *habitus* in Ottoman music as source of his compositional voice. Recalling the manner in which reception of Ludwig van Beethoven's difficult late works changed over the course of the nineteenth century and in turn shaped the choices of cultural agents that followed, I identify the *Kanun Concerto* as itself an agent in the field of Turkish music cultural production. Just as Beethoven's late works provided a strategic means for Richard Wagner to enhance his positionality in the late nineteenth-century field of music-cultural production in Europe, late twentieth-century Turkish actors have used the *Kanun Concerto* to enhance their positionality and to advance particular visions of the field of music-cultural production in Turkey.

This thread of reception reveals that cultural products are not merely reactions to the interaction between their creators' subjectivity and the objective conditions with which they are confronted. Rather, these products encode the discourses, strategies, and *habitus* which brought about their initial creation. In this way, cultural products become tools in the hands of subsequent actors to advance their own positionality and their corollary visions of the field of cultural production.

In her September 7, 1978 article “The Developing of our Traditional Music and Alnar” (“Geleneksel Müziğimizin Geliştirilmesi ve Alnar”) in the *Republic (Cumhuriyet)* newspaper, Hülya Öncel contends that Alnar’s *habitus* in Ottoman music—particularly as manifested in the *Kanun Concerto*—grants him a unique status as true modernizer of Turkish music. With this conception, Öncel strategically co-opts the *Kanun Concerto* and the signs embedded in it to further her own conception of Turkish music. Situating Alnar’s music in a Marxist critical framework, Öncel contends that—unlike many of his contemporaries—Alnar maintained his Ottoman *habitus* and thus engaged in a dialectical relationship with the Turkish music of the past.¹⁵ After describing the workings of Karl Marx’s concept of dialectical negation, whereby the relationship of new cultural forms are dialectically related to negated forms both through negation and maintenance of certain ties with forms which have been negated, Öncel argues that this is also the case in the progress of music as an element of culture. She contends that “today those circles in Turkey who maintain that they have adopted the view of dialectical materialism scream with their entire behavior that they have not comprehended the essence of that view.”¹⁶ Those circles had thought that they were presiding over dialectical negation, but in Öncel’s view they were in fact leading a process of mechanical negation in which the object negated in dialectical negation is destroyed by an outside force. Öncel describes, in other words, the process of violent repression represented in the second movement of the *Kanun Concerto*.

With this framework in place, Öncel turns to Alnar’s career:

The ‘Turkish Classical Music’ that forms a portion of our traditional music is opposed to that circle [which thinks that it has adopted the view of dialectical materialism] and the mechanical negation of the artists produced by that circle. Those circles are of the

¹⁵ Hülya Öncel, “Geleneksel Müziğimizin Geliştirilmesi ve Alnar,” *Cumhuriyet Gazetesi*, September 7, 1978: taken from Safınaz Rizeli thesis “Hasan Ferid Alnar.”

¹⁶ Öncel: Bugün Türkiye’de de materialist diyalektik görüşü benimsediklerini savunan çevreler, bu görüşü özünü kavrayamadıklarını, tüm davranışlarında haykırıyorlar.

opinion that they have created the conditions for the creation of that negation, new music, music of today.

This should not be forgotten: new music, the music of today does not come from a random place. It is formed with the rational development of the values and knowledge carried by our traditional music.

Ferid Alnar, the kanun master whom we lost a few days ago, understood that fact and was a revolutionary musician who sped up the continuing evolution in music.

Alnar, who grew up with traditional Turkish music and over time negated that music dialectically, helped to create a new music from the old that had been rejected by taking and using the worthwhile aspects of that negated music. The Kanun Concerto is the strongest evidence of that.

That fact is what needs to be praised in Alnar's art and personality.

As Halif Refiğ also said, we are of the belief that for people of the cultural understanding that 'imagines that the music revolution is some of our ladies playing the Rachmaninoff Concerto', there are many things to learn from Alnar and his art.¹⁷

Productive mediation is manifest on two levels in Öncel's conception. First, Alnar's *habitus* in Ottoman music is the impetus for his creation through a process of dialectical negation of an emergent Turkish music exemplified by the *Kanun Concerto*. Second, the *Kanun Concerto* as cultural product embedding codes of Turkishness and modernity becomes a strategic tool in Öncel's hands for advancing her own conception of modern Turkish music and, by extension, her own positionality in the field of Turkish cultural production.

