



Fine Art, Fine Music: Controlling Turkish Taste at the Fine Arts Academy in 1926

Author(s): John Morgan O'Connell

Source: *Yearbook for Traditional Music*, Vol. 32 (2000), pp. 117-142

Published by: International Council for Traditional Music

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3185245>

Accessed: 27-09-2017 18:34 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

International Council for Traditional Music is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Yearbook for Traditional Music*

FINE ART, FINE MUSIC: CONTROLLING TURKISH TASTE AT THE FINE ARTS ACADEMY IN 1926.¹

by John Morgan O'Connell

Music education in Turkey was the subject of intense public debate during the 1920's. After the demise of the Ottoman Empire and the subsequent foundation of the Turkish Republic in 1923, some music educators altered the established music curriculum to suit the political sensibilities of the new republican élite: an élite that viewed Ottoman music (*alaturka*) as the symbolic capital of a benighted imperial past, considered western music (*alafranga*) as the appropriate musical expression of a modern nation state, and sought, accordingly, to revolutionize Turkish musical instruction within the context of a Fine Arts Academy. While *alaturka* was not completely expunged from the canonic realm, it was classicized and classified to suit the modernist predilections of republican orthodoxy. In this paper, I will examine the debate that surrounded the establishment of a new musical institution in İstanbul. I will show how different conceptions of musical instruction disclosed competing cultural perspectives which had existed in the nineteenth century but which were now expressed within the unifying parameters of republican discourse. Further, I will demonstrate the ways in which this discourse was manipulated by contemporary commentators to validate individual aesthetic preferences and to denigrate aberrant musical practices with taxonomic rigor. In short, I contend that the polemics surrounding the establishment of a Fine Arts Academy reveal the discursive character of taste and the economic constitution of fine music.²

¹ This paper was presented at the International Council for Traditional Music conference, Hiroshima, Japan in August, 1999. Research in İstanbul was supported by grants from the Turkish Government, the German Government (DAAD), by UCLA (Chancellor's Dissertation Fellowship), and Otago University (Otago University Research Grant). I would like to thank Meral Selçuk, Timur Selçuk, Fahire Fersan, Alâeddin Yavaşca, Murad Bardakçı, Cem Behar, Ali Jihad Racy, Dwight Reynolds, Susan McClary, Timothy Rice, Robert Walser and my teachers and colleagues in İstanbul for their knowledge, comments and support.

² The Turkish language has undergone a profound transformation since 1923: a transformation that has seen the language adopt a Latin (rather than an Arabic) alphabet and that has posed some problems of consistency in academic sources. For the purposes of transliteration, I have followed Shaw's example (1977, II: ix) by using the modern standard Turkish spelling system for most technical terms and place names. Where relevant, these spellings can be found in the New Redhouse Turkish-English Dictionary (1974). I have used Öztuna (1990) as a source reference for the names of Turkish artists, Turkish terminology and Turkish institutions where appropriate. Since there is a significant problem concerning the representation of Turkish names and dates during the twentieth century, I have adopted the current convention of supplying Turkish second names where relevant and of rendering Ottoman dates into their European equivalent for all events and citations.

The Discursive Character of Turkish Taste

The foundation of the Fine Arts Academy (*Güzel Sanatlar Akademisi*) in 1926 was a decisive moment in Turkish music history. Consistent with the ethos of modernizing reforms that attended the foundation of the Turkish Republic, the new Academy was modeled upon a western precedent (the music *conservatoire*) and replaced the *Darü'l-ellian* – an older institution which symbolized (for some) the cultural values associated with an outmoded Ottoman past. In this respect, the widely publicized debate surrounding the establishment of the Academy is extremely instructive. That is, the new institution provided a neutral space beyond the critical glare of editorial sanction for articulating cultural difference during an important period of political change. While the character of this difference was multiple (representing distinctive religious, social and political interests), the nature of the associated discourse was more simplistically divided between exponents of republican orthodoxy on the one hand and of Ottoman heterodoxy on the other. In this way the Fine Arts Academy not only provided a focus for defining and debating Turkish aesthetic preference according to the dualistic strictures of discursive practice but it also enabled individual commentators to validate distinctive cultural positions by co-opting the formalized language of a dominant republican perspective. Through their manipulation of the discursive realm, supporters of the new Academy were able change and control Turkish taste by promoting *alafranga* in the new music curriculum and by discriminating against *alaturka* both institutionally and economically.

In truth, the discourse about taste at the Fine Arts Academy has a well-established pedigree: a pedigree which is connected to the gradual appropriation of western cultural practices throughout the Ottoman Empire during the nineteenth century and which is intimately associated with the social upheavals that attended the demise of Ottoman political influence throughout the Eastern Mediterranean. This instability, which was accompanied by almost a century of intermittent reforms (known as the *Tanzimat* Period: 1839-1909), was characterized by the transformation of outmoded Ottoman institutions following European models. These westernizing reforms, in turn, had a profound influence upon the political and cultural fabric of the Ottoman Empire. In the former instance, the widespread adoption of European political ideals precipitated two attempts at constitutional reform and eventually paved the way for the dramatic events of the 1920's when the Ottoman Empire eventually collapsed and when Turkey itself became a Republic under the leadership of its founder, Mustafa Kemal (later titled, Atatürk, 1889-1938). In the latter instance, European aesthetic preferences (*alafranga*) competed with (and in some instances replaced) native urban sensibilities (*alaturka*) in a wide range of cultural practices. These practices were defined according to an ancient discourse concerning Turkish taste in Europe and included sartorial preferences, eating habits, temporal designations and, in particular, musical tastes.³

³ Following the dissolution of the Janissaries (Yeniçeri) in 1826, Sultan Mahmud II

In Turkey, musical taste was the focus of particular attention. Although the seeds of this interest can properly be traced to a European fascination with Turkish cultural practices during the eighteenth century and while the fruits of this interest can be found in the compositional works and the academic writings of contemporary composers and musicologists respectively, the nature of this interest was reconfigured to suit a Turkish rather than a European audience. That is, *alaturka* (Eng. 'Turkish style') was defined in its opposition to *alafranga* (Eng. 'foreign style'). While these categories referred to distinctive modes of dress (eastern vs. western), eating habits (native vs. foreign), personal hygiene (*hamam* vs. bathroom), and temporal conceptions (Islamic vs. Christian), they were also used to denote cultural distinctions in Turkish musical discourse. In contrast to a European preoccupation with unusual musical sounds and exotic performance spectacles, Turkish commentators appropriated this orientalist perspective to articulate musical difference. In other words, *alaturka* and *alafranga* were employed to define and distinguish between a wide range of entertainment contexts, including those involving music-making, theatrical events, concert presentations, wrestling matches, as well as radio departments and conservatory sections. The terms were also used to classify performers, choirs, instruments, ensembles, record labels and performance styles. As in other parts of the Eastern Mediterranean, stylistic discourse was bifurcated into opposing aesthetic categories so that *alafranga* became synonymous with the modernist interests of an emergent bourgeois élite while *alaturka* represented the symbolic capital of a outmoded Ottoman past: a past which was no longer consistent with the westernizing interests and the modernist aspirations of the newly-established Turkish Republic.⁴

(reign: 1808-39) instituted a number of westernizing reforms in an effort to modernize Ottoman administration. These reforms embraced military (including the foundation of a western-style military band to replace the Janissary ensemble - Mehter), educational (including the creation of an Imperial School of Music - Muzıkay-i Hümayûn Mektebi in 1834), and bureaucratic institutions. Further, his revolutionary achievements nurtured a preoccupation with reform during the nineteenth century: a preoccupation which not only precipitated a change in Ottoman government, taxation, justice, infrastructure and economy according to European principles but a preoccupation which also culminated in two unsuccessful constitutional movements (1876 and 1908) under the liberalizing influence of the Young Ottomans and the Young Turks respectively. In this respect, the reforms introduced by Atatürk after 1923 represented a reformulation – rather than a total reformation – of legislation passed during the previous century. See Shaw (1977) for a comprehensive historical survey of the Tanzimat and Republican periods. See Davison (1990) for an interesting interpretation of Ottoman precedents for republican reforms.

