

Stephen Blum

Ph.D. Professor of Music, City University
of New York Graduate Center, Consulting
Editor for Music of the Encyclopaedia Iranica,
USA, Member of ICTM
e-mail: Sblum@gc.cuny.edu

**TRANSMISSION OF MUSIC THEORY
THROUGH LISTS OF TERMS ENHANCED
WITH PROPER NAMES**

Keywords: shashmaqom, radif, dastgah, şöbə, güşə, composition and performance.

The muğam/maqām schools have long relied on a format for encoding music theory that works equally well in oral and written transmission: lists of named units that join proper names like *Rāst* and *Segāh* with technical terms for genres, like *dastgāh* and *darāmad*. Such lists summarize doctrines on the appropriate sequencing of units in performance – prescriptions that performers necessarily modify to fit the circumstances in which they work. Speaking of the Bukharian shashmaqom, the late poet-musician Ilyas Mallayev (1936–2010) observed that “to play maqom correctly you must play it in the exact order, but for concerts it is possible to play ‘fragments,’ and to perform it in other ways” (Rapport, 2014: 52). Yet Bukharian musicians are likely to perform whatever pieces they select in the prescribed order, as Roshel Rubinov commonly does with three pieces drawn from the initial sequence of *maqom Navo: talqini Bayot, nasri Bayot, and ufari Bayot* (ibid.). Although his selection omits *saraxbor* which, as the Persian prefix *sar-* implies, should come first in the vocal portion of a maqom, in adhering to the sequence of genres in which *nasr* follows *talqin* and *ufar* follows *nasr*, Rubinov reproduces important aspects of a preexisting compositional plan that, among other things, specifies the rhythmic cycle and poetic meter(s) appropriate to each genre. Similarly, musicians who choose to perform only two or three of what the late musician and theorist al-Haj Hashim al-Rijab (1921–

2006) termed the six ‘pillars’ (*arkān*) of the Iraqi maqām will at least respect the prescribed order of the genres *tahrīr*, *meyāna*, and *teslim* (Hassan, 2008: 105), which (as with *saraxbor*) is implicit in the terms themselves: an action is set in motion and centered before concluding with a descent.

The extensive sequences that constitute the Bukharian shashmaqom, the Persian radif, the Azeri muğam repertory, and the cycles (*fusūl*) of the Iraqi maqām are compilations designed to incorporate genres of diverse provenance – a point emphasized by Sanubar Bagirova (1992, repr. 2007) and Scheherazade Hassan (2008) in their studies of terminology in the Azeri muğam and the Iraqi maqām, respectively. We all know that proper names as well as terms for genres have acquired new meanings in passing from one practice to another, for reasons that can be difficult if not impossible to reconstruct. Scholarship on the muğam/maqām schools would be well served by a long-term collaborative lexicographic project aimed at registering the multiple meanings of technical terms and proper names as they are combined in the different practices, with attention to areas of disagreement as well as to efforts at standardizing usage. The sizeable fund of terms and names shared among the various schools allows for combinations of several types.

Each term for a genre refers to a limited or unlimited number of entities that share certain features, whereas the great merit of proper names is that we expect each of them to designate an individual with a unique set of characteristics that remains recognizable from one occasion to another. The muğam/maqām schools differ in how terms for genres and proper names are employed at each level of a hierarchical ordering.

Some terms designate units on more than one structural level, even within a single practice. For example, in Nur ‘Ali Borumand’s teaching of the Persian radif, the term *darāmad* ‘entering in’ designates both the initial gushes of any *dastgāh* or *āvāz* to which the first line of a ghazal is sung, and the initial phrases of certain gushes that initiate a secondary sequence of units within a *dastgāh* or *āvāz*, such as the sequence named ‘*Erāq* within the *dastgāh* of *Māhur*, where it normally follows *Shekaste* and precedes the *Rāk* sequence in the radif of Mirzā ‘Abdollah (d. 1918).¹ In a recorded

explication of *Māhur*, Borumand announces the three *darāmads* of the *gushe* called '*Erāq*' (Farhat and Asadi, 2005: disc 2, tr. 15, 0:00–1:40); seven more *gushes* with different names then follow to complete the '*Erāq*' sequence. In the *shashmaqom*, *daromad* may likewise designate the initial phase of a major unit, embracing several phrases (Rajabii, 1966: 11, 21; Karamatov and Radjabov, 1981: 108), though in Ari Babakhanov's notation of the *shashmaqom* (Jung 2010) major units generally begin with a phrase labeled *namud* 'manifestation.'² In the Azeri *muğam*, the *daramad* is an instrumental introduction that precedes the singer's entry. Thus, the term designates four different ways of 'entering in' to a sequence of units that bears a proper name.