¹⁷ Öncel: Geleneksel müziğimizin bir bölümünü oluşturan Klasik Türk Müziği bu çevrenin ve bu çevrelerin yetiştirdiği sanat adamlarının mekanik olumsuzlaması ile karşı karşıyadır. Bu çevreler bu olumsuzlamayı, yeni müziği, bugünün müziğini yaratmak yolunda yaptıkları kanısındadır. Şu unutmamalıdır: yeni müzik, bugünün müziği rastgele bir yerden ortaya çıkmaz. Geleneksel müziğimizin taşıdığı değerlerin, bilgilerin ussal geliştirilmesiyle oluşur. Birkaç gün önce yitirdiğimiz kanun ustası Ferid Alnar, bu gerçeği anlamış ve müzikte olagelen evrimi hızlandırmış devrimci bir müzisyendir. Geleneksel Türk Müziğinde yetişip, giderek bu müziği diyalektik açıdan olumsuzlayan sanatçıdır Alnar, olumsuzladığı müziğin yararlı yönlerini alıp kullanarak yadsıdığı eskinin bir yeni yaratmasını sağlamıştır. Kanun Konçertosu bunun en büyük kanıtıdır. Alnar'ın sanatında ve kişiliğinde övülmesi gereken işte bu gerçektir. Halit Refiğ'in de dediği gibi "müziğin evrimini bazı hanımlarımızın Rahmaninof konçertosu çalması sanan" bir kültür anlayışındaki kişilerin Alnar ve onun sanatından öğrenecekleri çok şeyler var inancındayız.

The *Kanun Concerto* continues today to provide a means for cultural agents in Turkey to advance their positionality. Contemporary Turkish *Kanun* performer Tahir Aydoğdu's career as virtuosic performer has been enabled to a significant degree by performance of Alnar's *Kanun Concerto*. While the *Kanun Concerto* was encoded cultural forms at odds with Republican modernism during Alnar's lifetime, the concerto has granted Aydoğdu access to the highest levels of Turkish secular modern cultural life. Aydoğdu is a graduate in physics from Ankara's elite Middle Eastern Technical University (*Ortadoğu Teknik Üniversitesi*), has performed with the major Turkish state orchestras, lives in Ankara's bourgeois Ümitköy district, and aligns himself with secular Turkish politics.¹⁸ Removed chronologically from the specific musics and discourses that it encodes, the *Kanun Concerto* as virtuosic product of nationalist composer Hasan Ferid Alnar becomes a tool for advancement in the late-twentieth and twenty-first-century field of musical cultural production in Turkey.

Aydoğdu himself is aware of the problem of Alnar's *habitus* in Ottoman music in the context of twentieth-century Turkish music culture. However, Aydoğdu uses the concerto as a means to de-construct the Republican anti-Ottoman bias. Like Sevin Alnar, Aydoğdu labels Ottoman urban music as "Turkish music." This time, his choice of terminology enables a re-formulation of the Turkish field of music:

Excerpt 1:

Erol Koymen: You already talked a bit about this, but could you perhaps talk a bit about the music revolution in Turkey, the Turkish Five, and Alnar? I mean, why, how? Was it successful? Was it not successful?

Tahir Aydoğdu: Of course the music revolution—at the center of the reforms aimed at for Turkey by the great Atatürk ... the music revolution's foundations were as good as possible, but of course there were mistakes. The pieces that were composed didn't come down to the people. The people's quality was middling. In order to understand those pieces, it was anyway a Russian school ...

¹⁸ Aydoğdu, Tahir, and Hülya Aydoğdu. Interviewed by Erol Koymen. Personal interview. Austin, April 8, 2015.

Erol Koymen: Pardon?

Tahir Aydođdu: Russian school. The Turkish Five was founded in that way, working to send [music students] abroad to develop Turkish music ... But, for example, one of Alnar's most important qualities ... other than him all of the other Turkish Five members made rude remarks about Turkish music, they used bad words, Turkish music is not our music, it is Arab, Byzantine, Iranian music, they said. But in no way did Ferid Alnar use malicious expressions about Turkish music. Not in a single report, because in his pieces I think he uses Turkish music's modal and rhythmic systems better than any of our other Turkish composers.

With the early Republican distinction between Ottoman urban and Turkish folk music removed and both classified as "Turkish music," Alnar's *habitus* in Ottoman music re-cast as Turkish music becomes a positive attribute. Indeed, Aydođdu's choice of terminology causes the position of those who opposed Alnar for his Ottoman *habitus* to appear incoherent—they wished to develop "Turkish music," yet opposed a master of "Turkish music's modal and rhythmic systems." Even the other Turkish Five composers appear suspect with this re-formulation. In this context, Ziya Gökalp returns as a now fully historicized thinker whose legacy nonetheless remains:

Excerpt 2:

Tahir Aydođdu: I mean, there is still no chair named after Alnar, no concert hall, nor is there a street to which his name has been given. There is nothing at all. I worked on it some ... I was not successful ... I mean to give his name [to something], hall, concert hall. I mean, there is Cemal Reşit Rey [Concert Hall), Adnan Saygun [Art Center]. Why is there no Ferid Alnar?

