

3

Conclusion

The title of this dissertation alludes to the “forging” metaphor, which is probably an apt visual image to understand the idea of “national music.” Music served as raw material that was forged into the desired shape by human agency. Hence “national music” is not naturally inherent in the culture of the nation; it is “artificial” and “imagined,” as the nation itself is. However, the term is far more complex and has many various facets that have to be taken into consideration. As this study has shown, the term “national music” is versatile and has no established definition. Its notions change throughout time and adapt to dominant intellectual currents. Its definition is not final and may include or exclude elements according to contemporary esthetic requirements. This study has presented “national music” from a few different angles, both in the intellectual discourses and in the case studies. The Greek case studies showed that in the nineteenth century, harmonized Greek or German melodies were considered by some intellectuals to be “national music.” Some supporters of the harmonized Greek Orthodox church chant also seemed to conceive their new tetraphonic arrangements as a contribution to “national music,” although they were rejected later for being considered “unnational” or “foreign.” Other examples are the Greek commemorative songs dedicated to March 25, which followed the clear compositional rules of Western art music; and yet it would be odd not to consider them as Greek “national music.” At the beginning of the twentieth century, musicians of the New National School used folk songs as a source of inspiration for new compositions, which were considered “national music” as well. The same applies to folk songs and patriotic songs that were considered “national songs,” but it later turned out that they were sung to French melodies or also existed in neighboring countries. Sigalas’ volume *Anthology of National Songs* went so far as to even include hymns to the Ottoman Sultan and Muslim prayers, which he considered part of the Greek national repertoire. The songs in the Turkish case

studies were no exception. The “Sevastopol Song” and the “Gallipoli Song” changed their meaning according to political conflicts that were emerging. They were partly forgotten then revived and filled with new meaning that fit the political agenda of whomever was in power. Moreover, it turned out that both songs also existed in the Greek-speaking world. The definition of “national music” changed and followed contemporary global and local national ideologies. In the quest to define and shape ideas of a “national music,” Greece and Turkey followed different yet similar paths.

The most vital differences between the two nations result from the political and ideological conditions in the early nineteenth century, the impacts of which lasted until the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The French Revolution and the spirit of the European Enlightenment had notable repercussions on Greece and the Ottoman Empire. Greece emerged as an independent nation-state from the Rumelian provinces of the Ottoman Empire. It is impossible to consider Greek Independence without pondering the multiple, often mutual entanglements that derived from the revolutionary spirit that had expanded in all of Europe in the first half of the nineteenth century. After the assassination of the first head of state, Kapodistrias, the succeeding emperors—King Otto of Bavaria and King George of Denmark—were all rulers of non-Greek origin. Hence, both contributed to the formation of the Greek state with their own cultural background and networks. During this period, many young Greeks were sent abroad to study at German, Austrian, French, English, and Italian universities. Additionally, the rise of archaeology and Byzantine studies intensified the ties between Europe and Greece. Greece was in contact with European economic centers, intellectual currents, and diaspora communities, which influenced the process of nation-state building. This new, crucial path that Greece followed was responsible for the major European influence in many musical realms, some of which were singled out in this study.

These included, for example, the Greek music debate, as well as the Greek school song anthologies of the latter nineteenth century. The Greek music debate started much earlier in Greece than the Turkish music debate did in the Ottoman Empire. This was due to the established network of societies and printing houses that the Greeks already had. Whereas the debates among the various interest groups were in full progress in the Greek-speaking world, on the Turkish side, comparable debates were found only at the end of the nineteenth century. One likely reason was the missing infrastructure whereby intellectuals could have come into contact to exchange ideas. This may now give the impression that Ottoman musicians were cut off from the latest debates about the synthesis of Western European and “Oriental music,” which, however, was not the case. The Ottomans did indeed follow the latest discussions on harmonizing “Oriental music,” as Guatelli’s scores have shown. It is likely that this group of progressive musicians that were able to follow international debates was probably smaller but expanded at the beginning of the twentieth century. The arguments regarding national music that were discussed in the journals at the beginning of the twentieth century sometimes referred to articles that had been published thirty years before.

