CHAPTER I

SOURCES, LITERATURE, NAMES

I. Introduction

"It is really something extraordinary and fine, something quite unique, this radif that we have created in Iran." It was a sentiment imparted to me several times by my teacher, Dr. Nour-Ali Boroumand, when I studied with him between 1966 and 1974. As far as he was concerned, the radif was the principal emblem and the heart of Persian music, that form of art as quintessentially Persian as the nation's fine carpets and exquisite miniatures.

Boroumand himself was not well acquainted with other musical systems, but it strikes me today that his intuition was surely correct in emphasizing the uniqueness of the radif in the context of world music. For while Persian classical music is, on the whole, rather closely related to the classical music of Arabic and Turkish cultures, a bit less closely to the art music of India, and possibly even more distantly to other modal systems such as those of medieval Europe or contemporary Southeast Asia and Indonesia, the radif, its central core, is a unique phenomenon. In one sense, it is the central repertory of the musical system of Iran; in another (Zonis 1973:43), it is the theory, as opposed to the practice, which consists of performances based in various ways upon it. It is in some respects simply one of the contemporary versions of a widespread and comprehensive way of making music that has existed in many related forms for centuries throughout the Middle Eastern Islamic world; but it is also a coherent system developed recently by a small group of individuals, and with characteristics quite different from the worlds of the Arabic and Turkish maqams. For certain purposes, one may properly speak of the radif, but for others, it makes sense to count as many radifs as there are masters, each of whom may have or use several variants of his own version.

The radif has been the principal subject of many important studies of Persian music in the last three or four decades. Perhaps it has even been overemphasized in relation to the music that is derived from it, and in comparison with other types of music of Iran. But in the musical culture of Iran, it casts a broad shadow. Central, to be sure, to the classical music, it plays a role as well in modern popular music, and some of the folk or regional rural musics of Iran are also related to it.

The attention given to the radif in many publications has not produced unanimity in its perception as repertory or concept. Diversity of view will be of concern at several points in the present series of studies, but for the moment it is best to begin discussion with a very standard, if for us preliminary, definition. Ella Zonis, in the earliest prominent English-language work on Persian music, says, “Persian art music is based on a large collection of melodies known as the radif (row)” (1973:62). The implication clearly is that the radif is fundamental, and that there is other material that emanates from it. Similar characterizations appear in more recent studies of the Persian classical music system, such as those of Farhat (1990) and During (1991); and, as well, in the rhetoric of Iranian musicians who, in conversations with me, would describe the study of Persian classical music simply as "studying radif," and sometimes even by designating a performance of classical music as "playing radif," while on the other hand, distinguishing between the radif itself and performances based on it, even criticizing musicians by statements such as, "he is not really playing music, only repeating the radif."

Zonis (1973), Tsuge (1974), and During (1984a, 1991), three of the authors of fundamental works on Persian music, each appropriately devote a whole chapter to the radif, and use that term in their chapter titles. It may seem surprising, then, that other prominent scholars writing slightly earlier depended much less on the concept, but this may be a result of the fact that the concept does not quite fit the stereotypes of Middle Eastern practice developed by Western scholars. Massoudieh (1968), giving a rather comprehensive exposition of Persian theory, does not actually use the term. Barkechli, in various publications (e.g.1960, 1963), also does not make much use of it, nor does Khatschi (1962), in a book that provides important data about its history. Indeed, Khatschi, in contrast to Zonis, Barkechli, and Massoudieh, seems even to be relatively uninterested in the quality of unity and grand design in interrelationships of components which Boroumand seemed to consider so significant. Caron and Safvate (1966:17), in another work from the same decade, recognize the concept somewhat in passing, as they inform the reader that Persian music consists of a number of pieces of basic material or units in an order called radif. In this paragraph, however, we have given merely a sampling of the uses of the word, "radif," in recent western scholarly literature which, as we see, uses term and concept, and also describes the Persian classical music system, in a number of ways. In the musical world of Iran, the term seems to have been used more by musicians than by theorists, and its use seems to have increased in the course of the twentieth century.

Following Boroumand and Zonis, Iranian music master and American scholar, I wish to argue that understanding the significance of the radif is the key to understanding the Persian classical music system of the twentieth century. But, going now beyond Zonis's above-mentioned definition, precisely what is it? The literature, some of it cited above, may agree on substance but not significance, and yet one can, from it as well as from statements of my consultants in the world of Iranian musicians, draw the following by way of preliminary synthesis. Whether the term is used or not, it is recognized that there is a body of scalar patterns and basic melodies that are used in composition, improvisation, and performance, and that these are presented as a unified system in which the interrelationship of the numerous components is significant and highly complex. The word "radif" is translated as "row" or "order," and evidently it is not used much outside musical and poetic contexts (but see e.g. Caton 1983:140). But when it appears in music, it connotes a large and comprehensive corpus, in a particular order, with emphasis precisely on these concepts of completeness and order, with a complexity of internal interrelationships. The concepts of unity and order are inherent in the word; the notion of complexity is derived from it and can be related to other aspects of Iranian culture. The three traits distinguish the radif from related materials (with which it otherwise has much in common) in the Middle East and Europe.

The studies in the following chapters make no attempt to be definitive in providing definition, nature, and history of the radif. Hopefully, they will contribute to these issues through case studies, and thus augment the already large literature about the radif. They deal in particular (but not necessarily in this order) with the following general questions: a) internal structure of the radif; b) comparison of versions of the radif, or of the radifs of various masters; c) relationship of the radif to improvised performance; d) relationship of the radif to the total musical culture of Iran; and e) the radif as an index to important cultural characteristics and values of Iran.