Erol Koymen: Do you have a theory? I mean, we talked about it a bit, but ...

Tahir Aydođdu: Because he came out of Turkish music.

Erol Koymen: He came from ... aha.

Tahir Aydođdu: Rooted in Turkish music, because, in his day Ziya Gökalp's trend ... how can we say it ... in the period influenced by Ziya Gökalp, those interested in Turkish music were to a great degree looked down on. Those working on Turkish music ...

because of that those people were not supported. For example, this comes from a similar concept as Atatürk's music banning ...

Gökalp's polarizing conception of Turkish music now being a relic of the past in Aydoğdu's conception, the *Kanun Concerto* and the signs it embeds become a vehicle for Aydoğdu to propose a more inclusive conception of Turkish music:

Excerpt 3:

Erol Koymen: That topic ... could you say something to that topic [of folk music and Turkish art music]?

Tahir Aydoğdu: What does "folk music" mean? What does "art music" mean?

Hülya Aydoğdu: I mean, they are both Turkish music ... music is art in any case

Tahir Aydoğdu: In any case ... when you say Turkish music, or more properly when you say Türk musikisi ... that is a more appropriate term ... folklore, our classical music and our Dede Efendis, and after that our mehter military music and our religious music. Together, they constitute [our music].

Erol Koymen: That ...

Tahir Aydoğdu: distinction?

Erol Koymen: Where did that distinction come from?

Tahir Aydoğdu: Muzaffer Sarısözen made collections at that time. We created an artificial division. The TRT (Turkish Radio and Television) also participated in [collecting] folk music. That is folk music, and that is art music, they say. What does that mean? Is music not art? There is this funny terminology, and they still couldn't find a solution for it unfortunately ... That distinction was begun with Muzaffer Sarısözen. However, Turkish folk songs are ours and [Turkish art music] songs are also ours. One of them ... is a collection, and one of them is an art song. There are those who support music from the palace and those who support music from the people, but it shouldn't be said, that is the music of the folk. That is that happened with those division-makers who said "which music is my music?"

Hülya Aydoğdu: I think it is as if the city-dwellers and the Anatolia-dwellers are separated. The Anatolia-dwellers say "folk," but then what do we city-dwellers say?

Tahir Aydoğdu: You see, they looked at it a bit like this: folk music is closer to the folk, the music of the aristocratic class, if it is also the music of the Ottoman palace ... they call it Ottoman music. Okay, Turkish [art] music's important century ... nearly seven

century period ... that music's shining, golden periods also exist, but they are absent. We can talk about Turkish [art] music's long, seven-century period, but when we say Turkish music, it's like I explained earlier. We have to talk about four branches.

Erol Koymen: Sorry?

Tahir Aydoğdu: Four components ... four materials ... our folkloric, classic, and religious music, and mehter military music. Those are Turkish music ...

For Aydoğdu, the *Kanun Concerto* provides a medium for critiquing the categories imposed upon the field of music in the Turkish Republic. This critique extends far beyond music, however, to the Turkish Republican historiographical and nationalist project. Aydoğdu calls into question the rejection of Turkey's Ottoman history in the name of the a-historical Herderian folk. In so doing, Aydoğdu becomes the mouthpiece for the critique embedded in the second movement of the *Kanun Concerto*. Thus, while the *Kanun Concerto* provides Aydoğdu with a vehicle for advancement in the contemporary field of Turkish music-cultural production, Aydoğdu also serves as a vehicle for the dissemination of critiques embedded in the *Kanun Concerto*.

Hasan Ferid Alnar's oeuvre and the *Kanun Concerto* have provoked both unease and productive mediation. In the former vein, critics have read Alnar's career in terms of Turkish Republican musical discourses and tended to view Alnar and his works as essentially marked by his *habitus* in Ottoman music. In the latter, critics have recognized the productive aspect of Alnar's use of Ottoman musical signs in dialogue with Western musical forms and techniques—especially as embedded in the *Kanun Concerto*. These actors have appropriated the concerto as a means for improving their own positionality in the contemporary field of Turkish music-cultural production and for advancing particular re-formulations of that field. Thus, though Alnar's *habitus* in Ottoman music placed him in a conservative position vis à vis Gökalpists and the other Turkish Five composers, the *Kanun Concerto* encoding the Ottoman markers of Alnar's

conservative positionality has ironically become a vehicle for actors in later generations to define themselves as reformers against the meanwhile solidified conservatism of Turkish Republican orthodoxies.

