

Music and the Nation in Greek and Turkish Contexts (19th – early 20th c.): A paradigm of cultural transfers

MERIH EROL (Berlin)

Ethnocentric history writing in the Balkans and elsewhere which often sees nations as singular and monolithic entities, fails to observe the porous boundaries between the musical cultures.

The purpose of this article is to shed light on the process in which music came to the center of the nationalist discourses and the politics of culture in Greece and Turkey, by using a comparative perspective that adopts a methodological framework based on concepts such as ‘transfer’, ‘exchange’ and ‘interplay’. The romantic, nostalgic and modernist concepts and discourses, which are investigated in this study, address various concerns about the nation’s collective identity and its relationship to modernity. Regarding its inter-ethnic and inter-cultural aims, this study tries to bring the common Ottoman experience into the exploration of the ethno-nationalist discourses on music among the nineteenth and early twentieth-century Greek and Turkish intellectuals, musicians, and experts. Furthermore, by introducing the Greek and Turkish cases into a wider European problematic of the instrumentalization of music in a plethora of nationalisms from the Scandinavian countries to East-Central Europe, it aims, first of all, at studying the history of these countries as part of European history and more generally, at broadening the scope of comparison across the regions of Europe, hence enriching the study of European cultural history.

Well known for his research in Franco-German cultural relations, Michel Espagne defined the research perspective ‘cultural transfer’ in opposition to a quest for homogeneous forms, and drew attention to the study of the zones of mixture (‘*métissage*’) in which multiple national spaces – and intellectual discourses thereof – blended¹. The cultural transfers approach emphasizes the treatment of “parallel” cultures as occasionally communicating entities which interact with and shape each other. Thereby, it tries to overcome the claims for particularity and uniqueness of the ethnocentric history writing². It is important to note that the perspective of cultural

1 Michel ESPAGNE: *Les transferts culturels franco-allemands*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1999, pp. 1–8.

2 The merits of this approach have also been mentioned concerning the study of the Greek Orthodox communities in Europe. Vaso Seirinidou noted that, the communal institutions, cultural practices and reform programs of the “diasporic” Greek communities of Europe should be studied in their interaction and mutual configuration with those of the “receiving society”. Challenging the standard approach to the study of the Greek communities in Europe which have been dealt with interpretative claims of historical particularity and continuity, V. Seirinidou situated the linguistic program – concerning the Greek-language education at the Greek Orthodox schools in Habsburg Monarchy – of the intellectual Dimitrios Darvaris within the nationalizing processes that were prevalent in Central Europe at that time. See Vaso SEIRINIDOU: “Πολιτισμικές Μεταφορές και Ελληνικές Παροικίες. Νεές Αναγνώσεις μιας Παλιάς Ιστορίας, με Αφορμή το Παράδειγμα του Δημήτριου

transfers developed in a critique to the existing notions of comparison within the historical scholarship³. Hence, Espagne stated the necessity of taking into account the chronological succession of interferences between two cultures paying attention to historical continuity, instead of simply comparing synchronic constellations⁴. Another approach which inspired some of the questions of this paper is the comparative and intercultural mode of investigation into concepts as offered by Hans-Jürgen Lüsebrink whose studies focus on the German-French cultural communication, mediating figures and processes of perception⁵. Here, I should note that the modes of comparison drawn from the Franco-German context – the way the research has generally focused on the exchange and mediation between two national spaces – are useful, but not directly applicable to the nineteenth-century Greco-Turkish context. As we will see especially in the following section, the comparative tool of “cultural transfers” will be problematized as a mode of exchange and interaction not between two distinct national spaces, but as “transfers” within the same context. Hence, in the first section cultural transfers will be analyzed across the two ethno-national spaces within the imperial Ottoman context, with particular attention to the continuity and the transfers of various concepts, themes and discourses on nation and “its” music. Later, as the second part looks into what we can call the ‘politics of music’ in modern Turkey and Greece, the problematic of the paper will partly shift to a ‘transfer history’ between the different historical regions of Europe.

Δόξαση”, paper presented at the Conference (*Nation and intellectuals between Greece and Europe in the long 19th century*), Athens, 10–11 April 2009.