Another crucial difference between the two nations was the use of school song an-

thologies. Greek school song anthologies followed European models, as can be seen in the volumes of Tantalidēs, Maltos, and Sakellaridēs. The methodological concept of these song anthologies followed those of the German-speaking pedagogical currents. This became evident not only in the methodological description but also in the numerous borrowed German melodies that were underlaid with new Greek lyrics. Remarkably, the same also applied to patriotic songs. In the latter nineteenth century, it was seemingly unproblematic to transfer and recontextualize, for example, songs from a specific German political and national context to Greek school songs. Although the songs' contents were changed, the Greek lyrics adopted their patriotic undertone. The lyrics were, however, not randomly set to the foreign melodies, but the meter and rhyme scheme normally fit the song's musical organization and structure, as has been demonstrated in the piece "The Young Soldier." This practice could only be observed in the Greek, and not in the Ottoman, case. Neither songs nor melodies adopted from the German student anthologies could be found, nor, seemingly, were any school song anthologies published in the nineteenth century. This was probably due to the political situation under Abdulhamid II and the lack of suitable personnel with the know-how to design school song anthologies. In contrast, Greece had a Bavarian emperor whose musicians transferred their musical knowledge and culture to Greece. The relationship between Greek and Bavarian musicians showed that there was an exchange that even endured the reign of King Otto. The Ottomans had also initiated a westernization program, but the emperor was no foreigner but remained the Sultan himself. In other words, the official cultural, religious, and political orientation did not significantly change. Therefore, it is not surprising that the Ottomans "skipped" this period when European melodies were included in school song anthologies. Besides, many of the Greek patriotic songs, such as those of Methfessel, derived from the 1848 Revolution, which the Ottomans surely rejected. This changed only when Abdulhamid II was dethroned, and the Second Constitution passed. Unfortunately, this period coincided with a great deal of political, ideological, and socio-cultural tumult. Although there was a brief comeback of Ottomanism, the loss of the Balkan territories destabilized the confidence of the various ethnic groups and strengthened the Turkist movement, which under the Young Turks' government had a major influence on the realm of education. The accelerating disintegration of the Ottoman Empire at the beginning of the twentieth century led to a high degree of social militarization. Militaristic mentality and highly nationalist ideology entered the school song anthologies, instilling resentment and poisoning the minds of young children who in later years were sent to war. However, similar to Greece, the invention of school songs was not genuinely Turkish: its idea had been adopted from German models, and youth organizations were modelled with the cooperation of German military officers. Although the Ottomans did not borrow any German melodies, they did adopt the principles of school music education, filling the songs with national Ottoman, cultural, and musical language that the students were familiar with.

Another interesting phenomenon observed in this study was the further parallels in the way the two nations positioned themselves in the national music debates. Although the content of the music debate was different and controversial in both nations, the organ-

ization of the debate and the questions that were raised were the same. A probable reason for this is that both nations developed a new understanding of their music and conceived and measured it in national terms. This national viewpoint did not derive from the authors themselves nor from their musical or esthetic tradition. It was a result of European knowledge transfer, of Western scholarship, and of the Greeks' and Ottomans' self-positioning within the identity discourse, which automatically defined the "self" and the "other(s)." On the one hand, both nations aspired to mime and copy, to adopt and assimilate Western European models in many cultural, economic, and scholarly fields. Both nations sought to belong to the "civilized nations" and to follow the steps of what had been considered to represent progress, enlightenment, and civilization. On the other hand, this assimilation came at a high price. Firstly, it was necessary to give up, to a certain extent, what both nations considered their "own" culture, for it was harshly criticized and rejected by the European intellectuals with an orientalist stance. This triggered reactionary tendencies among the intellectuals of both nations.