Chapter 8: Conclusion

[I] wish you ... from my heart that it will be all the more possible for you in an even more effective manner to continue your battle for everything healthy and viable and thus against aberrations and degeneracies (*Entartungen*), and thus that your highly esteemed efforts for music culture can be spread in a more intensive manner not only from the side of the public but also by the state.¹

Alnar's strategic relationship with Joseph Marx along with his Arelian alliance placed him in a unique position within the field of music-cultural production in the Turkish Republic. With his alignment with conservative musical views and practices accompanied by his status as composer of the Turkish music revolution, Alnar occupied a kind of quasi-conservative position in the field. As opposed to a true conservative made so by control of the means of cultural production, Alnar's control was threatened by revolutionary intervention. Alnar was able to control the field of Late-Ottoman music-cultural production with its *alaturka-alafranga* dichotomy by virtue of his developing abilities in both Ottoman and European music. With the founding of the Turkish Republic and the ensuing internal division of the field of Turkish music-cultural production into Ottoman/Turkish Art music and Turkish folk music, and the call for elimination of the former and elevation of the latter, Alnar became a persecuted conservative in the role of a revolutionary. He was conservative by way of his *habitus* in an existing cultural form vying for continued dominance—Ottoman/Turkish Art Music—but was persecuted because this cultural form was forcibly repressed by the Gökalpist Turkish Music Revolution. At the same time, he entered the role of a revolutionary via his strategic decision to orient toward European music. He was ostensibly a progressive aimed at the reform of the field of Turkish music cultural production like his other Turkish Five colleagues. However, as has been demonstrated, his position within that group was distinct due to his position in the field of

¹ Hasan Ferid Alnar to Joseph Marx, March 9, 1935, Manuscript Collection, Austrian National Library, Vienna, Austria.

Ottoman music cultural production. While the other Turkish Five composers, through lack of integration in that field, were able to participate more fully in the ideologically sanctioned rejection of Ottoman music in favor of the constructed category of Turkish folk music, Alnar's double *habitus* made this impossible.

Even as Joseph Marx found in Alnar an invitation to Turkey as a site for conservative Austrian music propaganda, Alnar found in him a conservative ally, who likewise had too much of a stake in a grand tradition to abandon it for progressive gain. Indeed, the full extent of Alnar's conservatism comes out in his interaction with Marx, as evidenced by the above quote reeking of musical eugenicist from a March 9, 1935 letter from Alnar congratulating Marx on his appointment as *Staatsrat* in the Austrian *Staendestaat*. This statement indicates that Alnar developed in his interaction with Marx a conception of music influenced by late-19th and early-20th century eugenicist currents. Alnar was thus ironically aligned with Gökalpian musical disabling of the very variety that, through its attempted euthanization of the Ottoman musical tradition, brought about Alnar's own musical disabling.

Through analysis of the trans-national strategizing that developed the web of strategic relations between Alnar, Marx, and Arel and ultimately brought about Alnar's musical disabling, I open up new ways of thinking about Turkish and Austrian musical nationalism and the field of music cultural production in Turkey. The strategic exchange of symbolic capital between Alnar and Marx necessitates a re-thinking of what has often been depicted as a uni-directional music-cultural flow from Europe to Turkey during the first half of the twentieth century by positing a bi-directional flow of power conceived of in terms of the strategic actions of individual agents operating in their respective fields of cultural production. This re-conception calls for a revised analysis of other cultural exchanges between Europe and Turkey during this period. The

predominance of Austro-German cultural agents during this period, such as Paul Hindemith and the numerous Austro-German architects who planned the new national capital Ankara, indicate that this analysis will continue to require consideration of the strategic congruence of repressive nationalist cultural policies developed by the Austrian and German nation-states on the one hand and the Turkish nation-state on the other during the first half of the twentieth century.²

By developing the Gökalp-Arel division as a major one in Republican Turkish music history while at the same time complicating the role of Gökalp's thought, my study encourages a re-thinking of the structure of the traditional Turkish Music Revolution narrative outlined at the beginning of this study. Likewise, by exposing a fissure underneath the glossy Republican packaging that has heretofore encased the Turkish Five, I bring to the fore the constructedness of the Turkish Five as a flagship product of the music revolution. A new study is needed that takes as its aim not the heroization of the Turkish Five composers but rather the examination of the bringing under one roof of five diverse musical personalities to serve the purposes of Turkish nationalist ideology.