⁴ *Alaturka* is the Turkish spelling of a European term *alla turca* ('in a Turkish style'): a term that was probably coined by the Italians during the seventeenth century with reference to the military music of the Janissary Band. After the defeat of the Ottoman armies at the gates of Vienna (1683) and the subsequent decline of Ottoman political influence in Europe during the eighteenth century, Turkish cultural practices (including Turkish coffee houses, Turkish candies, and Turkish musical instruments) were imitated and popularized. In particular, Turkish military music appeared – albeit in a modified form – in a large number of western compositions (including those by

Indeed, this division of aesthetic preference into distinctive *alaturka* and *alafranga* categories was itself prescribed by a major musical event—the creation of an Imperial Band (*Muzıkay-i Hümayyûn*) in 1827 to replace the traditional Janissary ensemble (*Mehterhane*). While Guiseppe Donizetti (1788-1856) and his successor, Guatelli Paşa (d. 1899), were brought to Turkey to fulfil the western musical needs of this organization, their method and medium of instruction—namely *solfege* and notation, respectively—were soon adopted by *alaturka* musicians. Due to the gradual demise of courtly patronage for *alaturka*, Turkish musicians either adapted western musical techniques to their advantage by transcribing the repertoire of *alaturka* (as in the case of Necib Paşa, 1815-83), by incorporating western instructional methods (as in the case of Haşım Bey, 1815-68), and by harmonizing Turkish melodies to suit the popular demands of contemporary taste (as in the case of Notacı Hacı Emin Efendi, 1845-1907). Or, they retreated to the Mevlevi houses (*Mevlevihaneler*), where an historic system of musical education (*meşk*) was continued.⁵ Yet

Brossard, Lully, Glück, Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven). Turkish historical and cultural themes provided the main subject matter for operas (such as Mozart's *Die Entführung aus dem Serail*), ballets (such as Lully's *Opéra-Ballet*), and masked balls. Turkish music received special attention in the writings of early musicologists and travel writers—including Donado (1688), Toderini (1789), La Borde (1780) and Fonton (1751)—because of its close affinity with Ancient Greek theory and because of its perceived exotic character. In addition, Turkish instruments (for example, the addition of the Janissary kettle drum (*kös*) to contemporary ensembles) and Turkish instrumental effects (for example, the creation of a Janissary stop on harpsichords and later on fortepianos) underscored this contemporary fascination with Turkish style. See Farmer (1936), Sanal (1964), Meyer (1974), Obelkevich (1977), and Signell (1988) for a fuller discussion of 'Turquerie' and for an examination of its relevance to western art composition during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. See Racy (1982, 1983) for an equivalent discussion of Arab aesthetic discourse in Cairo during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. See also Safa (1933), Uşşakizâde (1932), Nişbay (1942), Karabey (1965), Behar (1987a), Tanrıkorur (1989), Erguner (1990) as well as a multitude of contemporary references in Turkish newspapers and journals (1923-38) for an emic exposition of the *alaturka-alafranga* debate.

⁵ *Meşk* (lit. "lesson" or "model") was a system of instruction uniquely suited to the oral transmission of Turkish music. In contrast to the written method and the melodic focus of conservatory study, *meşk* concentrated upon the poetic basis of the Turkish vocal repertoire and organized the training process accordingly. Students sat in a circle on the floor with their teacher and memorized text (*güfte*), rhythmic cycles (*usûller*), modes (*makamlar*), interpretation (*yorum*) and performance (*icra*) in one instructional operation. The lesson was divided into discrete poetic units which were themselves subdivided into literary and rhythmic components: a framework that served to structure the learning experience, to collapse all textual, musical, and stylistic criteria into one palatable whole, and above all to aid memorization. In this respect, to beat the *usûl* (*usûl vurmak*) was critical. That is, vocal repertoire was learned by rote from a teacher, replicated exactly, and memorized orally with the aid of *usûl*. This method, called *dizi dövmek* (lit. "to beat a line"), served not only to transmit vocal repertoire from teacher to pupil within a graded instructional framework (structured according to prescribed levels of rhythmic complexity) but also to preserve Turkish vocal compositions for subsequent generations. While the system was ideally suited to the transmission of vocal repertoire, instrumental compositions were harder to preserve—especially where

even in these traditionally conservative locations, European standards of musicological research were employed by a number of Mevlevi affiliates who were specifically interested in preserving a canonic version of the classical repertoire and who were extremely influential in the development of music education in Turkey.⁶ Although a number of music schools were founded during the early twentieth century to satisfy the continuing demand for *alaturka*, these Mevlevi members were principally involved in the foundation of the first conservatory of music in Turkey (*Darül'elhan*). This institution, which loosely imitated a European precedent, emphasized musical literacy over oral transmission and encouraged (for the first time) both sexes to participate in musical instruction and musical performance.⁷

no form of musical notation was used (Behar 1993: 22-26).

⁶ During the nineteenth century traditional music scholarship blended with western musicology to form a unified, modernist, and altered approach to Turkish modal theory. In this respect, a number of Mevlevi dervishes played a critical role. These dervishes included Celâleddin Efendi (1848-1907), Atâullah Dede (1842-1910), and Hüseyin Fahreddin Dede (1854-1911): dervishes who were the respective heads of the Mevlevi houses at Yenikapı, Galata, and Bahariye in İstanbul. In contrast to the conservative and insular artistic interests of Sufi orders before 1826, these Sufi masters encouraged Mevlevi affiliates to appropriate contemporary methods of musicological research: methods which resulted in the adaptation of Helmholtz's acoustic principles to Turkish music theory and which enabled the exact measurement of Turkish musical intervals using sonometeric techniques (especially by Atâullah Dede after 1895). In addition, these dervishes fostered a renaissance in musical composition (especially in religious genres). They encouraged the publication of authoritative song text collections (*güfte mecmuaları*), they compiled musical anthologies, and they sponsored academic research into musical theory, music history, and music terminology. They also fostered an eclectic intellectual environment: an environment that was nourished by the philosophical, literary and academic achievements of both eastern and western traditions. Many founding members of the *Darül'elhan* were educated in this rich artistic environment (İnal 1955; 1958).

⁷ The creation of the *Darül'elhan* was a momentous event in the history of Turkish music. Founded in 1912 (as the *Darülbey-i Osmanî*), renamed in 1916 (as the *Darül'elhan*), closed in 1918, and reopened in 1923, the *Darül'elhan* was the first public institution to offer a comprehensive system of instruction in Turkish music: a system which loosely imitated a European precedent and which emphasized musical literacy over oral transmission. In its regulations concerning musical education (published in 1918), the Ministry of Education stressed the importance of learning solfège (article 2), the significance of musical transcription (article 5), and the central role of musical notation: "... it is necessary to look at the musical score while learning a piece" (quoted in Özalp 1986, I: 84). Employing many of the most important instrumentalists (including Refik Fersan, 1893-1965), vocalists (including Bestenigar Hoca Ziya Bey, 1877-1923), theorists (Rauf Yekta Bey, 1871-1935), and traditors (Zekaiâde Ahmed Efendi, 1869-1943) of the Turkish tradition, the curriculum of instruction included lessons in musical theory, notation, and solfège as well as practical classes in religious genres, instrumental performance, and voice. The institution also organized regular concerts, sponsored the publication of a journal (*Darül'elhan Mecmuası*), and promoted the notation of Turkish music in an authoritative musical series (the *Darül'elhan Külliyyatı*).

Defining Turkish Taste

Generally speaking, the insemination of European ideas during the *Tanzimat* Period served to define Turkish aesthetic preference according to distinctive *alaturka* and *alafranga* classes and, in doing so, bifurcated Turkish musical discourse along the lines of taste. While it is not completely correct to provide a sociological interpretation of aesthetic preference here, the belated percolation of European philosophical writings to Turkey during the early twentieth century made such an analysis possible and even appealing to Turkish intellectual circles.⁸ In this respect, Turkish commentators tended to stereotype artistic sensibility according to its appropriate social category and historical epoch so that, during the 1920's, *alaturka* and *alafranga* were indelibly confined to their respective Ottoman and republican stages. This critical perspective is especially apparent in the writings of Ziya Gökalp (1876-1924), a Turkish sociologist who interpolated the sociological principles of Durkheim (1859-1917) and the philosophical writings of Auguste Comte (1798-1857) in the context of Turkish music history. In his most important publication, *The Principles of Turkism (Türkçülüğün Esasları)*, Gökalp argued that eastern music (*Şark Musikisi*) belonged to the religious or imperial stage of 'civilization' (*medeniyet*) and that it had not progressed to the 'culture' (*hars*) or national category exemplified by folk music, carpet weaving, calligraphy, and (surprisingly) architecture. Although Gökalp elevated Turkish folk music to the most evolved historical phase, others—including Peyami Safa (1899-1961)

⁸ A sociological and class-based interpretation of Turkish culture during the early Republican era (1923-38) is problematic. While large Turkish cities witnessed the growth of a bourgeois class during the nineteenth century, this expansion was chiefly confined to the non-Muslim community: a community which was organized into religious (*millet*) rather than economic classes and which was protected by non-Turkish rather than Turkish interests. The economic activities of the new bourgeoisie reflected these unique historical circumstances. Although the *Tanzimat* era saw the expansion of native industries in line with the westernizing reforms of the period, the economic conditions necessary for full industrialization were not achieved: conditions which would have allowed for the development of a distinctive class structure characteristic of capitalist economies. That is, where members of the *millet* class were involved in foreign trade and where they were able to accumulate capital from their business activities, they were unable to reinvest their earnings at home. This resulted in the net outflow of capital from Turkey to the detriment of further economic growth (see Shaw 1977, II: 122-3). Following Gökalp's lead, the new republican élite advocated a musical style that was characterized by aesthetic necessities and social reality. Perhaps Stokes (1992: 38) is correct when he connects this contemporary concern for social realism with Hindemith's *Gebrauchsmusik* movement (see Fn. 12, below). I feel, however, that the orthodox interest in aesthetic necessity was part of an earlier cultural concern: a concern which sought to stereotype the aesthetic sensibilities of the Ottoman era as escapist and to forge a new musical aesthetic appropriate to the social realities of the Republic. See Feld (1993), Hebdige (1979), Keil (1994), Lomax (1968), McClary (1991) and Walser (1993) for critical interpretations of aesthetic preference in music studies. See During (1987, 1994), al-Fārūqī and al-Fārūqī (1986), Greve (1995), O'Connell (1996), Poché (1994), Racy (1982, 1983) and Shiloah (1993, 1994) for ethnomusicological analyses of taste in the musical traditions of the Eastern Mediterranean.

and Adnan Saygun (1907-1990) – viewed western music in similar evolutionary terms. While Gökalp's conception of a national music can properly be attributed to Necip Asım Bey (see Akçura 1981: 91-2; Behar 1987a: 95 and Aksoy 1989: 2) and while his musical principles were readily available in a number of earlier publications (see Gökalp 1959), the auspicious date of the book's publication (in 1923) and the widespread recognition of its importance ensured that Gökalp's musical theories had a large contemporary readership. Simply put, Gökalp provided the necessary sociological framework for distilling Turkish music history into Ottoman and republican epochs, for bifurcating Turkish musical discourse into eastern (*alaturka*) and western (*alafranga*) categories, and for separating musical practices into old and modern types.