As the chapters on the music debates have shown, the most striking similarity in the national debates was the trigger that, in both cases, derived from the orientalist and deprecatory standpoint of leading European musicians, musicologists, and travelers and from their attitude towards "Oriental music." The supporters of traditional music in both nations tended to argue constantly from a defensive position and, hence, in reaction to the claims of persons such as Fallmerayer, Hatherly, and Bourgault-Ducoudray. At the beginning of the twentieth century, both Greek and Turkish musicologists discredited the deprecatory claims of foreign researchers and reinforced the superiority of "Oriental music," highlighting its rich tonal inventory. This complex field of tension, between belonging to European civilization and yet not being forced to give up their "own national elements," remained a controversial topic that lasted throughout the twentieth century.

National identity becomes manifest in a sense of belonging and not belonging to a nation. This tendency of the "self" and "other" could also be observed in the nomenclature that writers often used to differentiate the music of the "self" and of the "other." The increasing influence of Western music in public life impacted the perception of the different music cultures that co-existed. Intellectuals of non-European nations could not speak simply of a "music" in general terms but had to determine a terminology that would differentiate the "self" from the "other." What was for Greeks and Turks their "self" was likewise called "Oriental music" by Western European intellectuals. Turks and Greeks, however, created their own terminology to distinguish the "self" national from the foreign "other." Debates in the Greek language, for example, used terms such as "kath' ēmas mousikē" [our music] or "ethnikē mousikē" [national music] to separate their "own" from Western music. Some Greeks referred to European music as "phrangoi" [Frankish] or "Music of the Franks," which had pejorative connotations.¹⁰³³ Another term that was used in this context was simply "italikē" [Italian] or "evropaikē mousikē" [European music], which insin-

¹⁰³³ Cf. Philopoulos, *Eisagōgē stēn ellēnikē polyphōnikē ekklēsiastikē mousikē*, 68.

uated that Greeks did not always conceive themselves as Europeans. To differentiate their music from other Middle Eastern nations, they also used specific words such as “asiatikē” [Asiatic] or “aravopersikē” [Arabo-Persian], both of which were coined to differentiate the “self” from, for example, Ottoman music.

Similar tendencies could also be observed in the Ottoman debates on music. Although the Ottoman debates used the similar term “frenk” [Frankish] to refer to Western music, they mostly Turkified Italian expressions in the debates using “alaturca” or “alafranga.” By doing so, they distinguished between makâm-based music and Western diatonic, harmonized, and polyphonic music. The terminology that Greek and Turkish reformists likewise used to criticize their respective native music was adopted from the debates of Western intellectuals, and their terminologies shared similarities. Both described their music with attributes such as “monotone,” “backward,” “nasal,” “sick,” “barbaric,” “melancholic,” and “effeminate.” This analysis shows that the idea of the “self” and the “other” were constructed. The terminology that both nations used to refer to Western music and “Oriental music” were similar. However, when they had to refer to the “self” and the neighboring “other,” the terminology had to be refined within the realm of “Oriental music” in order to specify the differences between the musical similarities of the “self” and the “other.” These differences were ignored in the West.

For both Turkey and Greece, Western music was never seen as a potential threat which could challenge the origins of the national music culture. Their “own” music culture was seen as the cradle from which European music had developed. This differed, however, between Greece and Turkey. The similarities in the music theory and system of “Oriental music” initiated a challenge where both nations fought for ownership of the origins of their music. This was mainly achieved by appropriating the music culture and history of the other. The national reading of music history reduced the value of traditional music to its origins. In accordance with the ideology of its time, national music had to be genuinely “Greek” or “Turkish,” respectively, in order to be considered national or representative and worthy of protection. In Greece, Greek Orthodox church music has been seen as the most authoritative music to represent the Byzantine heritage from the medieval period until today. Thus, since the second half of the nineteenth century, this music has been called “Byzantine music”—a term that not only refers to the music that was played in the Byzantine Empire but also suggests that the music of that time is identical to that of today. The Turkish case was less successful in this regard. The cultural revolution in the Turkish Republic showed that the key stakeholders were not moderate conservatives, such as Rauf Yekta, but revolutionary reformists. The Kemalist policies put an end to Ottoman music culture since it was considered to be music of foreign origin and hence non-national. For forty years, a handful of Turkish musicologists opposed this stance and tried to convince the public of the national importance of Ottoman music. Arel’s essay served as one example that aimed to legitimize Ottoman music as genuinely Turkish in order to restore its reputation. Appropriation of the music culture was also key to validating nationalist argumentation to convince the public that Turkish music was not foreign—as had been claimed by the Kemalist thinkers—but of Turkish national origin.