II. Origin and Sources

The origins of the radif appear to go back at least to the eighteenth century. As far back as one can speculate (Tsuge 1974:29, citing Safvate 1969), each teacher assembled melodies that he used as his basic pedagogic toolkit. But hardly anything is known about practices, and for musical content, only names, often not very indicative (Khatschi 1967:70), have survived. Using contemporary Persian and Arabic practices in both art and folk musics as a basis for extrapolation, it seems reasonable to suppose that every teacher tended or tried to establish a unique grouping of commonly known melodies or variants, classed by modes, which he would teach to his students, to be used by them as a basis for their performances. In turn, a student learned the materials thus provided by the teacher and promulgated them. Eventually, at least in Iran, the materials assembled by a particular teacher could be identified as his personal teaching tradition, but they were at the same time variant of a generally recognized tradition. Furthermore, the tradition of a teacher would eventually be translated into versions and variants that would reflect the individual approaches and idiosyncrasies of the students who were partaking of it. Eventually, it seems reasonable to suppose, such a personal tradition with its variants came to be known in Iran as a radif. Gradually also, the radif seems to have changed from a body of music that was taught by a musician to his students as a kind of personal legacy to a corpus whose purpose it was somewhat more specifically to provide a point of departure for improvised performance and composition of set pieces.

In Iran, the interrelationship of these series of melodies that formed the bases of a personal tradition or of the entire tradition of radifs became enormously complex, so much so that it could perhaps be successfully analyzed with techniques developed by students of folk tale variants or tune families in European folkloristic traditions. The whole complex of the radif may therefore be viewed as something like one large tune Family. Individual teachers and their groups of students may have developed forms of it which were in turn comprised of variants and versions. In the course of the nineteenth century, as Iranian traditional culture declined, many of these "forms" may have been lost (but some are suggested by Safvate 1969:62). Today, as Tsuge (1974:29) points out, *the* radif usually means the particular version developed by Mirza Abdollah in the late nineteenth century on the basis of the teachings of his father, Ali Akbar Farahani, and then taught to Ali Naqi Vaziri, to Darvish Khan, and to a number of others (see Table R-1). Thus, what is available now is a group of versions of the radif that are tied together by their common derivation from Mirza Abdollah's form. A comparative study of the versions found in the twentieth century shows us perhaps a microcosm of the kind of thing that might, presumably in less codified and more informal manner, have existed earlier.

But it is important to recognize the likelihood that radifs of the twentieth century are substantially different from bodies of material with similar function. For one thing, Mirza Abdollah and his colleagues were quite aware of the existence and perhaps the nature of Western music, and some of them, particularly Vaziri and even Darvish Khan, studied Western theory with European composers, including Alfred J. B. Lemaire, who had been brought to Iran to introduce Western music to the military establishment (Zonis 1973:41, 186; Khoshzamir 1979:37-45). Considering the major changes thus surely brought about, one might reconstruct earlier times more adequately by suggesting first that the theoretical models of Arabic music of the twentieth century could be structurally similar to the Persian ones of earlier times. If Persian music was once taught as a relatively unstructured series of melodies (upon which one later improvised), it seems possible that the establishment of the radif as a large, unified system, perhaps in a single authoritative form, may have resulted from the perception of the grand design of Western theory. Furthermore, already early in the twentieth century, notated versions of radifs began to appear (Khoshzamir 1979:54-55; Tsuge 1974:46-60), and the concept of a single, authoritative form to replace the many personal versions extant earlier was promulgated in the 1930's.

The sources available for studying the contents of the radif are numerous and varied, and the early ones are discussed in particular by Khatschi (1962:1-35) and Zonis (1973:62-64). Although a number of sources include descriptions or partial contents from the earliest part of the twentieth century, there are two, by Mirza Nazir Forsat el Dowle and Mehdi Gholi Hedayat, that provide reasonably comprehensive listings of dastgâhs and gushes in the radif of Mirza Abdollah himself, or of students directly (and recently) associated with him. Nazir published a work in Shiraz describing Iranian music (Nazir 1903) in which the list of components is not actually included; but then, after a visit to Tehran during which he met a number of students of Mirza Abdollah's, he published a revised edition (Bombay, 1913) listing the radif and its contents (Khatschi 1962:3-4), suggesting that the careful classification of materials within the radif was a matter of some importance among the musicians in Mirza Abdollah's circle but not necessarily elsewhere. In 1928, Hedayat, one of the prominent music scholars in Iran during the first half of this century, published the three parts of a work, *Majma al-advar* (Tehran 1928) in which a list of gushes, dastgâh by dastgâh, is also provided. Produced several years earlier, over a period of some seven years, it was compiled on the basis of performances by a student of Mirza Abdollah's, Montasem el-Hokama. Khatschi (1962:16-23) compared the two listings and, finding that they are in many ways substantially alike, concluded that they must represent authoritative versions of Mirza Abdollah's radif.