Names of the most extensive sequences in all the schools join a term like *muğam* or *dastgāh* to a proper name which might be that of a scale degree (*Segāh*), emotion (*Shur*), quality (*Homāyun*), place (*Shushtar*), or ethnicity (*Bayāti Kurd*), to name only five major sources of names. While the term *shashmaqom* leaves no doubt about the correct number of *maqoms*, Persian musicians argue about which sequences deserve to be called *dastgāh*. Those who speak of twelve (e.g., Farhat, 1990: 20–21) include the less extensive sequences that are called *āvāz* by musicians who would limit the number of *dastgāhs* to seven (e.g., Kiāni, 1992) and who thus use the term *haft dastgāh* in the way that Bukharians speak of *shashmaqom*. The numbers twelve and seven are also prominent in Azeri theory, as in Bahram Mansurov's roster of twelve *muğams* that can also be called *dastgah*, seven of which are said to be "more important" (During, 1988: 38). Most of those seven names have a place on Hajibeyov's roster of what, borrowing the Russian term *лад*, he called "seven basic lads" (*yeddi esas ladi*) (Hajibeyov, 1988 [1945]: 14).

The compositional plan of an extensive sequence is almost certain to include less extensive sequences, and it may allow or even require interpolation of shorter sequences or shorter units of various sorts in the course of performance. These relationships – greater or lesser extent, inclusion or interpolation – need to be marked with appropriate terms, though where terminology falls short, musicians can learn to remember a series of units as a larger grouping that may

not need to be named. In the terminology of the Iraqī maqām, *quta* ‘designates pieces that a singer may interpolate “as a means to avoid monotony” (Hassan, 2008: 107), the same aim that inspires Azeri musicians to insert more than one tasnif or reng within a performance of ghazals. Persian singers may do the same with tasnifs, if at less frequent intervals, though a reng comes only after all the vocalizing has concluded. A singer of the shashmaqom may choose to perform lighter taronas after a weightier vocal genre like saraxbor, talqin, or nasr. The larger point here is, once again, that expectations of suitable moments within a sequence are attached to terms for genres.

The proper names assigned to full sequences generally signify membership of that sequence in one or more categories within a system of classification. Scheherazade Hassan lists several categories to which an Iraqī maqām may be assigned (Table 1), starting with the dichotomy of *aşliyya* ‘principal’ and *far’iyya* ‘derived,’ whose various forms have a long history in the traditions we are discussing. These categories are based on discriminations – such as ‘complex’ or ‘simple,’ ‘strong’ or ‘weak,’ ‘big’ or ‘small,’ ‘heavy’ or ‘light,’ ‘difficult’ or ‘easy’ – which have long been used in formulating sequencing rules, such as the norm that ‘heavy’ should precede ‘light’ just as elders (who supposedly prefer heavier genres and metric cycles) have precedence over their juniors. Without necessarily being named as such, some of these distinctions can be perceived and attached to the name of a sequence or of one of its parts.

Table 1. “Normative classification of the Iraqī maqām” (see Hassan, 2008: 109–113).

<i>al-maqāmāt . . .</i>
<i>al-aşliyya</i> / <i>al-far’iyya</i> ‘principal’ / ‘derived’
<i>al-dakhila fîl fuşûl</i> / <i>ghair al-dakhila fîl fuşûl</i> ‘forming part of the cycles’ / ‘not’
<i>al-fuşhā</i> or <i>al-shi’riyya</i> / <i>al-’āmmiyya</i> ‘sung in literary Arabic poetry’ / sung in colloquial poetry’
<i>tughanna ma’a al-īqā’</i> / <i>la tughanna ma’a al-īqā’</i> ‘accompanied by rhythmic cycles / not

al-muqayyada / *al-muṭlaqa* : order & number of pieces ‘is constrained’ / ‘is free’

al-murakkaba / *al-basiṭa* ‘complex’ / ‘simple’

al-ṣa‘ida / *al-nazila* : initial melodic contour ‘ascending’ / ‘descending’

al-mutashabiha ‘similar’

al-qawīyya / *al-dha‘īfa* ‘strong’ / ‘weak’

al-saghīra / *al-kabīra* ‘small’ / ‘big’

al-khafīfa / *al-thaqīla* ‘light’ / ‘heavy’

al-sahīla / *al-ṣa‘iba* ‘easy’ / ‘difficult’