The discussions around Greek and Ottoman music centered around the question of the legitimacy of their respective traditional music. As a reaction to the claims of foreign researchers that cast doubt on cultural continuity, it became vital to “prove” in a scholarly way the music’s national origin, and that it had not been influenced by foreign cultures through the centuries. In some cases, the roots of the national music were located in the pre-Christian age. However, it is a remarkable parallel that both nations located the first vestiges of their national music in the early medieval period. The late nineteenth-century articles and music historiographies put forth the thesis that Greek ecclesiastical music had originated from John of Damascus, who is regarded as the father of Greek Orthodox church music. During the same period, Turkish musicologists such as Rauf Yekta related the origins of Turkish music to names such as al-Fârâbî and other Persian-speaking intellectuals who lived in various places in central Asia and were therefore considered Turks.

Another important “setback” in the national music debate in Turkey concerned the field of musical literacy. Although at first sight, this topic seems to be irrelevant, a closer look and comparison reveals that it had turned out to be an obstacle in the Turkish case. The lack of a “national” Turkish music notation complicated the ability to bring forth arguments for Turkish cultural continuity. Whereas the Orthodox Greeks could look back at a musical heritage that had been handed down in a variety of neume notations, Ottoman music remained a musical culture that, until the middle of the nineteenth century, had been transmitting the music mainly orally. The Ottoman Greeks and Armenians reformed their notation in the light of the nineteenth-century Enlightenment movement and disseminated it among their communities. In the Ottoman case, there were only a few examples where an alphabet notation was used, such as in music treatises that had the purpose of exemplifying music theory. Besides the fact that many of these treatises were attributed to Persian or Arabic authors, the alphabet notation was never intended as a medium to conserve or perform a corpus of music. Furthermore, Ottoman musicians in nineteenth-century Istanbul started using staff notation. The (Armenian) Hampartsum notation had no national significance in Yekta’s eyes. His attempts to revive an old alphabet notation did not bear fruit. In the twentieth century, staff notation, with its extended repertoire of accidentals, became the only accepted way to notate down Ottoman music. Yekta’s understanding of musical notation as an element of national culture derived from a national reading of music history. It is likely that progress and modernity in the field of music during the Tanzimat era were probably also linked to musical notation. The abolition of the Janissary band and the beginning of a European-style military band, as well as the introduction of staff notation, were considered new and modern achievements. Additionally, the early Ottoman printed music sources that were not in Chrysanthine notation were in staff notation. Ottoman popular and secular music being printed in staff notation might have been a sign of progress that also made the national music accessible to an international audience. It is therefore possible to conclude that the idea of an “Ottoman national notation” is quite a late phenomenon, especially because Ottoman musicians for a long time rejected the idea of using any notation and insisted on passing on their reper-

toire via oral transmission. Whereas this impressive and relatively stable means of musical transmission had endured throughout the centuries via oral culture, in the fin-de-siècle the lack of musical notation, which had been alien to Ottoman music, caused Yekta great dismay.