In particular, Gökalp articulated a contemporary concern for revolutionary musical change by defining a new or national style (*millî mûsîkî*) and by reforming deviant practices according to western technical and musicological principles. As a result, his book provoked an acrimonious debate concerning the correct constitution of this national style, polarizing pro-western (*alafranga*) and pro-eastern (*alaturka*) into opposing perspectives and legitimizing aesthetic preference according to the nationalist ideals of *Kemalizm* (after 1931). To explain this process, I find Bourdieu's (1977) analysis of discursive practice especially instructive: an analysis which views discourse as a confined nucleus of orthodox and heterodox perspectives unified in their relationship to a dominant ideological order. Adapting Bourdieu's perspective to the Turkish context, I argue that a republican and nationalist concern for Turkish musical purity had to be addressed by all groups participating in the discursive process. His concept of *doxa* is especially relevant. That is, he defines the doxaic realm as a self-evident natural order that exists as a closed system where conflicting orthodox and heterodox views reside as discourse. He argues that the dominant and orthodox classes want to retain the 'innocence' of the *doxa* (a systematized perception of the dominant order) while the dominated and heterodox classes want to expand the limits of discourse and, by doing so, reveal the arbitrary basis upon which orthodoxy is built. In Bourdieu's view (p. 188), ideology serves to maintain underlying institutional mechanisms because it tacitly accepts the established system of formalized language. In this sense, the unitary character of discourse (polarized into competing but related ideological perspectives) is perpetuated by the institutional structures of a dominant élite.

Turkish music can be interpreted within this frame. The orthodox view reified Turkish folk music (*Türk Halk Müziği*) as the truly national aesthetic and denigrated the classical tradition as "not our music" and as music unfit for the aesthetic needs of Turkish youth. Turkish musicologists, using musical and linguistic comparative techniques, endorsed the ideals of *Kemalizm* by linking Turkish instruments, musical forms, and terminology to Central Asian prototypes. The classical tradition was defined by default, as it could not conform to the ideals of ethnic purity enshrined within the rural tradition. The heterodox perspective, also, defended its position according to the logic of comparative techniques. For instance Arel (1988), inspired by the Sun Lan-

guage Theory (*Güneş-Dil Teorisi*) formulated under the auspices of the Turkish Linguistic Society (initially called, *Türk Dili Tetkik Cemiyeti*), argued that the orthodox perception of *alaturka* as Byzantine in origin disguised the logical progression of cultural history from a Turkish hearth. According to him, Turkish classical music and Turkish folk music belonged to the same evolutionary trajectory, both originating in Central Asia and demonstrating impeccable Turkish credentials. Since all world musics (including western art music) diffused originally from this source, Arel not only attempted to reclaim the national status of Turkish classical music but, in doing so, he also attempted to demonstrate the highly evolved status of all Turkish musics. Interpreted from Bourdieu's perspective, Arel's argument is constructed within the realm of a dominant republican discourse since it concerned the appropriate constitution of Turkish culture, utilized the evolutionary methods of Cultural Darwinism and served to maintain the hegemonic status of republican order. While Arel attempts to expand the domain of discourse by emphasizing the ethnic ancestry of Turkish classical music, he employs the formalized language of the established system and, by extension, reinforces the underlying institutional mechanisms of republican control.

It could be argued that an interpretation of taste is more properly equated with Bourdieu's concept of *habitus*: a system of unspoken but encoded practices that exist outside the domain of verbalized discourse. However, I suggest that the parameters of Turkish taste had to be defined, debated, changed and controlled by the modernist interests of a dominant republican position precisely because of its elusive character and because of its all-encompassing cultural significance.⁹ In this respect, I am drawn to a theoretical precedent set by Foucault, who, like Bourdieu, connects discourse with economic modes of production operating at the base of culture. In his *Histoire de la sexualité* (1976), he argues that sexual behavior (which had traditionally existed beyond the realm of discursive interest) was codified during the sev-

⁹ Bourdieu (1977) coined the term *habitus* to describe an unspoken but pervasive behavioural mechanism which is constituted diachronically (as a history of strategic practices) and which predisposes individual action to a set of practical outcomes (or strategies) in response to social constraints. Put another way, individual action is the result of strategies which are put into practice in context and which arise out of an inherited but unstated disposition (*habitus*). Bourdieu further implies that the imposition of terminology upon the unspoken *habitus* not only does violence to the complex interactions of that system but also defines another and alternative system: a self-referential entity that 'accumulates' symbolic capital unto itself. The cyclical interactions of 'the natural way' (*habitus*)—characterized by the redistribution of symbolic capital—are replaced by linear modes of inquiry: modes which accumulate intellectual credit and which serve thereby the self-interest of the practitioner 'with ethical impeccability'. Of course, Bourdieu's (1984) critique of aesthetic preference outlined in *Distinction* is also relevant. Here, Bourdieu provides a Marxist critique of taste—viewing lifestyles as a matter of class relations and economic production. However, his analysis is based upon field-work conducted in France: an analysis that is more appropriate to a modern capitalist state than to an emergent industrial economy. In this respect, his examination of class taste is problematic in the Turkish context. See Signell (1981) for an interpretation of Turkish classical music as a class symbol.

enteenth century in response to the demographic imperatives of nascent capitalist production. Unlike Bourdieu, he contends that sexual behavior was defined, categorized, and medicalized by contemporary observers precisely because it posed such a profound but unspoken threat to the dominant capitalist order. Further, this codification of sexuality both legitimated certain practices in the eyes of orthodoxy and labeled others as aberrant. That is, sexual activities which did not conform to the moral purview of an ascendant group were contained and neutralized within the act of their own definition. Put simply, the taxonomic demarcation of sexuality during the modern period operated as a discursive practice (Foucault, 1969): that is, a circular play with prescriptions which was characterized by its own set of exclusions and which was controlled by a dominant élite eager to maintain its hold over political power and economic resources.

The debate surrounding Turkish taste can be interpreted from this perspective. While Foucault's economic interpretation of discourse is not fully applicable here and while his disregard for individual agency is problematic, his treatment of discursive practice, his analysis of modernist strategies and his explanation of political control are particularly relevant in the Turkish context. In this respect, the republican attitude towards aesthetic preference is consistent with Foucault's position. On the one hand, the exponents of this perspective viewed the multicultural and conservative characteristics of *alaturka* as the chaotic legacy of an imperial past. On the other hand, they equated *alafiranga* with the reforming ideals of the new republic. That is, they saw *alafiranga* as a unique manifestation of a precisely demarcated nation state: a state that was characterized by a single ethnic composition, by a new secular status, and by a contemporary outlook. As a fashionable expression of modernist taste, these exponents of *alafiranga* sought to control the perceived disorder of their Ottoman inheritance using the logic of western philosophical thought and the language of western aesthetic discourse. In doing so, they entered into a long-standing European debate on taste by defining *alafiranga* as tasteful (*tatlı*) and by excluding deviant practices from the orthodox realm with taxonomic efficiency. Further, their codification of taste according to a western tradition of aesthetic judgement served to validate their own position with moral rectitude and to provide a lexical edge in their whole scale denigration of *alaturka*. In short, republican critics were able to neutralize their perception of Ottoman disorder by co-opting the logic of modernism and the language of aesthetics and by re-ordering *alaturka* as a heterodox expression of a republican discourse.