- 3 Michel Espagne observed that the former comparative approaches took as their subjects, two totally separate units and searched for their similarities and differences, hence petrified the oppositions. Michel ESPAGNE: *Les transferts culturels franco-allemands*, p. 36. For more recent attempts to go beyond the established notions of comparison, see *Comparative and Transnational History. Central European Approaches and New Perspectives*, (eds) Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Jürgen Kocka, New York: Berghahn, 2009; Michael WERNER; Bénédicte ZIMMERMANN: “Beyond Comparison: *Histoire Croisée* and the Challenge of Reflexivity”, *History and Theory* 45 (February 2006), pp. 30–50; Jürgen KOCKA: “Comparison and Beyond”, *History and Theory* 42 (February 2003), pp. 39–44.
- 4 Michel ESPAGNE: *Les transferts culturels franco-allemands*, pp. 37–38. Also see Michel ESPAGNE: «Approches anthropologiques et racines philologiques des transferts culturels», in: *L’horizon anthropologique des transferts culturels* ed. by Michel Espagne, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 2004, pp. 213–226. In this essay, Espagne drew an interesting picture of the diachronic process of transfer in the fields of philology and literature in France and Germany through the intellectual biographies of Wilhelm von Humboldt and Max Müller.
- 5 See especially Hans-Jürgen LÜSEBRINK: “Conceptual History and Conceptual Transfer: The Case of ‘Nation’ in Revolutionary France and Germany”, in: *History of concepts: comparative perspectives*, ed. by Iain Hampshire-Monk, Karin Tilmans, Frank van Vree, Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 1998, pp. 115–128. In this study, Lüsebrink investigates the intercultural ‘genesis’ of the conceptual field of ‘nation’ in France and Germany.

I. Music and the Nation: a survey of concepts

Displaying a protagonist and exemplary role for the subsequent national movements in nineteenth century Southeast Europe, the Greek nationalist ideology initiated the statement of certain themes that would recur in later nationalisms⁶. Concerning the nineteenth-century Ottoman intellectual history, as Johann Strauss's convincing study showed, one can speak about an original and specifically Greek contribution to the shaping of new ideas among the Turks⁷. Strauss himself drew attention to the close ties and connections which existed among numerous Ottoman Turkish and Greek intellectuals due to their ethnic origins, matrimonial links, professional contacts or training in Greek schools. Highly interesting for our study, is his observation about an Ottoman intellectual of Albanian origins Şemseddin Sami's (1850–1904) ideas on the Turkish language. Strauss wrote:

Many of the ideas cherished by Şemseddin Sami have parallels in the language debate among the Greeks: for example the idea of the decline and corruption (*inhibit, tedenni*) in a language which has to be stopped; or the necessity of purifying (*tathir, tasfiye*) the language by eliminating its “foreign” – in the case of Turkish: Arabic and Persian – elements⁸.

The issue of language had long been occupying the Greek intellectuals since the late eighteenth century, one of the early mentors being the revolutionary scholar Adamantios Korais (1748–1833) who demanded the purification of the vernacular language from Turkish and Italian words. Parallel to the significance of the language, in nineteenth century European nationalisms, music became a site of identification where the meaning of the nation was constructed and a sense of “national dignity” was promoted. Hence, in conjunction with the dominant discourse in nationalist narratives and nationalist historiography in Greece which condemned the period of Ottoman rule as an impediment to the progress of the nation, a specific discourse on music developed which held the political and cultural subjection of the nation responsible for a rupture in the “natural” course of the evolution of its music, and moreover, for the latter's “corruption” and “degeneration” by “non-national” musical elements and idioms. Hence, a notion of “decline” (*parakmi*) of music emerged, which was interwoven within the revolutionary political discourse of the Greek En-

6 See Vangelis KECHRIOTIS: “Adamantios Korais: Report on the Present State of Civilization in Greece”, in: *Discourses of Collective Identity in Central and Eastern Europe (1770–1945)*, vol. I: *Late Enlightenment – Emergence of the Modern ‘National Idea’*, ed. by Balazs Trencsenyi & Michal Kopecek, Budapest, 2006, p. 143. On the evidence of the ‘Report’ (1803) of the prominent revolutionary Greek intellectual Adamantios Korais, V. Kechriotis stated that “Greek nationalism may be considered the first expression of nationalism to appear outside Western Christendom among a community ruled by non-Christians and itself hitherto hostile to Western notions”.

7 Johann STRAUSS: “The Greek Connection in Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Intellectual History”, in: *Greece and the Balkans. Identities, Perceptions and Cultural Encounters since the Enlightenment*, ed. Dimitris Tziouvas, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2003, pp. 47–67.