This study has also observed some interesting parallels and differences in regard to patriotic songs. One important parallel that stood out in the comparative perspective was the subject matter of the songs. The patriotic songs of both nations drew on the same elements to reinforce national sentiment. These songs can be roughly subcategorized into songs that praise the nation and its virtues (“Love for the Homeland”) and soldiers’ songs (e.g. “National March” by İhsân Hanım), with both subcategories being made to incite strong feelings of national sentiment. Creating the “other” and demonizing it was an efficient way to draw a clear line between the “self” and the “other.” The image presented of the “self” was in line with national virtues that were the same in both cases, such as loyalty to the emperor, manhood, martyrdom, love for the nation, revenge, justice, and trust in God. Additionally, farewell songs that dealt with the separation of the soldier to fight at the front were also presented in both “The Young Soldier” and “Ey gâzîler.” Another interesting element was the oath, which was especially and extensively used in the Greek case. Christianity was an important driving force in the Greek national narrative, therefore the “oath on the cross” highlighted the Christian virtues of the God-given national mission. In the Ottoman case, the “oath” in patriotic songs usually did not have any religious connotations.¹⁰³⁴ Other important key words in the context of Greek patriotic songs were “slavery” and “freedom” from “tyranny,” which in the Ottoman-Turkish context are absent. The above-mentioned topics are also evident in the patriotic songs that emerged in the context of the revolution in Germany and France. Such topics as the noble brigands that found their Greek equivalent in the figure of the Klepht, or the righteous battle against tyrannical rule, were borrowed from the literature of European revolutions. This study pointed to the cultural entanglements of Greek poets who had spent time abroad in Germany or collaborated with Bavarian musicians in Nafplio and Athens. In Europe, the battle songs belonged to the standard repertoire of patriotic songs and it is likely that Greek and Ottoman lyricists likewise borrowed—intentionally or unintentionally—elements and other features from the European “revolutionary literature,” adapting them to the respective socio-cultural context.

Not only features of the “revolutionary literature” but also features of the music were transferred from European to the respective Greek and Turkish contexts. Whereas in the Greek case the principles were adopted one-to-one in the 1870s, in the twentieth century, both nations tended to translate the methodological principles into the native, popular musical language. In musical terms, these principles were, for example, simplicity of the melody as well as symmetries that not only shaped the song’s structure but also created the symmetrical relationship between melody and lyrics. Most of the songs had rhyme

¹⁰³⁴ See, for example, “Ordumuz etti yemin” [Our Army Took an Oath] with lyrics by Mehmed Celaleddin in İkbâl Kütüphanesi sâhibi Hüseyin, *Vatan ve hürriyet şarkısı*, 37.

schemes and meter, which further facilitated memorizing the songs. Another noteworthy point was the use of popular music elements in the rhythmic disposition of the piece as well as in tonality. Except for the “Emperor’s March,” the Ottoman school songs showed features typical of popular music. They had makâm-based melodies and were composed on the simple and popular rhythmic pattern of the usûl düyek. These popular features, with which Ottoman children were familiar, facilitated access and, hence, made the songs easier to learn.

In this context, it is necessary to refer to the Boy Scout associations that were established and used in both nations for nationalist aspirations during the same years, from 1909–1920. The numerous military confrontations that Greece and the Ottoman Empire engaged in with different nations led to a governmental crisis. During the governance of the Young Turks on the east side of the Aegean and Venizelos on the west side of the Aegean, the societies underwent a process of militarization. This process was further reinforced by the irredentist ideology of the Greeks and Turks which inevitably led to even more military conflicts. Hence, children—among them many orphans—were trained in a soldierly manner in Boy Scout associations that prepared them for the front. The Turkish “Boy Scout’s March” reinforced hatred for and revenge against the “other” and accentuated martyrdom for the sake of the nation. The march used group dynamics which additionally reinforced the national group identity of the “small soldiers.” Feelings of revenge and glorification of war in the light of the “Great Idea” could also be observed in the lyrics of Greek school songs. The lyrics of the Greek “Boy Scouts’ March” gave revealing insights into the nationalist values that children were exposed to. To grasp the Greek Boy Scout songs and activities in more detail, a thorough musical analysis of the march “Be Prepared!” is still pending. Greek and Ottoman children during this period were not only victims of a militarized ideology that was ready to sacrifice the nation’s offspring; they were turned into agents that were directly or indirectly involved in total war.