Notated versions of three radifs (plus sections of a few others) were available to us. Of these, the one by Musa Ma'roufi, published in 1963, definitely instrumental but best suited for the târ, was to become particularly influential in recent years as a teaching device. It is by far the most extensive, and because of the fact that it was developed in response to government directive (Zonis 1973:63-64), it had in the period around 1970 come to be regarded by many younger musicians as the most definitive authority. Older conservative musicians in the 1960's sometimes considered it to be too large, complaining that it contained materials not properly part of the radif. The method of naming sections that Ma'roufi followed gave it an extremely long table of contents, as materials sometimes designated as gushes might have been considered by other musicians to be subdivisions of gushes. Thus, Zonis (1973:120-21) designates fourteen units from Ma'roufi's published radif as the portion of the dastgâh properly comprising the introductory gushe, darâmad; but Boroumand, in conversations with me, considered only six of these as materials properly belonging in the radif and deserving of individual designation. The point is that Ma'roufi's radif includes a number of metric pieces evidently never subject of improvisation and thus of questionable status in the radif; this applies particularly to several rengs and chahâr mezrâbs appearing near the endings of several dastgâhs. But it is easy to see how such materials could once have been part of the stock of materials passed on by master to student.

The total number of pieces in Ma'roufi's radif is 470, a good many of them of course repeated precisely or recurring in closely related variants. As this radif was originally intended to be the product of a committee (Zonis 1973:63), it is presumably a combination of material from several radifs. To be sure, there are other extant radifs that may be related to Ma'roufi's. Two that are evidently products of the same period were recorded in the 1970's by the Iranian Ministry of Culture, i.e., those of Ali Akbar Shahnazi (instrumental) and of Abdollah Davami (vocal; see Lotfi ca.1975 for a notation of dastgâh-e Shur), and made available to the UCLA Ethnomusicology Archive through the courtesy of Margaret Caton. They are shorter than that of Ma'roufi, but they include much material with the same designations and, at least in some cases, musical content. The radif of Morteza Ney Dâvoud (târ) was recorded by Radio Iran, and it too is roughly similar in scope, length, and number of units to that of Ma'roufi. With only minor exceptions, these three radifs were available for study only from lists of contents.

A second printed radif, that of Abolhassan Saba, is in fact a set of instruction books for individual instruments—two sets for violin, one for santur, and one for târ or setâr (see the bibliography under the name of Saba, which includes a partial listing with parts of the imprint lacking, as some bibliographical details are absent in the volumes). Each includes two to four volumes, and all of their title pages say that this is "Saba's radif." Each of Saba's volumes is organized by dastgâhs. Within the scope of any one dastgâh may be found gushes generally recognized to be part of the radif, and included in the other published radifs; and along with these one also finds Saba's own compositions. In none of Saba's books is there an attempt to present the entire radif of a dastgâh. The number of units in Saba's radif is, therefore, relatively small, and evidently he included only or largely those gushes widely considered to be "important." The total count of units may be about one hundred, but considering the number of separate compositions and sections simply called "âvâz," it is difficult to calculate. Saba is, however, recognized (by both Caton and Sadeghi; see Table R-1) as a student of Mirza Abdollah himself, and also of the influential Darvish Khan. And Saba's instruction books were widely used in the 1970's.

The structure of the radif and its parts is highly varied, as the case studies below will show. But a third printed radif, that of Mahmoud Karimi, is particularly different from the rest because it is vocal, as a result of which the structure of the gushes is more standardized. Ordinarily in his radif, there is a brief introductory section usually called "darâmad" (in contrast with the broader use of the term as the main and initial gushe of a dastgâh) without text, a texted section called she'r (poem), and a melismatic and virtuosic tahrir. This may be very different from the forms of gushes in the instrumental radifs; but in motivic and scalar content of gushes the two types of radif are close and also, generally speaking, in the complement of dastgâhs and gushes (in their names in any event, but typically also in musical content).

In its complete form, Karimi's radif was recorded in the middle 1970's, and in 1978 there appeared a publication of its entire corpus in an exemplary transcription by Massoudieh, along with Karimi's own complete recorded performance (Massoudieh

1978). The transcriptions are intended more for scholarly analysis than for use by students of Persian music performance. The total number of units (counting subdivisions, where given) is 172. Additional recordings, made earlier, of parts of Karimi's radif are also extant. In the middle 1960's, Gen'ichi Tsuge studied with Karimi and recorded large portions, incorporating transcriptions in his dissertation (Tsuge 1974:315-401). In 1968-69, I recorded the dastgâhs of chahârgâh and shur. It is thus possible to make comparisons and thus to trace the range of variation and possibly even the history of Karimi's work with the radif. In general, his three versions agree remarkably. There is actually more congruency in musical content than in nomenclature, as variant labelings seem to be more readily introduced than melodic variants.

A fourth radif of principal significance is that of Nour-Ali Boroumand, a man widely praised in his lifetime as one of the most authoritative musicians-teachers-scholars of the radif in the 1960's and 1970's. Boroumand's radif has been recorded but not transcribed (at least in published form) completely. In its most complete version, it was recorded in the middle or late 1970's by Iranian government authorities, and this recording (minus the dastgâh of bayât-e esfahân) has been available for our study. Additionally, portions of Boroumand's radif, principally the dastgâhs of chahârgâh and shur plus excerpts of others, were recorded by myself in Tehran in 1968-69; and major portions of several dastgâhs were recorded by Stephen Blum in 1967, on occasion of Boroumand's month-long visit to the University of Illinois. Moreover, G. Tsuge had recorded material from Boroumand's radif earlier, in the middle 1960's, and included transcriptions of the dastgâh of shur in his dissertation (1974:402-45). Again, it is instructive to compare these materials. In Boroumand's radif, there is more substantive change from one performance to the next than in Karimi's radif, but there is also, it must be said, an extremely high degree of consistency. The total length of the eleven dastgâhs in the complete recording is 207 units, and with bayât-e esfahân, there might be about 225.