8 J. STRAUSS: “The Greek Connection in Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Intellectual History”, p. 65.

lightenment. This motif which connected “decline” with the concept of “corruption (*parafthora*)” had the connotation of “impurity” caused by Turkish influence.

Before continuing further with notions which have largely been inherited from romantic nationalisms and their engagement with music, I would like to draw attention to how the concept of nation was subscribed into the westernization and reform attempts concerning music. The history of the westernization of music in the Ottoman Empire has been written mostly from the perspective of the dissemination of European musical forms by European musicians (generally in a continuum from the palace to the higher echelons of the society), i.e. the first opera watched by Selim III, the reform of the military music by Donizetti Pasha. However, the appropriation and adaptation of western musical concepts by indigenous musicians hint at a more interesting web of interferences both at the local and the trans-local level. In the first decades of the nineteenth century, the concern about preserving the “authentic” form of the music resulted in the invention of various notation systems, almost simultaneously by Ottoman musicians from different ethnic-religious backgrounds, which are attributed to certain Greek Orthodox⁹, Armenian¹⁰ and Muslim (Mevlevi) musicians¹¹.

Regarding the Greek Orthodox context, the fundamental innovation of Archbishop Hrisanthos was to replace the polysyllable terms of the notation in use, which denoted the neumes, with monosyllable notes *pa, vu, ga, di* etc. like the *re, mi, fa, sol* of the European system. His deliberate choice of the monosyllable notes *pA, Bou, Ga, Di, kE, Zo, nH* indicates his intention to maintain a link with the ethnic element, the alphabet¹². Hrisanthos’s influential book on music theory was published in Trieste in 1832¹³. In the prologue of *Theoritikon Mega tis Mousikis* written by a student

- 9 In 1814, a new theoretical system and a new music notation were introduced by the “Three teachers”, Hrisanthos of Madytos, Grigorios the First Cantor (*Protopsaltis*) and Hurmuzios the Archivist (*Hartofilakas*). See Kaiti ROMANOY: “I Metarrithmisi tou 1814”, *Musicology* 1 (1985), pp. 7–22.
- 10 The invention of a new notation system using the Armenian letters is attributed to Hampardzum Limondjian or later as he was called Baba Hampardzum (1768–1839). For his biography, see Komitas VARDAPET: «La Musique Religieuse Arménienne au XIXe Siècle Première Période 1839–1874», translated by Leon Ketcheyan (originally publ. in *Ararat* May 1897), in: *Revue des Etudes Arméniennes* 20, 1986–1987, pp. 497–506.
- 11 The Mevlevi sheik Abdülbaki Nasır Dede (1765–1821) explained the notational system invented by him in his book *Tabririye*, which he dedicated to Selim III. See *Osmanlı Musikî Literatürü Tarihi* [History of the Literature of Music during the Ottoman Period], ed. by Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, Istanbul, IRCICA, 2003, pp. 130–131.
- 12 This point has been made in Kaiti ROMANOY: “I Metarrithmisi tou 1814”, *Musicology* 1 (1985), pp. 7–22.
- 13 HRISANTHOS OF MADYTOS: *Θεωρητικόν μεγά της Μουσικής*, Trieste, Michele Weis, 1832, reprinted by Kouloura, Athens, 2003. In view of his exile by the Church and on the evidence of some nineteenth-century sources, musicologist Kaiti Romanou suggested that Hrisanthos had contact with the circles in Europe who supported the national movement. See Kaiti ROMANOY: “I Metarrithmisi tou 1814”, *Musicology* 1 (1985), p. 16. Romanou wrote that according to F. J. Fétis’ *Biographie Universelle des Musiciens* (2nd edition Paris, 1875), the ‘Introduction’ of Hrisanthos was published in 1821 in Paris by his student Anastasios Thamisris who was helped by a Konstantinos A. Nikolopoulos, teacher of Greek lit-