The power of music was also used to accompany and reinforce the evocative functions of commemorative ceremonies. Unlike immobile monuments that were raised to commemorate specific persons or events, music was able to spread and recall a predefined historical context even if performed in a distant place. The “Gallipoli Song,” which starts with a leap of a seventh and has the ambitus of a ninth within the first two measures, is certainly not a melodic line that can be found easily—if at all—in European folk songs. In the Turkish context, however, although the folk song gained importance only in the early 1920s, in the 1950s it had already become a symbol of the Gallipoli Memorial. Although the “Gallipoli Song” had probably started as a folk song, it became an element of a memorial culture into which it was purposely inserted. It was an artifact that supported the Turkish narrative about the Gallipoli Campaign. The commemorative ceremony has ritualized a specific, determined narrative that has been accepted in the collective remembering. The “Gallipoli Song” is treated as a “survivor” of the campaign, an event so unique and horrible that the entire nation dedicated a commemorative site to it. This gave the “Gallipoli Song” a special position within the corpus of Turkish folk songs. The song was, in a way, appropriated and recontextualized as a part of the Turkish Gallipoli narrative. This case study

showed that the remembered past in the context of Gallipoli had been not just one but multiple narratives of the same story. Since the process of change is inherent in the folk song and the popular song, it was not surprising to find the melody of the “Gallipoli Song” in other neighboring nations. This example showed that if the song’s melody is popular and accepted by the audience, no national borders can stop it from being passed on. Hence, the numerous recordings of the same melody in Greek and Ottoman-Greek recordings proved that the “Gallipoli Song” was not the sole survivor from the days of World War I and that many other versions existed in other musical contexts. The idea that the “Gallipoli Song” was a “national song” assumed that it drew on a national topic. The same could also be proven in the case of the “Sevastopol Song.” The sources showed that the song was known in various Ottoman communities, starting with the Ottoman-Greek, Ottoman-Armenian, and also Ottoman-Turkish communities. In Keiveleş’ song anthology, it had started as a comparatively innocent song. The fact that it later became a national song is due to the fact that it was revived and recontextualized every time the Ottoman state was in danger of going to war with Russia. The comparison of the different primary sources has shown how the song’s content was gradually modified and loaded with nationalist content to such an extent that the earliest version seemed alien compared to the later ones. The career of the “Sevastopol Song” is paradigmatic of how songs with apparently national content are contextualized and recontextualized according to the contemporary dominating ideology. This also explains why the song changed genres from “şarkı” [common secular vocal song] to “marş” [march] and, similar to the “Gallipoli Song,” eventually became a “türkü” [Turkish folk song] in the era of the Turkish Republic. Even if it started as a song of a hopeless war, the later versions of the song are full of nationalistic hubris. The song’s metamorphosis was not a natural process but a result of intentional modifications that resulted from times of war.

Since this study has concentrated on music and national identity “only” in Greece and Ottoman Turkey, it would be relevant to know how other Balkan nations with similar musical traditions dealt with this issue. In fact, Greece had a privileged position in Europe because entire philhellene movements supported the idea of Greece and Greek independence. The same did not apply, for example, to other Balkan nations such as Serbia or Bulgaria. How were the national music of other Balkan nations defined compared with other bordering nations? How did they react to the approaches of Western intellectuals, and how did they justify and legitimize their native music as being genuinely national in comparison to other Balkan nations? On what milestones was the national narrative based, and how was music contextualized in relation to the Ottoman or Greek musical heritage? How did they position themselves in the debate on “Oriental music”? How did they construct the narrative to present their music as genuinely national and as different from the neighboring “others”?

This research has studied national tendencies in Greek and Turkish school song anthologies up to the outbreak of World War I. The twentieth century had, and the twenty-first century will have, their own ideological currents as well as esthetical and pedagogical tendencies. It is very likely that, in one way or the other, these changes in the notions

of national identity will also be reflected and expressed in music. National identities are not unchangeable as they suggest; they are in a continuous process of “re-identification” and adaption to global ideas and events. In the future, will national music also perpetuate forming imagined (national) communities, or will it develop notions that will emerge due to contact with more global processes and movements?