A briefer, composite radif was produced for the instruction of laymen by Kambeez Roshanravan, for the Institute for the Intellectual Development of Children and Young Adults, in 1976. It is performed by a number of musicians and appears to be derived largely from Ma'roufi's work, although at some points it departs from it and may also be based on Saba's books and on Boroumand's personal teaching, as some of the performers are known to have been his students. Since it is consciously abbreviated, it cannot properly be used as a source for our study in the sense of the others just discussed, but it does represent a further development in the history of Mirza Abdollah's version of the radif, as it continued the principal function shared by the older radifs, the transmission and dissemination of Persian classical music.

A further source of the radif as used in the practice of a musician appears in an unpublished master's thesis by Sadeghi (1971), who lists 57 units (including darâmads) as the principal gushes of the radif. This calculation of mine does not, however, include the cadential foruds, although Sadeghi appropriately counts these among the most essential and characterizing ingredients of the individual dastgâhs. Sadeghi also gives the names of 131 other units which have a lower degree of significance and he provides extensive commentary. The dissertation by Hormoz Farhat (1966; see also Farhat 1990), which is discussed below among analytical works, also includes a listing of the contents of the radif, providing yet another source for our studies. Most recently, During (1984a) lists and discusses further contemporary source material for study of the radif.

Thus, a number of sources of substantially different nature are available for a comparative study of the versions of the radif used in the twentieth century. Our study of shur discusses these sources further, in the light of one dastgâh, also providing a table (Table S-1) that may be useful to the reader of this chapter although its principal purpose is to summarize the information in order to make possible a comparison of this dastgâh in the various radifs.

III. Literature on the Radif

Studies on Persian classical music have generated a considerable body of literature about the radif, principally since 1960. A brief review, supplementing the definitions mentioned in our introductory paragraphs above, is relevant as background material for the present study. Not counting the earliest works in Persian, by Hedayat (1928) and Nazir al Forsat (1903, 1913), which in any event are descriptions rather than analytical studies, we should first mention the work of Ali Naqi Vaziri (see bibliography, and Khoshzamir 1979) and his student Ruhollah Khaleqi (1937-38; 1955-60; 1961; see also Zonis 1973:188-90 and *passim*). Vaziri, longtime modernizer of Persian music, professor of aesthetics at the University of Tehran, a towering figure and virtually a culture hero to twentieth-century Iranian musicians, published several works in the 1930's that describe and circumscribe the radif (e.g. Vaziri 1934; see also Nettl, 1985:110-113).

Khaleqi, a major figure in the traditional musical life of Tehran in the period 1930-60, published a large number of descriptive and historical works, particularly in the 1940's, and a definitive three-volume history of Iranian music (1955-60), in which the development of the radif is detailed. The publications of these two authors are essentially positivistic works giving substantial arrays of factual material. They are also concerned with the question of authenticity, attempting to identify what is properly the radif, but they give less attention to analytical matters and to the nature of the radif as a group of versions of a unit, and of course they do not contribute to the important recent history of the phenomenon.

Among more recent Iranian scholars, a number of names (some already mentioned as sources of the radif) emerge prominently: Mehdi Barkechli, Dariouche Safvate, Khatschi Khatschi, Parviz Mahmoud, Hormoz Farhat, Mohammad T. Massoudieh, and Manoochehr Sadeghi. Barkechli, a physicist with great musicological knowledge and interest, published many works, mostly in French, about the radif. These speak principally to scalar aspects of dastgâhs and gushes, tying them to older Arabic theory and posing Barkechli's own view, according to which Persian intervals are built from combinations of Pythagorean commas (24 cents) and limmas (90 cents) (Barkechli 1960:460-83; 1963:5-21; Zonis 1973:53-55). His chief rival in dealing with theoretical matters of this kind was Vaziri, who maintained that the Persian system could be best understood in the context of a series of quarter-tones (Khoshzamir 1979:144-48).

In doing fieldwork, I found it interesting that the actual intonational practices do not conform precisely (or sometimes even remotely) to either of these theories, and that intonation is really a secondary issue in the aural identification of units of the radif by Iranian musicians (see also Zonis 1965:640). But to return to Barkechli's works, it must also be said that they are, additionally, of great value in providing synthetic accounts of the history of the radif and of its overall structure, especially in his introduction and explanation of the published version of Ma'roufi's radif (1963).

Khatschi Khatschi's University of Cologne dissertation (Khatschi 1962) is one of the most significant works in the literature on the radif, laying groundwork and becoming seminal in encouraging further research, but except for an article on shur (1967) in which the scalar consistency of this most important dastgâh over the centuries is appropriately questioned, he did not publish researches beyond his doctoral study. Khatschi's work is of particular importance for the studies presented here, as it is the major modern source for the contents of Mirza Abdollah's radif as described by Nazir al Forsat and Hedayat, as well as showing something of the changes that took place in the ensuing decades on the basis of the radif as described later by Khaleqi. It thus provides much material for comparative study of versions of the radif, and for an analysis of its internal structure. Also among the early works in the recent period to which the authors here under discussion belong is a dissertation by Parviz Mahmoud, a composer whose studies in the field of music theory were carried out at Indiana University (Mahmoud 1955). This work deals principally with scalar and intonational matters from a theoretical perspective, but without the analytical use of performed or recorded materials.