of Hrisanthos, Panagiotis G. Pelopidis, one sees the modern approach to music, so much emblematic of the Enlightenment, which became a repeated theme in the nineteenth-century discourse on music. Pertaining to the ignorance of the contemporary musicians, Pelopidis wrote: “[...] being deprived of a book teaching their art, they were not able to *progress* beyond what they received via tradition” (the emphasis belongs to me)¹⁴. Apart from the theme of “progress”, another interrelated dominant motif in the prologue-text was the “scientific” character of the book which was presented. The reader was invited to a “scientific” study of music and learning the art of composition through “scientific” means¹⁵. The idea of the representation of the nation by a scientific and progressed music continued to dominate the public and intellectual discussions also in the following decades. The discourse of “progress” and “national self-esteem” can be traced in many musical texts of the period. For instance, in the prologue of his book *Kripis itoi Nea Stoiheioidis Didaskalia tou Theoritikou kai Praktikou tis Ekklesiastikis Mousikis*, the *Lambadarios* (head of the left-choir) of the Great Church Stephanos wrote that he hoped to “satisfy the desires of those who, having seen the present national *progress* and improvement which is visible everywhere in [our] Genos, want to see also the divine art of [St. John] Damascene’s torch taking its due place among other fine arts” (the emphasis belongs to me)¹⁶.

The notion of “decline” in music which was generally employed concomitantly with an appeal to a reform of the existing state of music – whether or not it was conceptualized as the national music – through “scientific” methods resonated intimately with the modernist project of the Ottoman Turkish educated elite. Abundant musicological discussions in the columns of the Greek and Turkish newspapers of the time, which conveyed discourses of “objectivity” and “science”, may be seen as the concrete media of transfers of ideas and discourses¹⁷. The following excerpt from an

erature and amateur musician who would publish religious and patriotic Greek songs, and texts with patriotic content after 1821.

- 14 HRISANTHOS OF MADYTOS: *Θεωρητικόν μεγά της Μουσικής*, p. θ’: “[...] διότι στερούμενοι διδακτικού βιβλίου της τέχνης των, δεν δύνανται να προχωρήσωσι περαιτέρω από όσα κατά παράδοσιν έλαβαν”.
- 15 HRISANTHOS OF MADYTOS: *Θεωρητικόν μεγά της Μουσικής*, p. η’: “Μάθετε την τέχνην της Μελοποιίας, και τον τρόπον του συνθέτειν τας μελωδίας με λόγον επιστημονικώτατον [...]”.
- 16 Stephanos LAMBADARIOS: *Κρηπίς ητοι Νέα Στοιχειώδης Διδασκαλία του Θεωρητικού και Πρακτικού της Εκκλησιαστικής Μουσικής*, ed. by. D. Ioannis Protopsaltou, Constantinople, Patriarchal Publishing House, 1875, p. δ’.
- 17 Turkish and Greek musicians were also referring to each other’s works. For instance, Ebu Refi Kazim (1872–1938) mentioned in his essay in the journal *Malumat*, the research and the measurements of Nikolaos Paganas (1844–1907) with praise and published the values that Paganas found for the chord lengths which gave the sounds of the European instruments, saying that the differences of these lengths complied with his own findings. See Merih EROL: *Cultural Identifications of the Greek Orthodox Elite of Constantinople: Discourse on Music in the Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries*, Ph.D diss., Boğaziçi University, Istanbul 2009, pp. 322–323.

essay written by the Turkish musician Ali Rifat Çağatay (1869–1935)¹⁸ is striking in its revelation of some notions and discourses that we have seen so far in the works of the Greek authors:

Oriental music which is the product of the beautiful harmony of art and nature is composed of melodies that give pleasure and enjoyment to the soul. While in the last two centuries, it [oriental music] showed a significant progress within the laws of the science of mathematics, yet merely due to the fact that the theory of this science [music] was not given enough importance it waned in comparison to its previous grandeur¹⁹.

The romantic and nostalgic discourses on music which prevailed among the Ottoman musicians of the previous centuries, posited music as an art and science whose rules had been established by the ancient founders. In his previously mentioned book on music theory, the Greek Orthodox cantor Stephanos wrote that any effort to study ecclesiastical music would be in vain without a full knowledge of the principles (*ar-hai*) and the canons (*kanones*) which were handed over by the ancient founders and teachers of the science and art of chanting²⁰. Attesting to the continuity of these notions, some decades later, taking a stance against the western influences in music, Ali Rifat (Çağatay) would warn his readers against the danger of “seeking to improve [our] music by altering its old style (*tarz-ı kadîm*), that is, by intermingling it with European music (*alafranga*) and thereby adulterating it (*mablût bir hâle gelmesi*)”, which would cause, in his view, the destruction and the loss of “the rules that the honorable ancestors (*eslâf-ı kirâm*) established with utmost care”²¹.