NB: Hassan notes that the final four categories “use metaphoric descriptions and are often personal.”

The earliest uses of the term *dastgāh* noticed by current scholars of Persian theoretical writings distinguish a maqām or naghma that “has *dastgāh*” (*sāheb-e dastgāh*) or is “not lacking a *dastgāh*” (*khāli az dastgāhi nist*) from one that is “without (*bi*) *dastgāh*” or lacks “a substantial [*chandāni*] *dastgāh*” (for these expressions, see the anonymous seventeenth-century treatise *Dar bayān-e ‘elm-e musiqi va dānestan-e sho‘abāt-e u* ‘Explanation of the science of music and knowledge of its branches,’ edited by Purjavādy, 2002).³ In current Azeri usage, it is the most extensive muğams that are called *dastgah*, which might seem to retain the earliest sense of the term, though in the treatise mentioned two naghmas ‘having *dastgāh*’ are associated with two compositional genres, *tasnif* and *varsāqi*, which suggests to me that *dastgāh* may once have designated a scheme of modulation allowing for, but not requiring, an extensive sequence of units.

Be that as it may, the units constituting an Azeri *dastgah* are called either *şöbə* or *güşə*, the latter being shorter (Zohrabov, 1991: 95 and 1999: 131–132; During, 1988: 41–42). In theoretical writings since at least the 1960s (such as the introduction to Rajabii 1966), units in each of the shashmaqom are also called *shu‘ba* (Tojiki) or *şöbə* (Uzbek), whereas each unit of the Persian radif is a *gushe* no matter what its length, and distinctions of length must be associated with proper names.⁴ Rajabii adopted the Russian term *группа* for the two major divisions within the vocal portion of a maqom, the second

of which embraces smaller groupings bearing such generic names as *savt*, *mughulcha*, and *mustazod*, to which proper names are attached, as in *savti Sarvinoz* and *mustazodi Rok*, both in the second principal group of maqom *Buzruk*. Each of those genres is itself a sequence of genres, such as *chapandoz*, *talqin*, *qashqarcha*, *soqinoma*, and *ufar* in *savti Sarvinoz* (Jung, 2010: 48–59). This hierarchical arrangement can produce names like *soqinomai savti Sarvinoz* (ibid.: 54), following the formula *genre X of genre Y of proper name Z*.

The *Rok* sequence in the maqom *Buzruk* is comparable in length to the series of five or six gushes that begins with *Rāk* in the Persian *dastgāh Māhur*, whose proper names in vocal and instrumental radifs include *Rāk*, *Naghme-ye Rāk*, *Safir-e Rāk*, *Rāk-e hendi*, *Rāk-e ‘Abdollāh*, and *Rāk-e Keshmir* in highly variable orderings; the instrumental radifs of Mirzā ‘Abdollāh and Āqā Hoseyn Qoli (d. 1916) also allow for the genre *chahār mezrāb* and the rhythmic pattern *kereshme* in *Rāk* (During, 1991: 234 and Pirniākān, 2001: 134, respectively). A Persian gushe like *Rāk* or *‘Erāq*, whose name also designates the sequence of half a dozen or so pieces that it initiates, is sometimes called a *shāh gushe*. Whereas the Bukharian *Rok* follows a conventional sequence of genres (*Rok* itself, *mostazad*, *qashqarcha*, *soqi-noma*, and *ufar* in Beliaev, 1950: 243–58; the same sequence with *talqincha* replacing *mostazad* in Rajabii, 1966: 162–74), a *shāh gushe* is not subject to any such constraint. Gushes in different radifs that share a proper name like *Rāk-e Keshmir* may or may not display any musical similarities, and similar melodies may well bear different proper names.⁵