Dariouche Safvate, known in the Iranian music world principally as a performer, is the author of several significant works in Persian and also co-author, with Nelly Caron, of a major survey of Iranian music in French which includes a summary of the radif (Caron and Safvate 1966). Somewhat in the manner of Barkechli, these authors emphasize scalar matters, but they also discuss the relationship of the radif to improvised and composed performance and the character of the various dastgâhs. Like other studies by Iranians and foreigners, the book by Caron and Safvate views the radif as a work which has an authentic form that must be discovered. Since the late 1980's, Safvate has continued to distinguish himself as a scholar, performer, and advocate of Persian music. Other Iranian musicians, as well, including Mohammad Reza Lotfi and Dariush Tala'i, have made important contributions to the understanding of the Persian classical music system.

Hormoz Farhat was the first scholar in the United States to produce an ethnomusicological Ph.D. dissertation on Persian classical music (1966). Formally published by Cambridge University Press with few changes (Farhat 1990), this pioneering study describes the radif in detail, giving something of its history and reviewing earlier literature, characterizing the dastgâhs and gushes by scalar and modal traits. Two contributions of Farhat's are particularly important for the present study. One is the conception of gushes as units that include important, as well as less important, central and secondary sections, and the use of this distinction for representing gushes in artificial, abstract formulas for analytical purposes. This pointed to approaches of studying the gushe as material that can be used in a number of ways and to varying degrees as a point of departure for composition and improvisation. Second, like a number of authors, Farhat deals with the importance and method of classing gushes, contributing to the understanding of the distinction among different types and furthering the recognition that they are not equal but of widely varying orders of significance and function. In his dissertation, Farhat divides the units comprising a dastgâh into two principal groups, the gushes proper, and a category that he calls "tekke" (a word meaning "piece" or "portion" in Persian), a concept that includes forms, specific tunes, and rhythmic types that can be attached to the tunes of various other gushes. Farhat correctly pointed the way to understanding the radif as a combination of widely divergent materials, contradicting earlier implication that dastgâhs and their constituent parts are simply units that are virtually identical in structure and function, differentiated only by scalar and motivic characteristics.

Mohammad Taghi Massoudieh has published a number of studies on Persian classical and folk music and is particularly to be noted as the editor and transcriber of Karimi's radif (Massoudieh 1978). His dissertation (University of Cologne; Massoudieh 1966) is a study of the âvâz of shur in which the relationship between radif and performance becomes a major issue for the first time in the history of published Persian music research. His procedure includes a study of the radif in a composite form, based as it is on versions by five masters beginning with Nazir (i.e., Mirza Abdollah) and ending with Musa Ma'roufi. The work then analyzes one performance in the context of these radif versions, by a musician named Akhbari, a santur player residing in Meshhad. While Massoudieh's approach is insightful and innovative, the performance analyzed may for a number of reasons be somewhat uncharacteristic. In comparison with performances analyzed for our present study in Chapter 5, at least, it is rather too easily divided into sections dominated by individual gushes. The listener is therefore tempted to suggest that the performer, confronting an ethnomusicological field worker, was especially motivated to perform the gushes in order, as studied in the radif, though with some improvisatory elaboration. But on the other hand, it is also possible that this performance is simply unusual in being an example of "petite improvisation," one of the two types of improvisation described by Caron and Safvate (1966:129), in which the radif is presented in elaborated form rather than being the point of departure for far-flung fantasy. Massoudieh's approaches have been importantly suggestive for the studies presented here.

Finally, the mentioned master's thesis by Manoochehr Sadeghi (1971) completed at California State College at Los Angeles provides yet a further presentation of the radif, and gives a listing of gushes and divides them into types. It also goes into some detail to deal with the relationship of the radif to performance. Considering that the author is a practicing musician, the explanations of techniques used in improvisation, especially the identification of specific procedures such as expansion and contraction of motifs or longer section of the radif, centonization, ornamentation, and rhythmic modification, are all of great interest, and Sadeghi is to be highly commended for his insights into the interface between tradition and personal styles.

Two non-Iranian scholars, already mentioned prominently, who made major contributions in the 1970's are Gen'ichi Tsuge and Ella Zonis. Tsuge's work principally concerns the study of the vocal versions of the radif and their relationship to vocal performance of âvâz. His dissertation (1974) concentrates on the relationship of âvâz to the versification principles of Persian poetry, but it also contributes importantly to the understanding of the radif itself, and concerns especially the different types of rhythm found among the gushes. As mentioned, it includes transcriptions of large portions of two radifs.

Ella Zonis is responsible more than anyone else for making the contemporary system of Iranian classical music known in the English-speaking world, in particular through an early article (Zonis 1965) and her book (Zonis 1973), which introduce the reader to the tradition with the use of historical and analytical approaches, and also in an article (Zonis 1971) that deals with recent developments. In the introductory book, she presents the radif principally as it was used and promulgated by her teacher, Ruhollah Khaleqi, and (speaking more broadly) in the radif tradition of the Conservatory of National Music (Honarestân-e Musiqi-ye Melli-ye Irân), as taught there by Vaziri, by his pupil Abolhassan Saba, and more recently by several of Saba's students. Her formulation of the radif conforms essentially to those published earlier, but she provides numerous explanatory aids. For example, she suggests subdivision of the long radifs such as that of Ma'roufi into groups intermediate between dastgâh and gushe, proposing, for example, a fourteen-gushe section of shur that is devoted to versions and satellites of darâmad.