I do not claim to have examined exhaustively the dynamic and the dialogical development of the Greek and the Turkish musical debates in this preliminary survey of the “travelling” concepts and themes. Nevertheless, what I have tried to do was to draw attention to the emergence of a repertoire of certain tropes and themes pertaining to music throughout the nineteenth-century, i.e. the “decline”, “corruption”, and “progress” of music, the “scientific” rules of music, and the notion of music as ancestral heritage.

II. Music of the Nation: the notion and the project of “national” music

In the previous section, my main approach was to focus on the interferences between Greek and Turkish domains of musical concepts and discourses. This final part shifts the focus of transfers from an entangled history of the concepts related to music and

18 Ali Rifat (Çağatay) was an oud player and composer. He taught at *Darüelhan* (House of Melodies), the music school which was opened in 1914. He was the founder of the *Oriental Music Association* in Istanbul which was established during the WWI and was also the founding president of the *Institute for Turkish Music*.

19 Ali RİFAT (Çağatay): “Mukaddime (Introduction)”, *Malumat*, 23 May 1895 in: Faysal Arpağuş: *Malumat Mecmuası'nın 1–500 Sayılarında Yer Alan Türk Musikisi ile İlgili Makaleler* [The Articles on Turkish Music Published in the 1–500th Issues of the Journal *Malumat*], MA Thesis submitted to Marmara University, Istanbul, 2004, p. 19.

20 Stephanos LAMBADARIOS: *Κρητίς ητοι Νέα Στοιχειώδης Διδασκαλία του Θεωρητικού και Πρακτικού της Εκκλησιαστικής Μουσικής*, p. γ'.

21 Ali RİFAT (Çağatay): “Mukaddime (Introduction)”, p. 22.

the nation in the Greek Orthodox and Muslim *millet*s of the Ottoman Empire and the acculturation of musicians who crossed ethnic, religious and linguistic borders, to a comparative and transfer history of the notion of and the project of (building) a “national” music, focusing not only on the Turkish and Greek national spaces but also on a broader trans-European area.

Since the late eighteenth century, romantic nationalism inspired in various parts of Europe the discovery of an authentic repertoire of narratives, symbols, musical styles, and sounds which were claimed on behalf of the nation. More often than not, in East-Central and Northern Europe, collections of folk epics, poetry and folk songs served for the creation of a written language as they provided examples of the local dialects from which the grammar of the national language was derived. Considerable amount of studies attest to the parallelisms, exchanges and interplays between the language movements and the aspiration for the creation of “national” musics²². The national/cultural movements which competed on the Ottoman territories in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, namely Hellenism, Slavism and Turkism developed as open entities in interaction with each other²³. One of the shared themes in all these nationalisms was the significance given to the folk culture as the repository of the essence of the nation. Hence, many of the late Ottoman intellectuals coming from different ethnic and cultural backgrounds showed a similar attitude towards folk music as the authentic musical heritage of the nation and also expressed a similar call for a reform of the urban/scholarly music which bore “non-national” idioms due to the long centuries of coexistence with other ethnic and linguistic groups²⁴.

Having said this, I would also like to note the connections of these particular national movements to those that emerged in Central and Northern Europe and hence, even though it is beyond the limits of this article, I would like to argue for writing the history of the notions such as “national” music as a trans-European phenomenon and for integrating the cultural history of the so called “border” regions²⁵ into a com-

22 See Stale KLEIBERG: “Following Grieg: David Monrad Johansen’s Musical Style in the Early Twenties, and His Concept of a National Music”, in: *Musical Constructions of Nationalism: Essays on the History and Ideology of European Musical Culture 1800–1945*, ed. by Harry White and Michael Murphy, Dublin, Cork University Press, 2001, pp. 142–162, p. 160.

23 Arzu Öztürkmen noted that these nationalisms were part of the same cultural system. See A. ÖZTÜRKMEN: *Türkiye’de Folklor ve Milliyetçilik* [Folklore and Nationalism in Turkey], Istanbul, İletişim, 1998, p. 19.