A grouping like the *Rok* sequence of *Buzruk* is sometimes called a *shu‘ba* by Bukharian Jewish performers of the shashmaqom in New York City, who apply such Persian terms as *ohang* ‘tune’ and *porcha* ‘piece’ (rather than *shu‘ba*) to individual units within groups (Rapport, 2014: 52). Although in current usage *shu‘ba* / *šōbā* designates either a unit or a group of units within a larger sequence, the term may have carried different meanings at various moments in its long history, in which it has generally denoted some sort of relation to *maqām/makom/muğam* and often to *āvāz* as well. Trying to imagine what those relations may have been at one or another time and place is a continuing challenge for

readers of treatises. What are we to make of the formula *12 maqām / 24 shu‘ba / 6 āvāz* that turns up in Persian treatises for five centuries following its appearance in chapter six of Marāghi’s *Jāme‘ al-alhān* (holograph dated 1415)?⁶

The four or five *āvāz* associated with the *dastgāh Shur* (*Abu ‘atā, Afshāri, Bayāt-e Kurd, Bayāt-e Turk, and Dashti*) and the one or two associated with the *dastgāh Homāyun* (*Bayāt-e Esfahān* and *Shushtari*) have been called ‘derivatives’ (*mota‘alleqāt*), which might imply that one or more *āvāz* could be inserted within a performance of *Shur* or *Homāyun*; or it might refer to a perceived affinity of substance (*māye*, a Persian term that is now more actively used by Azeri than by Persian musicians).⁷ I have never heard a performance of Persian *Shur* or *Homāyun* that included one of its *mota‘alleqāt*. Except for *Abu ‘atā* and *Afshāri*, all the names mentioned are applied to entities in the Azeri repertoire, where they designate either a *muğam* with the status of *dəstgah* (*Şuştar*), a less extensive *muğam* (*Esfahan*), or a *şöbə* (*Bəyat-e Kurd, Bəyat-e Turk, Dəşti*). The latter two categories overlap to a greater extent than do *āvāz* and *gushe* in the Persian *radif*, as lists of a *dəstgah*’s component units may include names from any of these categories (see, for instance, the three lists for *Rast* in Zohrabov, 1991: 106 and 1999: 144).

In the *shashmaqom*, as mentioned, the name of a *shu‘ba* designates either the single poetic meter appropriate to that genre, or a small number of meters thought to work well with the *usul* of that genre, though gifted artists can challenge those norms (Rajabii, 1966: 13, 23; Karamatov and Radjabov 1981: 112). In the *radif*, relatively few *gushes* restrict the singer to verses in a single poetic meter, and the great singer Mohammad Rezā Shajariān (b. 1941) argues that, with those few exceptions, “any poem may be sung to any *gushe*” (Sims, 2012: 191). Of course, conceptions of what can be done are not claims about what is normally done, a topic that calls for statistics on the frequency with which singers choose each poetic meter at specific moments in a sequence. In the vocal *radif* as taught by ‘Abdollāh Davāmi (1891–1981) and his student Mahmud Karimi (1927–1984), the 14-syllable meter *mozāre‘* is one of only five meters commonly chosen for singing the initial *guh*es of a *dastgāh*,

and in Babakhanov's notation of the shashmaqom (Jung, 2010), it is the only meter used in a saraxbor, the initial shu'ba of the vocal section. In the radif, the only possible poetic meter for the gushe *sāqi-nāme* is the eleven-syllable *motaqāreb*, fitted to a specific rhythm, and that is the most common meter (fitted to the same rhythm) in the *soqi-noma* shu'bas in the shashmaqom (a topic further discussed in Blum 2015).⁸ *Motaqāreb* is said to be an appropriate meter for a *saraxbor*, but I would be surprised if a Persian singer chose verses in that meter to open his or her performance of a dastgāh. (This is not to suggest that surprises have no place in music-making; quite the contrary!)

