

Some *zurnacies* from Southwest Bulgaria declare that the *zurna* originates from Turkey [Пейчева, 1993:48-49]. They bring various arguments: what has been said by old people, the ban on the instrument due to its being Turkish during the so-called regeneration process. “The *zurna*’s from the Turkish yoke. The *zurna*’s a Turkish production. It’s neither Gypsy, nor Indian. They were arguin’ once, and I spoke for a long time to that old man and copied, I even got a cassette from him. He says “nobody’d fool you that it’s Arab, Indian, or Egyptian. From now on the *zurna*’s from the Turks. The *zurna* remains a Turkish instrument”. So they banned us, since it’s a Turkish instrument” [C.Д., 02/2001, p.8]. The clan’s memories document the Turkish origin of particular instruments. Answering the question “Who produced the instruments in the past?”, a *zurnaci* from Petrich gives the name of a Bulgarian craftsman but says that the *zurnas* were imported from Turkey: “Mostly from Turkey. My granddad’s *svirka* was from Turkey. My granddad Kurta’s was from Istanbul. And we called the *zurna* “Stamboliyka” (coming from Istanbul)” [Д.К., 10/2001, p.49].

The *zurnacies* from Gotse Delchev, identifying as Turks, insist on calling their music Turkish. Their unstable identity is apparent in the contradictory definitions of their own music. They argue that they are playing for everybody – *Pomaks*, Bulgarians, Turks and Gypsies. They play a repertoire at a Bulgarian Christian wedding; recall playing at Bulgarian banquets, of being members in Bulgarian folk ensembles. Meanwhile these musicians claim that their *zurnaci* music is Turkish, since they are Turks: “That’s called *kuşak* – a belt. In Turkish a belt. The thing we’ve begun playing, it’s all Turkish. There’s neither Bulgarian music, nor Gypsy, or this or that or the other. Only Turkish music” [M.M., p.37]. They quote linguistic proof: *Kuşak (h)avasi, Üç ayık, Tauşan, Türk (h)avasi, İstanbul (h)avasi, Nebet, Kandrelî*⁴ etc. All these are Turkish names. Consequently the *zurnacies*’ repertoire is Turkish. The musicians quote evidence from folk history transmitted down the generations in their clan. The *zurnacies* are *mehters*, as they used to play in the Turkish military orchestras: “My granddad was a great master. He even played even to *vojvodas*. In those days to the *vojvodas* of the Turks” [Д.К., 10/2001, p.49]. According to clan memory, the oldest times are the Turkish. As seen, it is an easy step to defining the traditional, inherited music as Turkish. For example a *zurnaci* from Kavrakirovo describes the beginning of the *Rusalia* plays as follows: “the Turkish march. They come with *fezes* (red cone-like caps worn by the men in the Ottoman Empire – n.a.), with the knife...” [C.Д., 08/2001, p.3].

One could comment on the arbitrariness of the ethnosymbolism in this opinion, starting with relating the fez to the Turkish. In fact it is an emblem of Ottomanism. The Kemalists who constructed modern Turkish national identity passed a law banning it [Stokes, 1992:26]. The relationship of the *zurna* with the Ottoman (called by the *zurnacies* Turkish) past in the consciousness of the players has historic grounds. Sources about the occurrence and rise of the Ottoman Empire (14th - 17th century) attest that the *zurna* and *tapan* were the musical instruments most used by Gypsies [Марушикова, Ионов, 2000:49]. The definition of *zurnaci* music as Turkish-style is shared even by scholars with authority: “Turks, Greeks and Slavs were close neighbours in the Ottoman Empire and shared many elements of their cultures. At village fairs, Bulgarians enjoyed the wrestling accompanied by *davul-zurna* which was a “Turkish-style” tradition” [Rice, 1994:40]. Discussions on the Turkish trace in interrelations between the musical traditions of Balkan peoples are often laden with prejudices. A Bulgarian connoisseur of *zurnaci* music and of