24 The collection and dissemination of folk songs was a shared concern for both Greek and Turkish nation-building attempts. Notwithstanding the long history of the folk song collections in Europe, one can perhaps talk about a local transfer of ideas and models within the Ottoman cultural elite. For instance, it is worth noting that not much later than the awarding of five folk music collectors by the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople in 1895–96, Necip Asım (1861–1935) wrote a letter to the editor of the journal *Malumat* demanding the publication of the old Turkish folk songs, shepherd songs, and the works of the bards and local poets. For Necip Asım’s letter, see Faysal ARPAGUŞ: *Malumat Mecmuası’nın 1–500 Sayılarında Yer Alan Türk Musikisi ile İlgili Makaleler*, pp. 106–110.

25 See Anna Veronika WENDLAND: „Randgeschichten? Osteuropäische Perspektiven auf Kulturtransfer und Verflechtungsgeschichte”, in: *Transfergeschichte(n). Peripherie und Zent-*

mon European history (or perhaps, overcoming the standard way of history writing of these regions at the border of the European historical development²⁶). Furthermore, I would like to call for the investigation of the contacts between the different “border” regions. A recent approach which has attempted to write a social and cultural history of ‘opera’ as genre and institution from a global perspective, noted the convergence of the two processes; the instrumentalization of the opera in the service of national competence within the “center” on the one hand, and the perception of the genre at the geographical margins of Europe as a *par excellence* European art form, on the other²⁷. This brings me to the issue of the complicated processes of perception and meaning formation between the center and periphery. It has been argued that the term ‘national school of music’, which came to be used by the twentieth-century historians of music, is in fact a product of the Western discourse, and that when it refers to Russian, Czech, Hungarian and Scandinavian art musics, it inheres a sense of being peripheral²⁸. Hence, the notion of “national music” bears a subtle twist which conceals the marginality, with reference to the (west) European canon, of the musical cultures that aspire to create a national art music.

In Greece, an early twentieth-century manifestation of the notion of “national” music belongs to the composer Georgios Lambelet. Taking stance against the contemporary modernist approaches to art, which saw art merely as an inspiration coming from the inner self of the artist, Lambelet stated that the source of real art was the national idea and the people²⁹. The musical works of the Russian and the Scandinavian composers set powerful examples before the twentieth-century Greek and Turkish musicians who aimed at building national art traditions. The “national music” which the western educated Greek musicians aspired to create was not a music which was merely a construction of a glorious music on the basis of reviving the ancient Greek heritage by means of inspirations from ethnic and religious elements, but rather a music that addressed the whole world with a contemporary musical

rum, Osteuropa 58. Jg., 3/2008, pp. 95–116; Daniel URSPRUNG: „Die Peripherie als Zentrum. Osteuropa und die Kulturgeschichte des Politischen“, in: *Transfergeschichte(n). Peripherie und Zentrum*, pp. 145–56.

26 See Antonis LIAKOS: “Canon and the conceptual frameworks of modern history”, in: *Transnational Concepts, transfers and the challenge of the peripheries*, ed. by Gürçan Koçan, Istanbul, Istanbul Technical University Press, 2008, pp. 20–29.

27 Philipp THER: „Introduction“, in: *Oper im Wandel der Gesellschaft. Kulturtransfers und Netzwerke des Musiktheaters im modernen Europa*, ed. by Sven Oliver Müller, Philipp Ther, Jutta Toelle and Gesa zur Nieden, Wien, Böhlau, 2010, p. 17.

28 Carl DAHLHAUS: “Nationalism and Music”, in: *Between Romanticism and Modernism: Four Studies in the Music of the late Nineteenth Century* ed. by Mary Whittall, Berkeley, 1980, p. 89.

29 Georgios LAMBELET: “Η Εθνική Μουσική, η Λαϊκή” (1901): “Η τέχνη λοιπόν η αντλούσα την υπόστασίν της από τας αγνάς και ειλικρινείς πηγάς της εθνικής ιδέας είνε η αληθινή τέχνη [...]”; “Η αφετηρία πάσης τέχνης επηγάξει βέβαια πάντοτε από τον λαόν”, in: Olympia Frangou-Psychopedis: *Η Εθνική Σχολή Μουσικής. Προβλήματα Ιδεολογίας* [The national school of music. The problems of ideology], Athens, Ίδρυμα Μεσογειακών Μελετών, 1990, p. 219, 221.

idiom³⁰. Exactly for this reason, the Greek composer Manolis Kalomiris (1883–1962) admired the achievements of the Russian composers i.e. Tchaikovsky, Rimsky Korsakov and Mussorgsky. He wrote, in his memoirs:

With the sounds and the rhythms of the people's musical language, with its lamentations and its pains, the contemporary Russian composers built a musical language of their own, which possessed all the artistic mysteries of the universal music [...].³¹

However, for the Greek composer, the “nationalist” music should take a distance from the patterns and the mentality of the artistic and intellectual movements that developed in the West. His appreciating remarks for the Norwegian composer Grieg's music, bears this tension:

[...] still today, these childhood impressions make me feel a distinct emotionality and a special fascination for the music of the Norwegian composer, even though his nationalistic inspiration veils, quite transparently, the deep influence of German romantic music and mentality.³²

Elsewhere, in a polemical article criticizing the Italian ‘style’ education in Athens Conservatory, he wrote:

“[our] demotic music is outside the tonic circle of the Italian, French, German and Danish musics, like the Norwegian and the Russian demotic music ... at least for me, a Norwegian song reminds me more of our national music than ten Italian operas”³³.

The issue of national music had to address the West/East question and the Western/Eastern identifications of the debated age-old distinction between the Hellenic vs. Romeic thesis. Here, we also have to mention the particular juncture concerning the social and the cultural divisions in the early twentieth-century Greek society, which were to a great extent registered in the movement for the demotic language. The movement of demoticism favored the Romeic image of Greekness which drew on the Orthodox Christian tradition in contradistinction to the position of the so-called Hellenists who highlighted the ancient, pagan belief and argued for the continuity of the ancient Greek ideal on the terrain of independent Greece. However, both the Hellenic and the Romeic images had their own advantages, and instead of

30 Ibid., pp. 225–226. Georgios Lambelet held Grieg up as an example, saying that in his compositions, Grieg borrowed abundantly from Norwegian songs, and at the same time, enriched his music with the means of the contemporary polyphonic technique.

31 Manolis KALOMIRIS: *Η Ζωή μου και η τέχνη μου. Απομνημονεύματα 1883–1908*, Athens, Εκδόσεις Νεφέλη, 1988, pp. 98–99: “Με τους ήχους και τους ρυθμούς της μουσικής γλώσσας αυτού του λαού, με τους θρύλους του και τους καημούς του, οι Νεορώσοι συνθέτες είχαν φτιάξει μια δική τους μουσική γλώσσα, που κάτεχε όλα τα τεχνικά μυστικά της παγκόσμιας μουσικής [...]”. Kalomiris wrote his memoirs some time before the Second World War and during the Occupation.

32 Ibid., p. 78.

33 Manolis KALOMIRIS: “Η Τέχνη μου κι'οι πόθοι μου. Για ωδεία και για τ'οδείο”, *Νοημα* 31 January 1910, pp. 1–6 quoted in Kaiti Romanou: *Εθνικής Μουσικής Περιήγησις* [Wandering through the National Music], vol. I, Athens, Kouloura, 1996, p. 217.

two terms which are schematically opposed to each other, they should rather be seen as subject to the selective nature of historical interpretation³⁴.

Manolis Kalomiris, who was an ardent supporter of the demotic movement, employed in some of his works, the musical expression of ‘West vs. East’ and ‘ruling elite vs. the people’ oppositions that featured the operas of certain Russian composers, as Kaiti Romanou argues, in his search for a musical language in identifying the Greek nationality with the Orient³⁵.

In Turkey, the concept of “national” music was defined mainly in view of a westernization/modernization problematic. The construction of “national” music was part of the aspiration of the first generation of bureaucrats, intellectuals and experts to build a “homogenous” and westernized nation. The West/East dilemma and modernization themes which had long been in the center of intellectual discussions were sought to be overcome by a distinction (and at the same time, a fusion) between a concept of “authentic” culture and a concept of civilization which was necessarily Western. Hence, the rather simplistic formula of a synthesis of the folk music and Western music was offered by the famous ideologue of the early Turkish Republic Ziya Gökalp towards the creation of “a music which was both national and European”³⁶. A paradox, noted by Füsün Üstel, pertaining to the relationship and the attitude of the Republican elite to the folk culture of Anatolia is worth to reflect upon. Üstel wrote that, different than the Ottoman intellectual who had an intense notion of the State but not a concrete notion of the homeland, the Republican intellectual, after the shrinking of the Ottoman territory, had to face a socially undefined reality of Anatolia. Hence, in his attempt of defining this multicultural, heterogeneous and fuzzy structure, he constructed a unity from its certain parts and brought it under state control, more precisely; this meant the “codification” and dissemination of folk music by the political power³⁷.