I conclude with a few thoughts about the lexicographic project suggested at the start of this paper. While, at my age, I am in no position to design new projects, I offer a few recommendations in the hope that younger scholars will find effective ways to coordinate their studies of terminology. An online lexicon of the terminology of the muğam/maqām schools should treat each term and name, and each combination, historically, listing all significant occurrences in the extant literature. The project should document interrelationships among terms and names as they were used at specific times and places, taking care to specify with precision the respects in which early uses of, say, *maqām*, overlap with modern uses of terms like *mode* or *лад*. Here, an excellent model is available in the *Handwörterbuch der musikalischen Terminologie (HmT)*, forty installments of which have been issued since it began publication in 1972.

HmT has so far restricted itself to terms in European languages that are documented in writings, with an occasional excursion beyond Europe (e.g., the 2001 entry on Japanese *gaku*).⁹ It will never serve the needs of our areas of interest for two reasons: our research on terminology requires citation of recorded interviews as well as of writings, and the editorial policies of *HmT* enforce a strict separation of *technical terms* from what are deemed mere *names* (Eggebrecht, 1981). In this paper I have argued that terms enhanced with proper names have long been fundamental to transmission of oral and written theory in the muğam/maqām schools. Entities that are identified by combining terms for genres with proper names function

as distinct genres within more inclusive genres, and some of the events that constitute them (like *darāmad*) are also best understood as genres.

Endnotes

¹ In the radif of Mirzā ‘Abdollah’ s brother, Āqā Hoseyn Qoli, ‘*Erāq* is the final sequence of dastgāh *Māhur*, following rather than preceding the *Rāk* group (Pirniākān, 2001: 136–38).

² Babakhanov’s notation of the maqom *Rost Panjgoh* also includes an entire piece titled *Daromadi Ushshoq* (Jung, 2010: 151–52).

³ Early uses of the term *dastgāh* are discussed in Asadi 2008. It should not be confused with the older term *dastān*, as it is in Zohrābov, 1991: 88 and 1999: 123.

⁴ *Tekke* ‘piece’ can be used in place of *gushe*. Hormoz Farhat, 1990: 22, restricts the term *tekke* to a certain class of gushes (“fragmentary pieces frequently omitted in performance”), though no such limitation is evident in Borumand’s use of the term in the recordings issued as Farhat and Asadi, 2005.

⁵ The initial phrase of *Rāk-e Keshmir* in the vocal radif of Mahmud Karimi has the same contour as the initial phrase of *mustazodi Rok* in Ari Babakhanov’s notation of *Buzruk*, as shown in Blum, 2015. Compare Mas‘udiye, 1997: 114 with Jung, 2010: 71.

⁶ This formula was still in circulation as the First World War was ending; it turns up in the encyclopedia *Daryā-ye kabir* ‘The great sea’ compiled by Forsat al-Dowla Shirāzi (d. 1920) in the final two years of his life (see Massoudieh, 1996: 67). Forsat al-Dowla is best known to musicologists for his important work *Bohur al-alhān* ‘Meters of melodies’ (Bombay, 1914), portions of which (not the important ones!) were copied from *Jāme’ al-alhān*.

⁷ Referring to the proposed derivation of the Iraqi maqām *Huweizawi* from the melodic essence of maqām *Hijāz*, in other words from *naghm al-hijāz*, Scheherazade Hassan (2008: 103) has noted that this usage of Arabic *naghma* (the feminine, rather than masculine form *naghma*) resembles the usage of Persian *maye*.

⁸ Bagirova, 1992 and Nizami, 1992 are valuable discussions of this general topic.

⁹ A full list of the terms covered to date in *HmT* is available at www.sim.spk-berlin.de/dispositionen_368.html#g.