In a manner more detailed than Massoudieh's, Zonis also attempts analytically to draw the connection between radif and improvisation (1973:98125). She presents the various stages in the improvisatory process as a series of decisions beginning with the choice of dastgâh, then of gushes and their order, and going on to selection and elaboration of materials from the radif. Although she does not provide case studies analyzing specific performances, she provides the most thorough treatment of this complex subject so far available.

The most important work in the last decade is by the French scholar Jean During, whose fieldwork extended from the 1970's to the 1980's. During's most important synthesis, *La musique iranienne: Tradition et Évolution* (1984a), presents the radif and the way it is taught, as well as its relationship to performance, in a somewhat different light from the series of studies given here. During's work also sheds light on the work of Iranian musicians active in France since the revolution. A more recent work, directed more to the general reader than to specialists (During and others, 1991) relates Persian music to its spiritual roots in Sufism and, in addition to providing a basic introduction to structure, techniques, and instruments, cites at length a number of Iranian musicians, particularly Dariouche Safvate, on various relationships between Persian classical music and Iranian culture.

Several smaller and less well-known studies produced outside Iran should also be mentioned. Edith Gerson-Kiwi, distinguished scholar of Middle Eastern and Jewish traditions, published a brief study (Gerson-Kiwi 1963) based principally on the work of a single consultant, an authority on Persian language and literature (but by his own admission not on music), whose musical studies were carried out in a branch of the above-mentioned Tehran conservatory located in Rasht, on the Caspian Sea. This book is one of the earliest works to deal with the concept of dastgâh, and probably for that reason describes the radif in less comprehensive fashion than do the later, larger works by Barkechli, Massoudieh, Zonis, and Tsuge. It also does not make totally clear the distinction between radif and performance. Interestingly, Gerson-Kiwi's presentation of a few dastgâhs leads us to suspect that this non-Tehran tradition includes fewer gushes, and in different order, than do the main sources. It therefore suggests some regional variation, something on which we will be able to comment further in Chapters 3 and 10. Thus, for example, Gerson-Kiwi describes shur as consisting of "shur" itself (i.e., darâmad), greyli, shahnâz, hosseini, khârâ, and mollânâzi, a list corresponding to that provided by Vaziri in his book, *Dastur-e Tar* (1913), which is intended primarily as an instruction manual, but one evidently not followed in the tradition that was later on established among musicians in Tehran.

A dissertation by Eckart Wilkens (1967) presented, like those of Khatschi and Massoudieh, at the University of Cologne, compares performances by two musicians, one presumably an amateur, and the other, a "professional," though the definition of this term is not quite clear. It is not a study of the radif itself but analyzes the structure of performance in a way somewhat related to the approaches of Massoudieh (1968), and of our Chapters 3-5, but it does not actually present the performances in their specific relationship to sections of the radif. Vinogradov (1982) provided a synthetic survey based substantially on Barkechli's work, emphasizing the relationship of Persian music to the neighboring musical systems, including those of Central Asia, while Jung (1989) suggests relationship specifically between the dastgâh system and the Shashmakam of Uzbekistan.

Much of the literature by Iranian scholars has a normative tone. It seeks to establish what is authentic and correct, and to help in preserving the true tradition. Non-Iranian authors in this field have sometimes adopted a similar view, and in any event, some of them have derived from it the belief that there is actually a single, correct form of the radif. It is a view corresponding to that of many practicing Iranian musicians (although the opinion of each may differ from the rest as regards the specific nature and character of the authentic form), but it does not constitute an objective characterization of the radif and its tradition. To me, the radif is best viewed as a set of versions and variants of one fundamental unit, a unit that differs in form and content from musician to musician and even changes from time to time in one musician's work. It is the multiplicity of these versions and their interrelationships, the differences in internal structure of the variants, that make the radif a fascinating object of study. Solid and relatively stable in its broad characteristics and its overall style, the radif is fluid and changeable in the details of its content and structure.

IV. Radifs and the Radif

It is difficult to speculate about the nature of the radif and its relationship to performances before the late nineteenth century. In the Arabic-speaking world of the early twentieth century, the orally transmitted material that may be considered the truly basic stuff of music making—including composition, improvisation, and performance—is comprised of a variety of units from complex composed suites in the Maghreb and Iraq to less structured models of modal configuration in Syria and Lebanon (see Elsner 1975; Touma 1971; 1975:57-68, 81-103). The existence of a large number of maqams associated in characteristic groupings for purposes of extended improvisation that included modulation seems to have led to standardized sequences of maqams and even set pieces in at least some parts of this musical area (Tsuge 1972). As already suggested, it may be that a number of maqam-like units, with characteristic scales, ranges, contours, motifs and cadences, therefore also existed in the Persian tradition, and that these were combined without much formality into groups named after the main or initial maqam. The selection of secondary and modulatory maqams in Arabic taqsims (see Nettl & Riddle 1974) around a main maqam is described by theorists (Touma 1968, 1975) and can be extrapolated from performances; but so also can the lack of strict uniformity in practice. In Iran, it may be that certain practices in performance such as the association of mâhur with (what became the modulatory gushes of) delkash, shekaste, and râk were informally recognized long ago. It seems reasonable to believe, furthermore, that each master of Persian music had his own customary groupings and sequences of materials that he used in teaching and in improvised performance; and also that different areas or communities developed their own variants of this general practice. But for all of this there is only spotty and circumstantial evidence, and in small quantity at that.