In musical terms, the process is especially apparent. Turkish classical music (*Türk Klasik Musikisi* also spelt *Türk Klasik Musikisi*), in contrast to western art music and its variants, was relegated to the *alaturka* camp. Exponents of the *alafiranga* perspective sought to marginalize this ancient tradition by bifurcating musical discourse into opposing orthodox and heterodox positions and by codifying musical practices accordingly. In this respect, they classified the Turkish and Western classical traditions into contrasting musical categories by emphasizing their distinctive melodic conceptions (monophonic vs. polyphonic), their different musical textures (heterophonic vs.

homophonic), and their divergent compositional techniques (improvisatory vs. composed). In doing so, they attempted to contain the seemingly elusive character of Ottoman practice within the straitjacket of republican discourse. This discourse served to re-order Turkish classical music according to the precepts of a western musical paradigm and to frame aberrant practices for further scrutiny. As part of the same process, they sought to provide a visible manifestation of sonic chaos. That is, they highlighted the disorganized manner of *alaturka* performance and the disheveled appearance of *alaturka* performers as tangible expressions of Ottoman dissolution. Further, they portrayed the lifestyle of *alaturka* practitioners—cultivated within the nocturnal confines of drinking houses (*Meyhaneler*)—as a degenerate concoction of alcoholic excess and sexual promiscuity and equated it with the debauched characteristics and multicultural provenance of *alaturka*. Simply put, they viewed *alaturka*—including Turkish classical music—as the benighted product of Ottoman disorder. It was a pervasive domain of unspoken meanings that had to be defined, classified, and rigorously scrutinized for the sake of republican order and control.¹⁰

Debating Turkish Taste

Turkish music education symbolized these concerns. Viewing musical transmission as an essential element in the formulation of musical taste, republican commentators attempted to expand the domain of discourse by including distinctive methods of musical instruction in their critical examination of aesthetic preference. In this respect, they tended to equate the teaching of Turkish classical music—especially as it was taught within traditional educational contexts (*Meşkhaneler*)—with a larger heterodox position which represented the symbolic capital of an unfashionable Ottoman past and which deviated significantly from the westernizing ideals underpinning republican musical taste. In order to bifurcate musical instruction into opposing perspectives within the domain of discourse and to stress the heterodox position of *alaturka* in that context, they emphasized the oral (rather than literate) mode of musical transmission, the textual (rather than melodic) conception of musical interpretation, the repetitive (rather than non-repetitive) method of musical instruction, and the religious (rather than secular) contexts chosen for musical training. They also questioned the pedagogic value of Turkish classical music by disputing the musical integrity of the Turkish classical system and by reifying, instead, the theoretical principles and the aesthetic ideals of west-

¹⁰ Turkish classical music is known by a number of different names in Turkish. Generally speaking, this ancient tradition is called Osmanlı Mûsikî and Fenn-i Mûsikî in Ottoman sources and Türk Sanat Müziği and Türk Klasik Musikisi in republican publications. Other expressions are also found including: Divan Musikisi, Enderun-i Mûsikî, Şark Musikisi, Türk Mûsikisi, Alaturka, and (more colloquially) Ahenk. The choice, spelling, and even pronunciation of specific terms in many sources reveal aesthetic preferences and ideological attitudes reminiscent of the *alaturka-alafranga* debate. See Tanrıkorur (1989) for an interesting examination of the term Türk Sanat Müziği and for a discussion of its relevance for programming policy in the national television and radio organization (TRT).

ern art music. For them, traditional methods of musical transmission perpetuated the cultural values of the late Ottoman period. These values were encoded practically within the *habitus* of its adherents and were appropriated without question during the didactic process. Since these values encompassed a wide range of contemporary concerns involving religious affiliation, social status and aesthetic interest, members of the *alafranga* coterie concentrated upon music education as a locus for defining aberrant practices and as a focus for debating these practices in the public domain.¹¹

The debate was most acrimonious in the context of the Fine Arts Academy. From one perspective, proponents of the *alafranga* camp wished to expunge *alaturka* completely from the curriculum. For instance, Zeki Bey (Osman Zeki Üngör, 1880-1958) questioned the pedagogic value of Turkish classical music for music education. By refuting the existence of an independent musical system in Turkey and by suggesting that the musical materials of *alaturka* were merely stylistic (rather than substantive) in character, he advocated instead the globalization of Turkish music according to the universal principles of western art music by extracting quarter tones from Turkish scales, by harmonizing the resulting diatonic melodies, and by replacing traditional educational methods with western equivalents. As a prominent orchestral conductor and as a recognized composer, Zeki Bey was particularly critical of the exalted position enjoyed by *alaturka* performers in contemporary Turkish institutions and of the place historically accorded to *alaturka* within the Turkish educational system. From another perspective, members of the *alaturka* camp defended their position vigorously. For instance, Rauf Yekta Bey (1871-1935), being the most outspoken, continued to emphasize the fundamental differences between *alaturka* and *alafranga*: differences which in-

¹¹ Alaturka was taught and performed in a variety of contexts. The transmission of *alaturka* was traditionally conducted in special rooms (known as a *Meşkhaneler*) which were located either in the religious houses of the Mevlevi dervishes (*Mevlevihaneler*) or in the palaces of the Ottoman elite. With the demise of courtly patronage for *alaturka* after 1826 (especially in the court of Abdülmecid I, reign: 1839-61), musical instruction was confined to a select number of *Mevlevihaneler* where traditional educational methods, performance practices, and compositional styles were continued. In some instances, *alaturka* was also taught in private homes, public establishments (such as coffee-houses) and, increasingly, in music schools (see Behar 1993). These schools proliferated in urban centers after 1908 and provided an important precedent for the development of a music conservatory in Turkey. The most significant of these included: *Mûsikî-i Osmani*, *Darü'l feyz-i Mûsikî* and *Darüttalimi Mûsikî*. The performance of *alaturka* was also curtailed. Given the expanding influence of western art music in court after 1826, *alaturka* was gradually limited to popular venues: venues where alcohol was available, where Christians, Jews as well as Muslims congregated, and where music-making was not universally applauded for its artistic excellence. It was specifically with reference to these popular venues that republican commentators equated *alaturka* with the multicultural constitution and the degenerate character of Ottoman culture. See Aksoy (1985), Ali (1983), Behar (1987a), Borrel (1928), Ezgi (1933-55), Feldman (1990-1, 1993, 1996), Greve (1995), Jäger (1996), Markoff (1986, 1990), O'Connell (1996), Oransay (1983, 1985), Reinhard and Reinhard (1984), Say (1998), Seroussi (1989), Signell (1977), Tura (1983, 1988), Uçan (1987), Wright (1988) for different approaches to the representation of Turkish music during the early Republican era (1923-38).

cluded the distinctive tonal composition (12 vs. 24 notes), the different tonal arrangements (equidistant vs. non-equidistant), and the disparate textural attributes (polyphonic vs. monophonic) of the two traditions. For him, *alaturka* and *alafranga* were two independent systems that could not be galvanized into a modern synthesis for ideological purposes. As an eminent music theorist and as a long-established music educator, Rauf Yekta Bey was able to counter the theoretical arguments proffered by Zeki Bey with academic rigor and to propose, in their place, a music curriculum that honored Turkish classical music.

The debate concerning music education extended beyond the realm of theoretical discourse. While some of the major protagonists legitimated their distinctive positions according to the unifying principles of music theory and while they also invoked the authority of foreign experts to validate their individual perspectives, others sought to expand the domain of discourse to include a critical appraisal of cultural values transmitted within didactic contexts. In this respect, exponents of the *alaturka* camp were less uniform in their rhetorical positions. Where Rauf Yekta Bey sought to promote the instructional value of *alaturka* in theory and in practice, a number of his colleagues were more circumspect in their defense of Turkish musical performance. For instance, Halil Bedii Bey (Yönteken, 1899-1968) was most virulent in his condemnation of this aspect of *alaturka*. Contributing significantly to the debate in his capacity as a musicologist and composer, he denigrated the "poor" and "primitive" characteristics of contemporary performance practice and advocated instead a westernized version of *alaturka* consistent with Gökalp's evolutionary model. Surprisingly, traditional supporters of *alaturka* were carried away by the invective. In particular, Musa Süreyya Bey (1884-1932) exercised his institutional status (as Director of the *Darü'l-elhan*) and his musical authority (as the son of Giriftzen Âsım Bey, 1852-1929) to reject Rauf Yekta Bey's call for practical recognition and to support the development of a western conservatory of music in Turkey. Like Halil Bedii Bey (see Yönteken 1924), he was responding to a contemporary republican concern for musical change that envisaged the transformation of Turkish music culture according to western principles, with music education playing a critical part of this process. By eliminating *alaturka* performance from the curriculum but by allowing only *alaturka* theory to be studied, Musa Süreyya Bey was at once able to avoid the cultural stigma associated with Turkish musical practice and to relegate Turkish music theory to the archives of history.

The resolution to this conflict lay not so much in the entrenched positions of these camps, but rather in the realm of folk music. In this respect, the ethnomusicologist Mahmut Ragıp Gazimihal (1900-1960) was most influential. By tailoring Gökalp's argument to suit a musically informed Turkish audience, Gazimihal justified the need for change in Turkish music by analyzing the relationship between social and artistic systems in Europe during the nineteenth century, by comparing his findings with contemporaneous Turkish developments, and by emphasizing the obsolete status of *alaturka* within this framework. While he was critical (see Gazimihal 1924) of Gökalp's representation of Turkish music history (especially the Byzantine provenance of

'eastern music') and while he disagreed with some aspects of Gökalp's interpretation of Turkish music theory (especially his analysis of quartertones), he had a profound respect for Gökalp's nationalist principles which he interpolated to justify the need for change in Turkish music. Accordingly, he proposed a national school (*millî ekol*) of Turkish music: a school where folk musical motifs and themes were collected and adapted to the compositional language of a national style. To this end, he participated in a number of Anatolian expeditions which were organized to document the distinctive regional styles of the Turkish folk tradition. Consistent with Gökalp's thesis, he developed a theory of pentatonicism which not only served to validate contemporary European models concerning the origins of Finno-Ugric cultures but which also helped to legitimate a new and different conceptualization of Turkish history as one that looked to the Turkic regions of Central Asia for its roots and circumvented the Islamic and Middle Eastern associations of its recent past. It is significant that this research was sponsored and published by the new Fine Arts Academy (see Gazimihal 1928).