Analysis of Alnar's musical disabling by lack of accommodation of Ottoman/Turkish Art music also reveals transnational forces of musical disabling rooted in the nineteenth-century rise of statistically-based eugenics and the resulting hierarchical orientalist frameworks. This approach not only lends depth to existing music studies in the Turkish Republic, but also raises issues in the field of music and disability studies such as disabling of genre, issues of musical accommodation or its lack, and the effects thereof.

After having received relatively little attention in Turkey for more than three decades following his death, Alnar made a return to the national scene in Turkey with the 2013 television

² See Sibel Bozdoğan, *Modernism and Nation Building: Turkish Architectural Culture in the Early Republic* (Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 2001).

series “I Really Loved Him” (Ben Onu Çok Sevdim). The series focuses on Adnan Menderes, prime-minister of Turkey during the multi-party 1950s ultimately hanged in the 1960 military coup, and his affair with Alnar’s first wife Ayhan Aydan. At the opening of the series, Alnar is in the hospital recovering from a breakdown. Subsequently, we find him obsessively pursuing his soon to be former wife, threatening her at one point with a knife and plotting against her with her best friend before they finally divorce.

The series emphasizes the fact that Alnar is a composer. We see Alnar sitting at the piano and hear him say that he has begun composing a magnificent new opera. At no point, though, is any mention made of the kanun, let alone the *Kanun Concerto*. It as if the show’s creators knew that depicting the break-up of a marriage or a break-down in mental health would be one thing, but outing a supposedly proper revolutionary republican composer as a *kanun* performer would tantamount to slander in the Turkish Republic.

Bibliography

- Ahmad, Feroz. *The Making of Modern Turkey*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Altar, Cevad Memduh. "Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart im Lichte Osmanisch-Österreichischer Beziehungen," *Revue belge de Musicologie* 10, no. 3/4 (1956): 138-148.
- Altınay, Reyhan. *Cumhuriyet Döneminde Türk Halk Müziği*. İzmir: META Basım Matbacılık Hizmetleri, 2004.
- And, Metin. "Atatürk and the Arts with Special Reference to Music and Theatre." *Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey*. Leiden: Jacob M. Landau, E.J. Brill, 1984.
- Antokoletz, Elliot. *The Music of Béla Bartók: A Study of Tonality and Progression in Twentieth-Century Music*. University of California Press, 1984.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso, 1983
- Araci, Emre. "The life and works of Ahmed Adnan Saygun." (PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 1999.
- Arel, Hüseyin Saadeddin. *Türk Musikisi Kimindir?* Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Türk Musikisini Araştırma ve Değerlendirme Komisyonu Yayınları, 1969.
- Arjomand, Said Amir. "A la Recherche de la Conscience Collective": Durkheim's Ideological Impact in Turkey and Iran." *The American Sociologist* 17, no. 2 (May 1982): 94-102.
- Bartsch, Patrick. *Musikpolitik im Kemalismus: Die Zeitschrift Radyo zwischen 1941 und 1949*. Bamberg: University of Bamberg Press, 2011.

- Bohlman, Philip. *Focus: Music, Nationalism, and the Making of the New Europe*. New York: Routledge, 2011.
- Bohlman, Philip. "Music inside out: sounding public religion in a post-secular Europe" in *Music, Sound, and Space*, ed. Georgina Born. Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Bozdoğan, Sibel. *Modernism and Nation Building: Turkish Architectural Culture in the Early Republic*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 2001.
- Briggs, Laura, Gladys McCormick, and J. T. Way. "Transnationalism: A Category of Analysis." *American Quarterly* 60, no. 3 (September 2008): 625-648.
- Brodbeck, David. "Dvorak's Reception in Liberal Vienna: Language Ordinances, National Property, and the Rhetoric of Deutschtum." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 60, no. 1 (Spring 2007): 71-132.
- Davis, Lennard J. *The Disability Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Degirmenci, Koray. 2006. "On the Pursuit of a Nation: The Construction of Folk and Folk Music in the Founding Decades of the Turkish Republic." *International Review of the Aesthetics and Sociology of Music* 37 (1). Croatian Musicological Society: 47–65.
- Eberhard, W., and Pertev N. Boratav. 1945. "The Development of Folklore in Turkey." *The Journal of American Folklore* 58 (229). University of Illinois Press: 252–54.
- Durkheim, Emile. *The Division of Labor in Society*. New York: The Free Press, 1966.
- Emile Durkheim. *The Rules of Sociological Method*. New York: The Free Press, 1982.