Similarly, regarding folk dances a process of re-appropriation, modification and readjustment took effect in order to construct a westernized “national” dance. As mentioned also in the Greek context, there were instances where the guiding experts of the cultural policies in Turkey, were inspired by certain north European countries which were acknowledged for having built a national tradition based on an inventive

34 For the Hellenic and Romeic thesis, see Michael HERZFELD: *Ours once more: Folklore, ideology and the making of modern Greece*, New York, Pella, 1986, pp. 18–19. Herzfeld furthermore argues that these two positions indicate a distinction between an outward directed conformity to international expectations about the national image and an inward looking self critical collective appraisal.

35 See Kaiti ROMANOU: “Eastern Naturalness versus Western Artificiality: Rimsky-Korsakov’s Influence on Manoles Kalomirois’ Early Operas”, *Journal of the Institute of Musicology of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts* 5 (2005), pp. 101–115.

36 Ziya GÖKALP: *Türkçülüğün Esasları* [The Principles of Turkism], Istanbul, M. E. Basımevi, [1923] 1970, pp. 146–7 quoted in Füsün ÜSTEL: “1920’li ve 30’lu Yıllarda “Milli Müsiki” ve Müsiki İnkılabı” [“National Music” and the “Musical Revolution” in the 1920 and 30s], *Defter* 22 (Fall 1994), pp. 41–53. The parallelism with the conceptions and the ideals of the Greek musicians like G. Lambelet and M. Kalomiris, regarding the establishment of an art music with both national and contemporary features, is obvious.

37 Füsün ÜSTEL: “1920’li ve 30’lu Yıllarda “Milli Müsiki” ve Müsiki İnkılabı”, pp. 48–49.

appropriation of their folk culture. In this vein, we should mention Selim Sırrı Tarcan's (1873–1953) efforts to create a western “national” dance based on his long-term engagement in collecting the *zeybek* dances from various parts of western and central Anatolia³⁸. Reminding the exemplary role of the “border” regions of Europe on the Turkish latecomers of nationalism, in his book on the folk dances and the *zeybek* dance choreographed by him as the “national” dance *par excellence*, Tarcan refers to his impressions and observations in Sweden – he received physical training education there in 1909 – concerning the practice of the folk dances in public and their capability of stirring national feelings³⁹.

Conclusion

The purpose of this article was to introduce the research agenda of cultural transfers into the study of the Greek and Turkish ethno-national spaces in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Within the limited confines of this study, it was not possible to analyze the genesis of some concepts in a more in-depth way and many actors in the field could not be mentioned. In the first part, I aimed at sketching the field of certain notions pertaining to music – within the broader discourse of nationalism – without necessarily defining them as borrowings between the two contexts, Greek and Turkish. In the second part, the concept of “national” music – a loaded term of the twentieth century – whose intellectual and ideological roots go back to the late eighteenth century, was investigated both comparatively in the Greek and Turkish contexts and also as an example of cultural transfers across Europe. I tried to show how the Western/Eastern identity problematic crossed both the Greek and the Turkish contexts, but with some difference. In Republican Turkey, a synthesis of West European polyphonic music and Anatolian folk music was imposed as the “national” music – where the musical question was located in a civilizing problematic – whose primary concern was to picture a western identity of the nation and society. In the case of Greece, the West/East dilemma, rather than being entangled necessarily with a civilizing problematic, underlined a tension between the ethnic and the religious foundations of the national identity, Hellenic vs. Romeic models, and was effective in the way “national” music was conceptualized.

38 A. Öztürkmen noted that Selim Sırrı Tarcan integrated the genuine motifs of the *zeybek* dances to a western form. ARZU ÖZTÜRKMEN: *Türkiye’de Folklor ve Milliyetçilik*, p. 227.

39 Selim Sırrı TARCAN: *Halk Dansları ve Tarcan Zeybeği* [Folk Dances and the Tarcan Zeybek], İstanbul, Ülkü Basımevi, 1948 quoted in A. ÖZTÜRKMEN: *Türkiye’de Folklor ve Milliyetçilik*, pp. 225–226.