These three different perspectives, outlined above, reflect the operation of a larger discourse in Turkish music concerning the appropriate constitution of a national music. It was popularly called the *alaturka-alafranga* debate. On the one hand, contemporary commentators were unified in their condemnation of the (perceived) slovenly musical practices, the (seemingly) degenerate lifestyles, and the (apparent) multicultural provenance of Turkish performers. On the other hand, they invoked the rhetoric of Gökalp to legitimate their positions according to the modernist predilections and the nationalist concerns of republican orthodoxy. In this sense, their varied interpretations of a national music manifested the unifying operation of a republican discourse that sought to distil Turkish music into distinctive historic (Ottoman vs. republican) and aesthetic (*alaturka* vs. *alafranga*) realms and attempted to recover a national style according to the musical preferences of individual protagonists. While the operation of this discourse served to fragment the integrity of the *alaturka* camp (especially in the area of performance), many observers tended to appropriate the formalized language and the bifurcated logic of the debate to articulate specific musical prejudices and to validate these prejudices accordingly. Consistent with Bourdieu's theory of *doxa*, they attempted to expand the domain of discourse to include their own conception of a national music and, in doing so, they participated in maintaining the institutional mechanisms of republican control. That is, they acknowledged the need for musical change in Turkey and, by extension, they accepted the need for the establishment of institutional mechanisms to implement this change. Simply put, the discourse about a national music was explicitly concerned with the correct constitution of fine music and implicitly concerned with the transformation of Turkish taste in the new Fine Arts Academy.

In retrospect, the debate was crystallized into discourse. That is, many commentators had to reconfigure their original rhetorical positions following the formal distillation of the debate into discrete *alaturka* and *alafranga* polarities. In this matter, the administrative sanction of *alafranga* both in terms of favorable governmental legislation and advantageous financial allocations

served to prioritize the central issues and to marginalize the fragmented interests of individual preference. While the personal antagonisms resulting from the original debate were deeply felt (especially within the *alaturka* camp), the survival of *alaturka* emerged as a principal concern. This was expressed (surprisingly) by a number of foreign specialists who were employed by the Turkish Government to develop *alafranga* rather than *alaturka*. These specialists, on the one hand, criticized the poor standard of *alafranga* performance at the academy and, on the other they denigrated the experimental development of a national music involving the harmonization of *alaturka* using modified western instruments (see below).¹² Following their lead, native observers began to reconsider their initial polemical stance with the benefit of historical hindsight. In this respect, the views of the theatre critic and children's playwright İsmail Hakkı Baltacıoğlu (1889-1978) are particularly noteworthy. Reacting in part to the whole-scale denigration of *alaturka* in official circles and in part to the failure of *alafranga* composers (especially in the realm of music theatre) to fashion a new Turkish music, this former member of the Fine Arts Commission softened his hostile attitude to *alaturka* by re-examining his own extensive contribution to the debate and by re-evaluating

¹² A number of foreign music specialists were invited to Turkey after 1930. These specialists were employed to develop western art music at the new music institutions in İstanbul (renamed: the İstanbul Belediye Konservatuarı) and Ankara (the Devlet Konservatuarı and the Gazi Enstitüsü). An impressive number of foreign artists were attracted to Turkey including: Joseph Marks (1882-1964), Paul Hindemith (1895-1968), Ernst Praetorius (b. 1880), Carl Ebert (1887-1980) and Eduard Zuckmayer (1890-1972). The German and Austrian nationality of these specialists is interesting. On the one hand, these musicians were attracted to Turkey (following Hindemith's lead) by the new job opportunities available there and, on the other, they wished to flee the increasingly difficult political situation at home. Continuing a long-established tradition of German-Turkish exchange, a number of Turkish musicians studied in Germany and/or Austria after 1918: musicians who advocated Germanic methods of musical instruction at the new Academy and who were extremely influential in the formulation of policy there. For instance, two members of the Fine Arts Commission – Cemil Reşit Rey (1904-85) and Musa Süreyya Bey (1884-1932) – were educated in Berlin and Vienna respectively. Other exponents of the orthodox position, including Mahmut Ragıp Gazimihal (1900-1960) and Osman Zeki Üngör (1880-1958), either studied or toured in Germany. As Stokes mentions (1992: 38), this may account for the widespread awareness of Hindemith's interest in social realism among republican commentators. However, I suggest that this contemporary concern for musical relevance probably predated Hindemith's interest in *Gebrauchsmusik* (see Fn. 8 above): an interest that followed a precedent set by Bessler (1925), that emerged in its most developed form after 1929 and that post-dated the establishment of the new Fine Arts Academy. This is not to say, however, that some Turkish musicologists (most notably Mahmut Ragıp Gazimihal) were not aware of contemporary European developments in architecture and fine art as well as music. It is interesting to note that exponents of the *alaturka* camp looked to France (rather than Germany) for international validation. In particular, Rauf Yekta Bey invoked the support of the musicologist Eugène Borrel (1876-1962): an ally who had published an important article on Turkish music theory (see Borrell 1922-3) and who had demonstrated his support for *alaturka* publicly in 1927. See Ali (1983), Oransay (1983) and Zimmerman-Kalyoncu (1980) for a more extensive history of German-speaking musicians in Turkey during the early Republican era.

his own position favorably in the ensuing discourse. By advocating a new tripartite vision of Turkish music and by including (for the first time) *alaturka* within this framework, he was able to review his original antagonistic stand and to re-clarify his own interpretation of the debate with discursive rigor. His representation of the debate, which was published in the popular newspaper *Akşam* in 1932, is characteristic of his revisionist stance:

Here I would like to discuss the notion of the real music of Turkey. This is actually not a new problem although Rauf Yekta Bey persists in continuing an old debate. For over 30 years, three distinctive perspectives have existed. Let us summarize these below.

First, there are the exponents of *alaturka* (here called pejoratively, *alaturkacılar*). They contend that *alaturka* is actually our music and that it is distinctive from other musical systems both in terms of its technical attributes and in terms of its innate spirit. According to this group, Turkish classical music (here called *Türk Musikisi*) must not be excluded from our national music and ought to be taught, accordingly, in the conservatories and in the schools. Many proponents of this perspective, for instance Muzika'lı İsmail Hakkı Bey (that is, Muallim İsmail Hakkı Bey, 1866-1927), suggest that if one increases the number of keys on a piano one will be able to perform operettas and marches in the *makam-s Nihavend* and *Hicaz-kâr*! There are even *alaturkacılar* who perform in such a vulgar and laughable manner when attempting to imitate *alafranga* songs.

Then there are the exponents of *alafranga*. They argue that distinctive *alaturka* and *alafranga* musical traditions in fact do not exist. They say that there is only one musical system (in Turkey) and that this system is western music. According to them, *alaturka* is a backward musical style both from the perspective of technique and expressiveness. Either *alaturka* must be modernized or *alaturka* must be rejected as a musical class altogether. They suggest that only western music should be performed in the conservatories and in the schools.

Finally there are the followers of Gökalp. According to Gökalp, *alaturka* is neither our first nor our second national music—either from the perspective of its technical or expressive properties. *Alaturka* is actually Byzantine music (*Bizanz Musikisi*). For him, our national music must be modern in technique and national in substance. In this respect, it must amalgamate the melodies from folk songs with the advanced techniques of western music. By harmonizing these melodies according to western principles, it is possible to create a national music. To this end, a number of Turkish composers have composed works according to Gökalp's principles." (Quoted in Ergin 1942, IV: 1823-4)

Changing Turkish Taste

The transformation of Turkish taste according to the rules of *alafranga* rather than the principles of *alaturka* reflected a more general concern with social and political change in Turkey after 1923. In an attempt to obliterate the cultural capital of an Ottoman past, the founder of the Turkish republic, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, instituted a set of religious (1924/5), sartorial (1925), economic (1927), and linguistic (1928) reforms which served to underscore the modernist and westernizing aspirations of his new state. These reforms,

which were legitimated subsequently in article 2 of the Constitution (1937) according the ideological tenets of revolutionism (*inkılâpçılık*), nurtured a discourse about change that permeated many aspects of Turkish life. While this discourse had a substantial historical pedigree and while this discourse had appeared in many contemporary publications, Atatürk was in a position to implement his vision of a new Turkish society with legislative effect and to validate (albeit in retrospect) his revision of this society by co-opting the evolutionary language of a long-established discursive tradition. As a result, Atatürk took (and continues to take) credit for the rapid transformation of Turkish culture during the period. In musical terms, his preoccupation with revolutionary change resulted in the emergence of a national style that sought to alter Ottoman music practice using western musical principles. Turkish folk music, operating as a mediating category between both perspectives, provided the conceptual space upon which the concept of a national style could be constructed and about which the boundaries of such a style could be contested. In educational terms, the creation of a new academy not only revolutionized musical instruction in line with the musical attributes of a national style but it also provided the basis upon which these innovations could be meaningfully debated. In other words, musical change and its discursive manifestation functioned within the orbit of republican consciousness and served to delimit *alaturka* both temporally and substantively within the architectural straitjacket of an *alafranga* edifice, the Fine Arts Academy.