- “Ecnebilerin Türk Musikisi hakkındaki görüşlerinden Profesör Joseph Marx’ın fikirleri” in *Cumhuriyet’in Sesleri* (Istanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 1999): 60-61.
- Ergul, F. Asli. “The Ottoman Identity: Turkish, Muslim or Rum?” in *Middle Eastern Studies* 48, no. 4 (2012).
- Fanning, David. “Shostakovich, Dmitry: 1926-1936.” in *Grove Music Online*, accessed April 26, 2016, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/subscriber/article/grove/music/52560pg2#S52560.2>.
- Farhat, Hormoz. “Western musical influences in Persia.” *Muzikoloski Zbornik* 27 (1991): 87-96.
- Feldman, Walter. “Cultural Authority and Authenticity in the Turkish Repertoire.” *Asian Music* 22, No. 1 (Autumn, 1990 – Winter, 1991): 73-111.
- Gazimihal, Mahmut Ragip. *Şarkı Anadolu Türküleri ve Oyunları. İstanbul Konservatuvarı Folklor Heyeti’nin dördüncü tetkik seyahatı münasebetiyle*. Istanbul: Evkaf Atbası, 1929.
- “Mahmut Ragıp Gazimihal,” Turkish Music Portal: Composers and Performers, accessed April 23, 2015, <http://www.turkishmusicportal.org/composer.php?id=18&lang2=en>.
- Haney, Joel. “Slaying the Wagnerian Monster: Hindemith, Das Nuschli-Nuschli, and Musical Germanness after the Great War.” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 25, no. 4 (Fall 2008): 339-393.
- Hanioglu, M. Şükrü. *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.

“Hakkımızda,” İleri Türk Müziği Konservatuvarı Derneği, accessed October 26, 2015:

www.ileriturkmuzigi.org/?pnum=2&pt=Hakkımızda

Heyd, Uriel. *Foundations of Turkish Nationalism; the Life and Teachings of Ziya Gökalp.*

London: Luzac, 1950.

Holzer, Andreas. “Joseph Marx und Paul Hindemith als “Musikalische Botschafter” in der

Türkei.” *ANKLAENGE, Wiener Jarbuch für Musikwissenschaft* (2009): 197-208.

Holzer, Andreas. “Joseph Marx als Lehrer.” In “Marjan Kozina: International symposium about

Marjan Kozina, on the occasion of the concert performance of his operetta Majda.” edited

by Primož Kuret, 37-42. Slovenia: Novo Mesto Press, 2001.

Gökalp, Ziya. *Türkçülüğün Esasları.* Edited by Mehmet Kaplan. Istanbul: Milli Eğitim

Basımevi, 1976.

Kezer, Zeynep. *Building Modern Turkey: State, Space, and Ideology in the Early Republic.*

Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2015.

Kirk, Tim. “Fascism and Austrofascism.” In *The Dolfuss/Schussnigg Era in Austria: a*

Reassessment edited by Günter Bischof, Anton Pelinka, and Alexander Lassner, 10-31.

New Brunswick: Transaction Press, 2003.

Kocatürk, Utkan. *Atatürk’ün Fikir ve Düşünceleri.* Ankara: Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek

Kurumu Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 1999.

Kröpfl, Monika. “‘ICH [HABE] NIEMALS EINER ANDEREN PARTEI ANGEHÖRT [...]

ALS DER PARTEI DER BEGABTEN!’ Joseph Marx im Spiegel der

- austrofaschistisch-ständestaatlichen und nationalsozialistischen kulturpolitischen Konzepte.” *Studien zur Musikwissenschaft* 55: 2009.
- Lavignac, Albert. *Encyclopédie de la musique et dictionnaire*. Paris: C. Delagrave, 1913.
- Lewis, Bernard. *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Lewis, Geoffrey. *The Turkish Language Reform: A Catastrophic Success*. Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Lubet, Alex. *Music, Disability, and Society*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2011.
- Makdisi, Ussama. “Ottoman Orientalism.” *The American Historical Review* 107, no. 3 (June 2002): 768-796.
- Marx, Joseph. “Musik ist klingendes Leben” in *Betrachtungen eines romantischen Realisten*, ed. Oswald Ortner. Vienna: Gerlach und Wiedling, 1947.
- Mayer-Hirzberger, Anita. *...ein Volk von alters her musikbegabt: der Begriff “Musikland Österreich” im Ständestaat*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2008.
- O’Connell, John Morgan. “Fine Art, Fine Music: Controlling Turkish Taste at the Fine Arts Academy in 1926.” *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 32 (2000).
- O’Connell, John Morgan. *Alaturka: Style in Turkish Music (1923-1938)*. Ashgate: 2013.
- Okyay, Erdoğan. *Ferid Alnar’a Armağan*. Ankara: Sevda-Cenap And Müzik Vakfı Yayınları, 1999.
- Parla, Taha. *The Social and Political Thought of Ziya Gökalp*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985.