The situation thus speculatively described is the context for the establishment of the radif by Ali Akbar Farahani, court musician to Nasreddin Shah. A man who because of his position may have been the most influential classical musician at the time, he may also have been one of the few musicians interested in maintaining the indigenous tradition in a period of cultural decline (Khatschi 1962:1; Zonis 1973:39-40; Keddie 1981:34-43). The versions of the radif, as they are now known from a number of twentieth century masters, always seem to be traceable to that of Farahani, and in particular, that of his son, Mirza Abdollah, whose knowledge of his (by then deceased) father's "radif," however, came about through instruction from Ali Akbar's brother and student, that is, Mirza Abdollah's uncle, Åqâ Ghulamhossein (Khatschi 1962: 148-49). The influential role of Mirza Abdollah and the musicians associated with him is described by many authors, but the contents of his radif, as we have seen, is known only by conjecture, partial notations by some of his students (including Ali Naqi Vaziri), and the mentioned listings of materials by two contemporaries, Nazir and M. Hedayat. These listings indicate that there is at least the likelihood that Mirza Abdollah's radif changed in the course of his life, that materials were added, and that strict standardization and authority were not major issues. In this context it is worth noting that Nour-Ali Boroumand, authoritative musician of mid-century, maintained (Nettl 1974b: 168) that the procedures of Mirza Abdollah had actually standardized the radif, and that Darvish Khan's generation, which followed Mirza Abdollah by a decade or so, began the now more current process of innovation and diversification.

Whether or not it existed earlier, we know that from Farahani on, there developed a tradition of handing down a personal kind of radif. It is a form of transmission still extant in the 1970's, though inhibited by media, print, and the respect for standardization in modernized society. And it is a kind of tradition that can be compared to that of folktales and tune families and studied similarly. Variants came into existence, versions influenced each other, and generations adhered in various degrees to what they believed to be an original authentic form. But like students of tales and European tunes, we also do not have the straight and unbroken lines of an ideal family tree. The known educational associations of their performers might help, but even with these, the group of radifs (or the versions of the radif now extant) do not make possible the reconstruction of the history of the material. Even the relatively good knowledge of who studied with whom in the twentieth century gives only the sketchiest idea of the nature and structure of Mirza Abdollah's radif.

We can gain some very general insight into the nature of the development of the contemporary situation from the relationship of musicians as presented by Sadeghi and Caton (Table R-1). Although the two plans agree in broad outline, there are some minor divergences between them, probably resulting from differences in opinion on the part of the musicians who provided the information. From my experience, I can add to the confusion, or better said, to the variegated picture: Nour-Ali Boroumand claimed to have studied with Darvish Khan, Musa Ma'roufi, also Habib Soma'i and Seyyed Hossein Taherzadeh, in addition to Qahremani. Ahmad Ebâdi, although a son of Mirza Abdollah, said that he was too young at the time of his father's death to have studied with him. The tendency of individual musicians to study with more than one teacher, as suggested by Boroumand's biography (see Chapter 10), and to put together composite radifs by combining materials from several, is indicated in these charts but possibly with insufficient emphasis. Yet, using Caton's (somewhat more comprehensive) table as a basis, the extant radifs come from a variety of the branches of the family tree beginning with Farahani: Ma'roufi and Saba from Darvish Khan, who recombined the traditions of the two sons of Farahani; Boroumand's, from a separate branch of the Mirza Abdollah school; Ney Dâvoud and Shahnazi from the less prominent side of the Farahani family, that of Åqâ Hossein Qoli; Karimi from yet a different combination of teachers. The history of the radif, at least in the twentieth century, is not one of neat, easily separable strands of tradition that turn into versions, variants, and forms, but a complex conglomeration of mutual influences. Given these circumstances, it is perhaps surprising that the extant variants of the radif are so similar, and the differences among the versions by one teacher often as great as those separating personal traditions.

These differences and similarities are of course among the main concerns of the group of studies presented here. But before dwelling on the differences, the point to be made is that as the extant radifs are really very similar to each other, what little we can do by way of diachronic examination shows that changes in the history of the radif may be less significant in content or in style of performance than in the attitude of musicians. The radif seems to have changed from a large, relatively amorphous corpus of materials from which musicians made selections to a single, complex and composite musical work. Boroumand suggested that in the nineteenth century there was one radif, performed identically at each performance, but there is also evidence that it was not so, and that the trend to standardizing is a characteristic of the twentieth century. The conscious attempt to provide a single, authoritative form, the subsequent attempts to record authentic renditions by major figures, the general concern about what is or is not properly part of the radif, the use of a single set of texts by a large group of teachers at the Conservatory of National Music in the 1960's, all of this suggests major changes in the conception of the radif. If Mirza Abdollah tried to institute standardization of the radif because of his knowledge of the power of this procedure in transmission and promulgation of Western music, his approach was followed and strengthened by his own students and their followers; and it may be for this reason that one can study radifs much as one can study set compositions in the Western musical tradition.

And so we find it instructive to regard the radif as a single, composite work, its style importantly unified. But it is essential also to bear in mind that it is also internally varied, and that its ingredients must have come from many places and kinds of music. Internal differences are still very much in evidence; degrees of fixity, the use of easily memorable tunes, different kinds of rhythmic structure and adherence to metric principles all point to a mixture of rural and urban, popular and classical, composed and improvised, indigenous and imported, vocal and instrumental roots and sources. In most cases, the style of a dastgâh or gushe can at best give only the vaguest suggestion of origin, narrate the history of the radif only in the most general sense.