The Fine Arts Academy was a tangible product of these reforms. Operating under the auspices of a specially designated Fine Arts Commission (*Sanayi-i Nefise Encümeni*),¹³ the new Academy was modeled upon a European

¹³ The Fine Arts Commission (*Sanayi-i Nefise Encümeni*) was constituted by the Ministry of Education to oversee the development of the new Fine Arts Academy. Operating under the direction of the Education Minister, Mustafa Necati Bey, the Commission was made up of the following members: the composer Cemal Reşit Rey (1904-85), the playwright İsmail Hakkı Baltacıoğlu (1889-1978), and the music educator Musa Süreyya Bey (1884-1932). The Commission was not only required to bring together disparate members of the artistic community into one institution but it was also required to implement the recommendations of the Ministry of Education according to the modernist principles of contemporary educational reforms. In this respect, the Commission was uniform in its educational goals: goals which were geared towards the development of a national academy of the performing arts and which excluded the performance and instruction of *alaturka* from educational institutions. Of course, the artistic prejudices of individual members of the Commission were significant, showing an inevitable bias in favor of the dramatic arts. While the integration of the performing arts into one overarching structure was not new (a precedent had been set in 1917), the exclusion of Turkish music in all of its forms was—a development that is often blamed (perhaps unfairly) on the Minister of Education (see Oransay 1985 and Cengiz 1993). In retrospect, Cemal Reşit Rey conceded that the execution of the Commission's recommendations had been swift and insensitive (Paçacı 1994: 121). This may, in part, reflect the rapid pace of Turkish reform in 1927 but it may also reflect the bureaucratic problems resulting from the rapid implementation of legislation intended perhaps to disguise a difficult period of political instability (Zürcher 1993: 183). See Ataman (1991), Bardakçı (1995), Cengiz (1993), Oran (1980), O'Connell (1996), Oransay (1985), Saygun (1965) and Sun (1969) for divergent analyses of Atatürk's attitude towards *alaturka*. See Aydemir

prototype where painting, sculpture, architecture and the performing arts were grouped together into one institutional structure. In this respect, the foundation of a new conservatory of music (initially called, *İstanbul Konservatuarı*) was a logical step in the restructuring process. In keeping with the spirit of revolutionary change that permeated many aspects of Turkish culture, prominent members of the Fine Arts Commission sought to transform Turkish music by adopting western instructional practices, by dropping *alaturka* from the music curriculum, and by promoting, instead, a national school (*millî ekol*) of musical performance. While a number of previous attempts had already been made to found such an institution (especially in 1916 and 1923), a unique combination of political and economic considerations in 1926 favored the implementation of the commission's recommendations. First, Atatürk wished to accelerate the 'modernization' of Turkish art (in all of its forms) by appropriating European cultural institutions. For him, this transformation could best be achieved in the context of a Fine Arts Academy (Saygun 1965: 21). Second, Atatürk wished to impress visiting foreign dignitaries with the artistic achievements of his westernized Republic. In this context, *alaturka* had no part to play. Third, difficult political and economic circumstances in 1925 resulted in a dramatic reduction in the yearly financial allocation made by the Ministry of Education to musical institutions. While western musical instruction was not significantly affected by this budgetary shortfall, *alaturka* was severely restricted. Fourth, the restructuring of existing institutions into a single Fine Arts Academy had obvious economic benefits. Not only was the new establishment more efficiently run (especially in terms of staff productivity and resource management) but it also provided a less expensive educational option for Turkish students who had previously relied on state sponsorship to study abroad.

The Fine Arts Academy was not founded in isolation. While the new Academy provided a locus for exploring the appropriate constitution of Turkish culture in general and for debating the national character of Turkish music in particular, it was established in conjunction with a number of other musical institutions which were set up quickly after 1923 and which promoted western rather than Turkish musics. After the cosmetic relocation and renaming of existing establishments, the educational ministry (*Maarif Vekâleti*) instituted a series of educational reforms which proscribed the teaching of Turkish music in schools (1924), promoted the instruction of western music in teacher training colleges (1924), and restructured existing institutions (such as the *Darü'l'elhan*) under the auspices of the Fine Arts Commission (*Sanayi-i Nefise Encümeni*) to the detriment of *alaturka*. That is, where *alafranga* was promoted in terms of a generous financial allocation, an active recruitment policy (for staff and students alike), and a well-advertised public performance series, *alaturka* was no longer taught or performed in the new Academy. In fact, out of an original complement of 18 full-time staff members employed in the *alaturka* section of *Darü'l'elhan* in 1924, only 3 members were retained.

(1976), Bisbee (1951), Kocatürk (1973), Kinross (1964), Landau (1984), Mango (1999), Volkan and Itzkowitz (1984), Webster (1939) and Zürcher (1991, 1993) for historical studies of Atatürk and his contribution to the reform of Turkish culture.

They were employed as musicologists (under the direction of Rauf Yekta Bey) to document the Turkish classical repertory from oral sources and were required to publish their findings in written anthologies. They were organized, accordingly, into the new Society for the Fixing and Classification of Turkish Music (*Alaturka Mûsiki Tasnif ve Tespit Heyeti*). This rapid restructuring of Turkish musical institutions had important implications for the transmission of *alaturka*. On the one hand, the traditional line of oral transmission (*meşk silsilesi*) was replaced by a new medium of instruction that relied upon fixed written (rather than variable oral) sources and that necessitated a new system of instruction according to western principles. On the other hand and following the closure of the Sufi *Tekke*-s (1925), *alaturka* was increasingly denied public recognition, institutional assistance and—above all—financial support.¹⁴

The Fine Arts Academy operated as an institutional mechanism for republican control. Through selective budgetary allocations and through restrictive admissions procedures, the Fine Arts Commission was able to reconfigure Turkish musical taste to suit the aesthetic interests of republican orthodoxy. In the fiscal realm, the annual budget published in *Düstur* shows the disproportionate allotment of government funds in the new institution—about 65% of the total (25,000TL) for the *alafranga* section—illustrating the withdrawal of support for the instruction and performance of Turkish music. In fact, the disproportionate allocation of funds in favor of *alafranga* had already begun in 1925. Due to financial constraints, the Ministry of Education was forced to make budgetary cut backs and the *Darül'elhan* received only 23,000TL—a shortfall of 12,000TL from the 1924 allocation of 35,000TL. While the *alafranga* division of the institution retained its annual grant of 12,000TL, the *alaturka* section suffered a dramatic reduction in funds—down from 22,000TL in 1924 to 11,000 in 1925—forcing the redundancy of 7 full-time members of the staff (from 18 in 1924 to 11 in 1925). In the administrative realm, student numbers show a similar decrease. In contrast to the dramatic growth in student enrolments for *alafranga* courses during 1925, the number of registered students in the *alaturka* section declined from 90 to 35 between 1924-5. While these figures are estimates and disguise the joint affiliation of

¹⁴ The line of oral transmission (*meşk silsilesi*), which served to maintain the Turkish classical repertory from one generation to another, was almost completely destroyed with the foundation the new music conservatory. After the closure of the Sufi lodges in 1925, the *Darül'elhan* became the only official institution offering professional training in Turkish classical performance. While it is true that certain western pedagogical techniques served to pollute the integrity of the *meşk* system before 1926, most of the *alaturka* teachers employed at the *Darül'elhan* were conversant with traditional methods of musical instruction and continued to practice them accordingly—so much so that İsmail Hakkı Baltacıoğlu complained in 1925 that the *Darül'elhan* had begun to resemble a *Meşkhane*. The formation of the *Tasnif ve Tesbit Heyeti* at the new conservatory did little to remedy the situation. By recognizing a single version of the classical repertory and by publishing its results using western notation, the society not only acknowledged a particular interpretation of an extensive but fragmented tradition but it also prescribed subsequent musical practice according to the literary rules of western musical education rather than oral character of traditional methods.

many students with the two departments (to the detriment of *alaturka*), they were used by contemporary commentators to demonstrate the dramatic decline of interest in *alaturka* and to justify further fiscal constraints in this area. The diminished support for *alaturka* continued the following year. Although there was a slight increase in the overall budget during 1926 (from 23,000TL to 25,000TL), the allocation for *alaturka* amounted only to 8,830TL. This reduction coincided with the foundation of the *Alaturka Mûsikî Tasnif ve Tesbit Heyeti*, with the banning of *alaturka* instruction in the new Academy, and with the loss of a further 8 full-time positions there.¹⁵

The Fine Arts Academy was an impediment to the survival of *alaturka*. While the instruments of institutional control (namely, economic maintenance and administrative support) served to curtail performance practice and musical instruction, the public onslaught against *alaturka* did not go unchallenged. In terms of performance practice, the Darül'elhan Ensemble (*Darül'elhan Mûsikî Heyeti*) survived for a short period independently (as the *Darül'elhan Alaturka Mûsikî Heyeti*). However, its members were soon attracted to a number of new ensembles (such as the *Türk Mûsikî Heyeti*) or they moved to established professional groups (such as the *Darü'ttâlim-i Mûsikî Cemiyeti* and the *Şark Mûsikî Cemiyeti*). The formation of an enlarged *Türk Mûsikî Heyeti* specifically for the performance of a commemorative evening in support of *alaturka* is interesting. This concert, which was presented at the *Türk Ocağı* on July 28th (1927), featured an ensemble of 95 musicians performing classical works (recently published in the *Darül'elhan Külliyyatından*). Sections of the program were subsequently recorded (using the latest electrical techniques)