- Pelinka, Anton. "Austrian Identity and the 'Ständestaat'." In *The Habsburg Legacy*, ed. by Ritchie Robertson and Edward Timms. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1994.
- Pearce, Susan C. "The 'Turkish Model' of Sociology: East-West Science, State Formation, and the Post-Secular." *The American Sociologist* 43, no. 4 (December 2012): 406-427.
- Preston, W. D. 1945. "A Preliminary Bibliography of Turkish Folklore." *The Journal of American Folklore* 58 (229). University of Illinois Press: 245–51.
- Refiğ, Gülper. *Atatürk ve Adnan Saygun: Özsoy Operası*. İstanbul: Boyut Yayın Grubu, 2012.
- Rexroth, Dieter. "Paul Hindemiths Beitrag zum türkischen Musikleben." *Hindemith Jahrbuch* 15 (1986).
- Rizeli Safinaz. "Hasan Ferid Alnar" (thesis, Istanbul Technical University Turkish Music State Conservatory, 1991).
- Sağlam, Atilla. *Türk Musiki/Müzik Devrimi*. Bursa, Alfa Aktüel Basım Yayım Dağıtım, 2009.
- Sağlam, Atilla. *Türk Müziğinde Çokseslilik Uygulamaları ve İlerici Armonisi*. İstanbul, Pan Yayıncılık, 2001.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.
- Sarı, Ayhan. "Evrensel Müzik Yaşamında ilk Kanun Konçertosu." *Orkestra Aylık Müzik Dergisi* 19 (1988).
- Say, Ahmet. "Seyfettin Asal." Kemancılar.net, <http://kemancilar.net/seyfettin-asal/>.
- Saygun, Ahmed Adnan, "Bartok in Turkey." *The Musical Quarterly* 37 no. 1 (1951): 5-9.

- Sugarman, Jane. *Engendering Song: Singing and Subjectivity at Prespa Albanian Weddings*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.
- Seeman, Sonia Tamar. "Chapter 4: Exnominating Turk, Hyper-nominating "çingene": Musical Representations of Ethnicity and Turkishness in the Early Republic. In *Sounding Roman: Representation and Performing Identity in Western Turkey*. New York: Oxford University Press, forthcoming.
- Seeman, Sonia Tamar. "Orientalism/Occidentalism and Nesting Alterities: Refracting identities in "Turkish Art Music" 1930 – 1950," delivered at Society for Ethnomusicology national conference, 2014.
- Seigel, Michol. "Beyond Compare: Historical Method after the Transnational Turn." *Radical History Review* 91 (Winter 2005): 62-90.
- Silberbauer, Angelika. "Eine 'führende Musikerpersönlichkeit der Ostmark'—Joseph Marx." In *Eine Institution Zwischen Representation und Macht: Die Universität für Musik und Darstellende Kunst Wien im Kulturleben des Nationalsozialismus*, edited by Juri Giannini, Maximilian Haas, and Erwin Strouhal, 325-337. Wien: Mille Tre Verlag, 2014.
- Spencer, Robert F. "Culture Process and Intellectual Current: Durkheim and Atatürk." *American Anthropologist* 60, no. 4 (Summer 1958): 640-657.
- Stokes, Martin. *The Arabesk Debate*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Şenel, Süleyman. "Darülelhan Heyeti Tarafından 'Fonograf'la Derlenen İlk Türkü ..." *Musiki Dergisi*, <http://www.musikidergisi.net/?p=1218>.