Bibliography

- Asadi, H. 2008. Towards the formation of the *dastgāh* concept: A study in the history of Persian music. In Elsner and Jänichen, 2008: 21–28.
- Bagirova, S. 1992. The Azerbaijanian mugam : Artistic idea and structural series. In Elsner and Jänichen 1992: 28–50. Repr. in the author's *Азербайджанский мугам : Статьи, исследования, доклады*, 93–113. Баку: “Элм,” 2007.
- Беляев, В. 1950. Шашмаком : Тартибдихандагон : Бабакул Файзуллоев, Шоҳназар Соҳибов ва Фазлиддин Шаҳобов, I. Мақоми якӯм бузрук. Москва : Нашриёти Давлатий Музикавий.
- Blum, S. 2015 (forthcoming). The Persian radif in relation to the Tajik-Uzbek *šašmaqom*. In *This thing called music: Essays in honor of Bruno Nettl*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.
- During, J. 1988. *La musique traditionnelle de l’Azerbayjan et la science des muqams*. Collection d’Études Musicologiques, 80. Baden-Baden and Bouxwiller: Koerner.
- . 2006. *Radif-e Mirzā ‘Abdollah barā-ye tār va setār : āvā-nevisi va barrasi-e tahlili*. Second edition. Tehran: Mahoor Institute of Culture and Art.
- Eggebrecht, H.-H. 1981. Zur Wissenschaft der auf Musik gerichteten Wörter. In International Musicological Society, *Report of the twelfth congress, Berkeley 1977*, ed. D. Hertz and B.C. Wade, 776–778. Kassel: Bärenreiter.
- Elsner, J. and G. Jänichen. 1992. Eds., *Regionale maqām-Traditionen in Geschichte und Gegenwart: Materialien der 2. Arbeitstagung der Study Group “maqām” des International Council for Traditional Music vom 23. bis 28. März 1992 in Gosen bei Berlin*.
- Elsner, J. and G. Jänichen. 2008. Eds., *Intercultural comparison of maqām and related phenomena: Proceedings of the fifth meeting of the ICTM Study Group “maqām”, Samarkand, 26–30 August 2001*. Berlin: trafo.
- Farhat, H. 1990. *The dastgāh concept in Persian music*. Cambridge Studies in Ethnomusicology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Farhat, H. and H. Asadi. 2005. *Descriptive analysis of the dastgāh of Māhur by Ostād Nur’ali Borumand*. Four compact discs from original recordings by Farhat, with notes by Asadi. Tehran: Mahoor Institute of Culture and Art, M.CD-176.
- Hajibeyov, U. 1988 [1945]. *Āzarbayjān khalq musiqisinayn asāsları*. Tehran: Enteshārāt-e Donyā. Azeri text in Arabic alphabet. First publ. in Russian, 1945.

Hassan, S.Q. 2008. Terminology, concepts and classification of the Iraqi maqam. In Elsner and Jänichen, 2008: 191–14.

Jung, A. 2010. Ed., *Der Shashmaqam aus Buchara überliefert von den alten Meistern, notiert von Ari Babakhanov*. Berlin: Hans Schiler.

Karamatov, F.M. and I. Radjabov. 1981 [1966]. Introduction to the šašmaqam, trans. Theodore Levin. *Asian Music* 13/1: 97–118. First published in Rajabov, 1966: 5–14 (Uzbek) and 15–24 (Russian).

Kiāni, M. 1992. *Haft dastgāh-e musiqi-ye Irān: pazhuhesh va negāresh*. Second edition. Tehran: Sāz-e Nowruz.

Massoudieh, M.T. 1996. *Manuscripts persans concernant la musique*. Répertoire International des Sources Musicales, B-xii. Munich: Henle.

-----, 1997. *Radif-e āvāzi-e musiqi-e sonnati-e Irān be ravāyat-e Mahmud Karimi*. Second edition. Tehran: Mahoor Institute of Culture and Art.

Nizami, A. 1992. The poetic ‘arūz system and the problems of structuring in the maqāms. In Elsner and Jänichen, 1992: 556–569.

Pirniākān, D. 2001. *Musiqi-ye dastgāhi-ye Irān: Radif-e Mirzā Hoseynqoli be ravāyat-e ‘Ali Akbar Shahnāzi*. Tehran: Mahoor Institute of Culture and Art.

Ражабий, Ю. 1966. Шашмақом, I. Бузрук. Тошкент: “Тошкент” бадиий Адабиёт Нашриёти.

Rapport, E. 2014. *Greeted with smiles: Bukharian Jewish music and musicians in New York*. American Musicspheres. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sims, R. and A. Koushkani. 2012. *The art of avaz and Mohammad Reza Shajarian: Foundations and contexts*. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books.

Zohrabov, R. 1991. *Muğam*. Baku: Azarnaşr.

-----, 1999. *Muqām : musiqi-e maqāmi-e Āzarbāijān*, trans. ‘A.Hoseyni. Tehran: Soroush. Persian translation of Zohrabov 1991.