¹⁵ For reference purposes, 1 Turkish Lira (TL) was approximately equivalent to £1 sterling in 1928. Due to difficult economic circumstances, the value of the Turkish Lira was liable to fluctuate. However, the rapid devaluation of the currency did not occur until the late 1930's (when for security reasons) military expansion necessitated the printing of extra money to offset spiraling debts. In fact, the Turkish economy was slow to recover after the War of Independence. While the agricultural sector showed a remarkable revival after 1923, the industrial sector did not demonstrate such vitality due in part to the restrictive provisions of the Treaty of Lausanne (especially with regards to the imposition of import tariffs) and due in part to the massive disruption to economic development brought about by the demise of the Ottoman Empire. In particular, the loss of Greek and Armenian traders had negative consequences for the survival of many home-based industries. Although it is true that a number of economic reforms (in the form of nationalization) were instituted to foster industrial expansion after 1925, internal political strife (especially in 1925-6) and external economic instability (in 1929) undermined the effectiveness of these. In this respect, the polemical discourse surrounding the foundation of the new Fine Arts Academy was probably a welcome distraction for (rather than central concern of) leading republican legislators. It may be precisely for this reason that the issues surrounding Turkish taste at the new institution were so widely and so publicly debated. Concerning reference sources, contemporary statistical information and governmental legislation are supplied by *Türkiye İstatistik Yıllığı* (1932, 1935, 1936, 1939) and *T.C. Resmi Gazete* respectively. Other statistical information is derived from contemporary newspapers, *İstanbul Belediyesi İstatistik Müdürlüğü* (1932, 1949) and *Düstur*. A summary of the relevant financial allocations in and personnel changes at the new Fine Arts Academy can be found in Ergin (1939-1943).

by Columbia on a special violet label. In terms of musical instruction, *alaturka* continued to be taught briefly in a number of public schools (such as the *Darişşafaka*) and private institutions. These institutions emerged soon after the foundation of the new Academy and benefited from the compulsory redundancy of Turkish musicians there. That is, a number of employment possibilities were available to former members of the *Darîl'elhan*. Apart from traditional career pathways, performers could apply for positions in one of the newly established radio stations (in İstanbul and Ankara) or they could sign contracts with record companies (especially Columbia, Pathé and HMV) which had recently benefited from the invention of electrical recording techniques and which were now engaged in an intense struggle for market supremacy. However, these opportunities were often impermanent and did not offer the tenured security of public employment. In other words, the new republican élite was able to control the constitution of Turkish taste through economic isolation and institutional restructuring. For them, only fine music was to be taught at the Fine Arts Academy.

Controlling Turkish Taste

Returning to Foucault's critical perspective, I have argued that Turkish taste had to be defined, debated, and changed to suit the aesthetic preferences of a newly established republican order. I have shown that the foundation of a Fine Arts Academy in İstanbul not only provided a locus for the dramatization of a discourse about taste but that it also provided the instruments (both economic and institutional) for its control. While it is not completely correct to focus exclusively upon discourse when discussing matters of taste and while Bourdieu's concept of *habitus* (that is, the realm beyond verbalized discourse) may indeed be significant in this respect, I contend that the public debate surrounding taste at the new Academy served to articulate an historic concern for aesthetic preference, to reconfigure this concern in the context of a newly established national order, and to control the unspoken practical possibilities of an aesthetic *habitus* with the rhetoric of nationalism and with the institutional mechanisms of republican order. In musical terms, the consequences of this discursive strategy are apparent. Turkish musical instruction and Turkish musical performance were expunged from the music curriculum: a decisive act in Turkish music education which broke the line of oral transmission and which—essentially—confined *alaturka* to the drinking houses of İstanbul. While Turkish classical music was subsequently patronized by radio stations (especially by *Ankara Radyosu* after 1938) and by the İstanbul Municipal Conservatory (that is, the İstanbul Belediye Konservatuarı after 1943), it was classicized (that is, westernized) and classified (that is, fixed in western notation) to suit the European predilections of republican taste. Even today, the politics of taste at the Turkish Music Conservatory perpetuate a discourse surrounding fine music: a discourse which was fixed during the early republican era and which crystallized around the foundation of a Fine Arts Academy in 1926.

REFERENCES CITED

- Akçura, Yusuf
 1981. *Yeni Türk Devletinin Öncüleri - 1928 Yılı Yazıları*. Ed. Nejat Sefercioğlu. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Aksoy, Bülent
 1985 "Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyete Musiki ve Batılılaşma." In *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, pp. 1212-48.
 1989 "Is the Question of the 'Origin of Turkish Music' not Redundant?" *Turkish Musical Quarterly* 2/4: 1-7.
- Ali, Filiz
 1983 "Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'inde Konservatuvarlar." In *Cumhuriyet Döneminde Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, pp. 1531-1534.
- Arel, Hüseyin
 1988 *Türk Musikisi Kimindir?* Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı.
- Ataman, Sadi
 1991 *Atatürk ve Türk Musikisi*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı.
- Aydemir, Şevket S.
 1976 *Tek Adam: Mustafa Kemal 1881-1919*. 6th Edition. İstanbul: Rezmi Kitabevi.
- Baltacıoğlu, İsmail Hakkı
 1932 "Türkiye Doğru." *Akşam* November 19th, 1932.
- Bardakçı, Murat
 1995 *Refik Bey: Refik Fersan ve Hatırları*. İstanbul: Pan Yayıncılık.
- Başbakanlık İstatistik Genel Direktörlüğü
 1932 *İstatistik Yıllığı: Annuaire statistique, 1931-1932*. Vol. 5. İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi.
İstatistik Yıllığı: Annuaire statistique, 1934-1935. Vol. 7. İstanbul : Devlet Basımevi.
 1936 *Kültür İstatistiği, 1934-1935*. No. 81. Ankara: Köyhocası Matbaası.
 1939 *İstatistik Yıllığı: Annuaire statistique, 1938-39*. Vol. 10. İstanbul: Hüsnütabiat Basımevi.
- Behar, Cem
 1987 *Klasik Türk Müsikisi Üzerine Denemeler*. İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları.
 1993 *Zaman, Mekân, Müzik: Klâsik Türk Musikisinde Eğitim (Meşk), İcra ve Aktarım*. İstanbul: AFA Yayınları.
- Besseler, Heinrich
 1925 "Grundlagen des musikalischen Hörens." *Jahrbuch der Musikbibliothek Peters* 1925: 35.
- Bisbee, Eleanor
 1951 "Culture." In *The New Turks: Pioneers of the Republic, 1920-1950*. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, pp. 150-160.
- Borrel, Eugène
 1922-3 "La musique turque." *Revue de musicologie* 6: 149-161, 7: 26-32, 60-70.
 1928 "Contribution à la bibliographie de la musique turque au XXe siècle." *Revue des études islamiques* ii: 512.

Bourdieu, Pierre

1977 *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Translated into English by Richard Nice. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

1984 *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Translated into English by Richard Nice. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Cengiz, Halil E. Ed.

1993 *Yaşanmış Olaylarla Atatürk ve Müzik: Riyâset-i Cumhur İnce Saz Hey'eti Şefi Binbaşı Hâfız Yaşar Okur'un Anıları (1924-1938)*. Ankara: Müzik Ansiklopedisi Yayınları.

Davison, Roderic H. Ed.

1990 *Essays in Ottoman and Turkish History, 1774-1923: The Impact of the West*. Austin: University of Texas Press, Modern Middle East Series, No. 16.

Donado, Giovanni

1688 *Della leteratura de'turchi*. Venice.

During, Jean P.

1987 "Acoustic Systems and Metaphysical Systems in Oriental Traditions." *The World of Music* XXIX/2: 19-28.

1994 "Question de goût: L'enjeu de la modernité dans les arts et les musiques de L'Islam." *Cahiers de musiques traditionnelles* 7: 27-49.

Ergin, Osman Ed.

1939-43 *Türkiye Maarif Tarihi: İstanbul Mektepleri ve İlim, Terbiye ve San'at Müesseseleri*. 5 Vols. İstanbul:Osmanbey Matbaası.

Erguner, Ahmed

1990 "Alla Turca - Alla Franca: Les enjeux de la musique turque." *Cahiers de musiques traditionnelles* 3: 45-56.

Ezgi, Subhi

1933-55 *Nazari ve Amelî Türk Musikisi*. 5 Vols. (1933-55). İstanbul: Millî Eğitim Basımevi.

Farmer, Henry

1937 *Turkish Musical Instruments in the Seventeenth Century*. Glasgow: The Civic Press.

al-Fârûqi, Ismail R. and Lois L. al-Fârûqi,

1986 "Ornamentation in the Islamic Arts." In *The Cultural Atlas of Islam*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., pp. 378-407.

Feld, Steven

1993 "Aesthetics as Iconicity of Style, or 'Lift-Up-Over Sounding': Getting into the Kaluli Groove." *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 20: 74-113.

Feldman, Walter

1990-1 "Cultural Authority and Authenticity in the Turkish Repertoire." *Asian Music* 22/1: 73-112.

1993 "Ottoman Sources on the Development of the Taksim." *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 25: 1-28.

1996 *Music of the Ottoman Court: Makam, Composition and the Early Ottoman Instrumental Repertoire*. Intercultural Music Series, 10. Berlin: Verlag für Wissenschaft und Bildung.