- Taruskin, Richard. "Public Lies and Unspeakable Truth: Interpreting Shostakovich's Fifth Symphony." In *Shostakovich Studies*, edited by D. Fanning, 17-56. Cambridge, 1995.
- Tekelioğlu, Orhan. "The Rise of a Spontaneous Synthesis: the Historical Background of Turkish Popular Music." *Middle Eastern Studies* 32, no. 2 (April, 1996).
- Turino, Thomas. *Music as Social Life: The Politics of Participation*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2008.
- Wilson, William A. "Herder, Folklore and Romantic Nationalism." *Journal of Popular Culture* 6 (1973).
- Youssefzadeh, Ameneh. "The Situation of Music in Iran since the Revolution: The Role of Official Organizations." *British Journal of Ethnomusicology* 9, no. 2 (2000).
- Zimmerman-Kalyoncu, Cornelia. *Deutsche Musiker in der Türkei im Zwanzigsten Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1985).
- Zimmerman-Kalyoncu, Cornelia. "Paul Hindemiths Türkei-Jahre—oder: Wie organisiert man Atatürks Musikreformen." *Hindemith Jahrbuch*, 15 (1986).

Primary Sources

Hasan Ferid Alnar to Joseph Marx, March 31, 1931, Manuscript Collection, Austrian National Library, Vienna, Austria.

Hasan Ferid Alnar to Joseph Marx, September 15, 1932, Manuscript Collection, Austrian National Library, Vienna, Austria.

Hasan Ferid Alnar to Joseph Marx, April 18, 1933, Manuscript Collection, Austrian National Library, Vienna, Austria

Hasan Ferid Alnar to Joseph Marx, December 21, 1933, Manuscript Collection, Austrian National Library, Vienna, Austria.

Hasan Ferid Alnar to Joseph Marx, January 14, 1935, Manuscript Collection, Austrian National Library, Vienna, Austria.

Hasan Ferid Alnar to Joseph Marx, February 4, 1935, Manuscript Collection, Austrian National Library, Vienna, Austria.

Hasan Ferid Alnar to Joseph Marx, March 9, 1935, Manuscript Collection, Austrian National Library, Vienna, Austria.

Hasan Ferid Alnar to Joseph Marx, April 14, 1935, Manuscript Collection, Austrian National Library, Vienna, Austria.

Hasan Ferid Alnar to Joseph Marx, April 27, 1935, Manuscript Collection, Austrian National Library, Vienna, Austria.

“Alnar Anlatıyor,” *Milliyet Gazetesi*, August 3, 1978; taken from Safinaz Rizeli Thesis “Hasan Ferid Alnar.”

Course listing for Hasan Ferid Alnar, 1932. Fachhochschule für Musik und Darstellende Kunst in Wien, Archive of the Universität für Musik und Darstellende Kunst Wien, Vienna, Austria.

Aydoğdu, Tahir, and Hülya Aydoğdu. Interviewed by Erol Koymen. Personal interview. Austin, April 8, 2015.

H.E.H., “Türkische Orchestermusik,” *Wiener Zeitung*, April 6, 1935, Austrian National Library, Vienna, Austria.

“İleri Türk Musikisi Konservatuarı,” *Musiki Mecmuası*, February, 1949, 27, Istanbul University Turcology Research Institute, Istanbul, Turkey.

Marx, Joseph, “Was Lehren die Düsselforfer Reichsmusiktage,” *Neues Wiener Journal* (Vienna, Austria), June 5, 1938.

Marx, Joseph, “Türkische Musik in Wien,” *Wiener Zeitung*, September 18, 1948.

Öncel, Hülya, “Geleneksel Müziğimizin Geliştirilmesi ve Alnar,” *Cumhuriyet Gazetesi*, September 7, 1978; taken from Safinaz Rizeli theses “Hasan Ferid Alnar.”

Dr. Paul, “5. Philharmonisches Konzert,” *Türkische Post*, 13 January 1943: Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin Preussischer Kulturbesitz Digitalisierte Ausgaben.

Refiğ, Halit, “Ferid Alnar İlk Film Müzikçimizdi,” *Milliyet Gazetesi*, August 3, 1978.

Tarihî Vesikalar: İstanbul Belediye Konservatuarı hakkında Prof. Josef Marks'ın raporu," Musiki Mecmuası, January 1, 1949, Istanbul University Turcology Research Institute, Istanbul, Turkey.

Tarihî Vesikalar: İstanbul Belediye Konservatuarı hakkında Prof. Josef Marks'ın raporu (Geçen nüshadan devam)," Musiki Mecmuası, February 1, 1949, Istanbul University Turcology Research Institute, Istanbul, Turkey.

Musiki Mecmuası, Mayıs 1970, No. 258, s. 9, E.R. Üngör—taken from Rizeli thesis "Hasan Ferid Alnar."

Yener, Faruk, "Hasan Ferid Alnar'ı Yitirdik," Milliyet Sanat Dergisi, September 11, 1978; taken from Safınaz Rizeli thesis "Hasan Ferid Alnar."