Fonton, Charles

- 1751 "Essai sur la musique orientale comparée avec la musique européenne." Bibliothèque Nationale (ms. Fr. Nouv. Acq. 4023).

Foucault, Michel

- 1969 *L'Archeologie du savoir*. Paris: Gallimard.
1976 *Histoire de la sexualité*. Paris: Gallimard.

Gazimihal, Mahmut

- "Musiki ve Ziya Gökalp." *Millî Mecmua* 24: 383-5.
1928 *Anadolu Türküleri ve Musiki İstikbalimiz*. İstanbul.

Gökalp, Ziya

- 1923 *Türkçülüğün Esasları*. Ankara: Matbuat ve İrtibarat Matbaası.
1959 *Turkish Nationalism and Western Civilisation (Selected Essays)*.
Translated into English by Niyasi Berkes. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Greve, Martin

- 1995 *Die Europäisierung orientalischer Kunstmusik in der Türkei*.
Berlin: Peter Lang, Europäische Hochschulschriften, Series XXVI.

Haşim Bey

- 1864 *Şarkı Mecmuası*. İstanbul.

Hebdige, Dick

- 1979 *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*. London: Methuen.

İnal, İbnülemin M.

- 1955 *Son Hattatlar*. İstanbul: Maarif Basımevi.
1958 *Hoş Sada*. İstanbul: Maarif Basımevi.

İstanbul Belediyesi İstatistik Müdürlüğü

- 1932 *İstanbul Şehri İstatistik Yıllığı, 1931-1932*. Vol. 2.
İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi.

İstanbul Belediye Neşriyat ve İstatistik

- 1949 "İstanbul Konservatuvarı." In *Cumhuriyet Devrinde İstanbul*.
İstanbul: Millî Eğitim Basımevi, pp. 155-8.

Jäger, Ralf

- 1996 *Türkische Kunstmusik und ihre handschriftlichen Quellen aus dem 19. Jahrhundert*.
Münster: Schriften zur Musikwissenschaft aus Münster, No. 8.

Karabey, Laika

- 1961 "Alaturka ve Alafranga Dâvâsı." *Musiki Mecmuası* 148: 483-484.

Keil, Charles and Steven Feld

- 1994 *Music Grooves: Essays and Dialogues*.
Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kocatürk, Utkan

- 1973 *Atatürk ve Türk Devrimi Kronoslojisi, 1918-1938*.
Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

Kinross, Lord Patrick B.

- 1964 *Atatürk: The Rebirth of a Nation*.
London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

La Borde, M. de Jean B.

- 1780 *Essai sur la musique ancienne et moderne*. Paris: de P-D. Pierres.

Landau, Jacob, Ed.

1984 *Atatürk and the Modernisation of Turkey*. Boulder: Westview.

Lomax, Alan

1968 *Folk Song, Style, and Culture*. New Jersey: Transaction Books.

Mango, Andrew

1999 *Atatürk*. London: John Murray Publishers.

Markoff, Irene

1986 "Musical Theory: Performance and the Contemporary Bağlama Specialist in Turkey." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Washington.

1990 "The Ideology of Musical Practice and the Professional Turkish Folk Musician: Tempering the Creative Impulse." *Asian Music* XXII/1: 129-145.

McClary, Susan

1991 *Feminine Endings: Music, Gender, and Sexuality*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Meyer, Eca

1974 "Turquerie and Eighteenth-Century Music." *Eighteenth Century Studies* VII/4: 64-87.

Nişbay, İzzettin Tuğrul

1942 "Alaturka, Alafranga ve Radyomuz." *Radyo* 9: 2-3.

O'Connell, John M.

1996 "Alaturka Revisited: Style as History in Turkish Vocal Performance." Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Olbelkevich, Mary

1977 "Turkish Affect in the Land of the Sun King." *The Music Quarterly* LXIII/3: 367-389.

Oran, Aydın, Ed.

1980 *Atatürk Devrimleri İdeolojisinin Türk Müzik Kültürüne Doğrudan ve Dolaylı Etkileri*. İstanbul: Osmanlı Matbaası, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Türk Müziği Kulübü Yayınları, No. 1.

Oransay, Gültelkin

1983 "Cumhuriyetin İlk Elli Yılında Geleneksel Sanat Musikimiz." In *Cumhuriyet Döneminde Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, pp. 1496-1509.

1985 *Atatürk ile Kuğ: Belgeler ve Veriler*. Second Edition. İzmir: Kuğ Yayını.

Özalp, Nazimi

1986 *Türk Musikisi Tarihi*. 2 Vols. Ankara: Müzik Dairesi Başkanlığı.

Öztuna, Yılmaz

1990 *Büyük Türk Mûsikisi Ansiklopedisi*. 2 Vols. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı.

Paçacı, Gönül

1994 "Dâr-ül-elhân ve Türk Musikisi'nin Gelişimi I." *Tarih ve Toplum* 121: 48-55.

Poché, Christian

1994 "De l'homme parfait à l'expressivité musicale: Courants esthétiques arabes au XXe siècle." *Cahiers de musiques traditionnelles* 7: 59-74.

Racy, A. Jihad

- 1982 "Musical Aesthetics in Present-day Cairo." *Ethnomusicology* 26/3: 391-403.
- 1983 "Music in Nineteenth-Century Egypt: An Historical Sketch." *Selected Reports in Ethnomusicology* IV: 157-179.
- Redhouse, Sir James
1974 *Redhouse Yeni Türkçe-İngilizce Sözlük: New Redhouse Turkish-English Dictionary*. 2nd Edition. İstanbul: Redhouse Yayınevi.
- Reinhard, Kurt and Ursula Reinhard
1984 *Musik der Türkei*. 2 Vols. Wilhelmshaven: Heinrichshofen's Verlag.
- Rona, Mustafa
1970 *Yirminci Yüzyıl Türk Musikisi*. İstanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi.
- Safa, Peyami
1933 "Alaturka mı? Alafranga mı?" *Yedi Gün* 2: 2.
- Sanal, Haydar
1964 *Mehter Musikisi*. İstanbul: Ahmet Sait Matbaası.
- Say, Ahmet
1998 *Türkiye'nin Müzik Atlası*. İstanbul: Borusan Kültür ve Sanat Yayınları.
- Saygun, Adnan
1965 *Atatürk ve Musiki*. Ankara: Ajans-Türk Matbaacılık.
- Seroussi, Edwin
1989 *Mizimrat Qedem: The Life and Music of R. Isaac Algazi from Turkey*. Jerusalem: Institute for Jewish Music.
- Shaw, Stanford
1976-7 *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*. 2 vols. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Shiloah, Amnon
1993 "An Eighteenth-Century Critic of Taste and Good Taste." In *Ethnomusicology and Modern Music History*. Eds. Stephen Blum, Philip Bohlman and Daniel Neuman. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 181-189.
- 1994 "Notions d'esthétiques dans les traités arabes sur la musique." *Cahiers de musiques traditionnelles* 7: 51-58.
- Signell, Karl
1977 *Makam: Modal Practice in Turkish Art Music*. Seattle: Asian Music Publications.
- 1981 "Turkey's Classical Music, A Class Symbol." *Asian Music* XII/2: 164-169.
- 1988 "Mozart and the Mehter." *Turkish Music Quarterly* I/1: 34-36.
- Stokes, Martin
1992 *The Arabesk Debate: Music and Musicians in Modern Turkey*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Sun, Muammer
1969 *Türkiye'nin Kültür-Müzik-Tiyatro Sorunları*. Ankara: Ajans-Türk Matbaacılık Sanayii, Kültür Yayınları, No. 2.
- Tanrıkorur, Cinuçen
1989 "Okulda Alaturka Dönemi Değil, Sağduyu Dönemi." *Millî Kültür* 67: 34-6.

Toderini G.

1789 *De la littérature des turcs*. Paris: Poinçit.

Tura, Yalın

1983 "Cumhuriyet Döneminde Türk Musikisi." In *Cumhuriyet Döneminde Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 5. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, pp.1510-1516.

1988 *Türk Müsikişinin Mes'eleleri*. İstanbul: Pan Yayıncılık.

Uçan, Ali

1987 "Music Education in Turkey in the Republican Period." *Turkish Review Quarterly Digest* 1987: 75-98.

Uşşakizâde, Halit

1932 "Alaturka-Alafranga." *Cumhuriyet* September 29th, 1932.

Volkan, Vamik and Norman Itzkowitz

1984 *The Immortal Atatürk: A Psychobiography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Walser, Robert

1993 *Running with the Devil: Power, Gender, and Madness in Heavy Metal*. Hannover: Wesleyan University Press.

Webster, Donald

1939 *The Turkey of Atatürk: Social Process in the Turkish Reformation*. Philadelphia: AMS Press.

Wright, Owen

1988 "Aspects of Historical Change in the Turkish Classical Repertoire." *Musica Asiatica* 5: 1-108.

Yönteken, Halil Bedii

1924 "Millî Müsiki." *Darü'l-elhan Mecmuası* 3: 129-132.

Zimmermann-Kalyoncu, Cornelia

1980 *Deutsche Musiker in der Türkei im 20. Jahrhundert*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang Verlag.

Zürcher, Erik J.

1991 *Opposition in the Early Turkish Republic: The Progressive Republican Party 1924-5*. Leiden: Brill.

1993 *Turkey: A Modern History*. London: I.B. Tauris.