V. Nomenclature

Important clues about origin and history may be provided by examination of the nomenclature of the parts of the radif. A few examples illustrate the nature of the words used to name dastgâhs and gushes. Take first the dastgâhs: Some of their names suggest non-musical characterization: homâyun ("royal"), râst ("right, straight"), dashti ("from the plains," or perhaps bucolic, or from the desert region of Dashtestân). Others are named for tribal or cultural groups—bayât-e tork (Turkish), bayât-e esfahân (the city), afshâri (the Afshar tribe). Others again take their names from materials specific to music, such as the number of a fret or a scale degree—segâh, chahârgâh, panjgâh ("third, fourth, fifth place"). But a few may simply be music-specific, words that are used only for the designation of musical materials—shur, navâ (but shur is also translated as "salty," as well as "passion," "emotion," and a number of related meanings).

The names of gushes have similarly interesting origins. Using those of the dastgâh of chahârgâh as illustration, zâbol is a place-name, a town in eastern Iran, while hesâr ("fence, enclosure, fortification") suggests some kind of non-musical character. The names maghlub and mokhâlef may show implications from music theory, but they are not from the standard world of Arabic-language musical terminology. Mokhâlef ("opposite") is the gushe in which the sixth degree, which is in fact the leading tone of darâmad, becomes the tonic, and in performances it also provides the greatest contrast (and at the same time closest relationship) to darâmad in a performance. Sometimes it heads the performance, often it is the second-most prominent gushe, and it may lead off the second of two principal sections of an extended âvâz. After darâmad, it occupies the largest amount of time in an average âvâz. Maghlub ("inverted, anagram") transfers darâmad material to the higher octave, which is in some ways (but not in all) a duplication of the lower. Muye ("lamentation") evidently refers to a song type; and rajaz, to a group of poetic meters. Pahlavi, derived from pahlavân ("champion") bestows non-musical character, and mansuri evidently refers to a personal name—Mansur—or perhaps also to a word from which the name is derived, "victorious." Zangule ("little bell") is conceivably a bit of program music but I have not found musicians who will say that it actually imitates a bell.

In mâhur, a number of types of origin of place-names can be identified as well. Style of music seems in some sense to be characterized in the names of dâd ("crying out"), tarab-angiz ("stimulating joy"), zir-afkand ("thrown down", as a carpet). Types of verse also give their names to gushes: sufi-nâme, a kind of sufi poem; and sâqi-nâme, a specific verse type of a bacchanalian sort. Place names play a major role in mâhur: tusi (from Tus, the small town which was the birthplace of Ferdowsi), neyshâburak (from Neshabur or Nishapour), esfahânak (from Isfahan), âshur (Assyria), âzerbâijâni. Some personal names appear—nazirkhâni, hajji-hassani, râk-e abdollâh (conceivably the râk of, or in accordance with, Mirzâ Abdollâh). Of special interest in mâhur are all of the gushes named râk, a term widely believed to be derived from "raga", an association that is strengthened by the fact that sections within the râk group are designated as Indian and Kashmiri—râk-e hendi, râk-e keshmir.

In the case of shur, too, a variety of terms appears, but fewer are related directly to musical matters. Salmak may be related to salm ("advanced, forward"). Shahnâz is a woman's name, derived from "nâz", a word denoting coquetry, flirtation, or putting on airs. Golriz means something like fine or delicate flower or flowery character. Majles afruz refers to the kindling of the majles, that is, "warming up" a session at which people sit, eating and drinking and perhaps listening to music. Bozorg and kuchek mean "large" and "small," respectively, and seem to be derived from the radif of two parts of another gushe, perhaps hosseini (that term derived, of course, from a personal name). Razavi may be derived from razâ (= will, thus perhaps "willing," or "willing to submit"). Khârâ means "granite," and safâ, "purity." Qarache may possibly be related to "qarachi," "gypsy." Mollânâzi seems derived from a personal name, and dobeyti, from a type of poem (distich).

It is difficult, of course, to provide much of a definitive interpretation of this nomenclature. Some of the terms are presumably quite old, and many if not most, while they are usually in the Persian language, are shared with the Arabic and Turkish systems of maqam. It turns out not to be possible to identify differences among gushes in accordance with type of nomenclature. For example, those named in accordance with peoples, tribal groups, or places do not, as a whole, differ from those named after aspects of the music theory system. Indeed, several gushes with similar melodic contour and character (e.g., darâmad of chahârgâh or segâh, maghlub, neyshâburak, hesâr-e mâhur, râk of mâhur, and mavâliân of homâyun) have a variety not only of names but of name types. The large number of different kinds of names support the contention that the radif was put together from a variety of materials, some of them from the realm of theory (such as modal exercises), some named for units analogous to modes in the European Middle Ages. Others had regional styles as their point of origin, or styles of tribal or folk music, some possibly coming from particular song types—warlike, romantic, contemplative. Certain ones probably originated from specific songs, types of poems, and particular contexts of performance. The variety of names provides clues about this mass of materials of heterogeneous origin which gradually became the ingredients, within a standardized format, of a unified work.

CHAPTER II

ASPECTS OF THE STRUCTURE OF THE RADIF

The structure of a highly complex phenomenon such as the radif requires examination from many perspectives; this chapter speaks to a few of these. We turn first to a consideration of what the versions of the radif as well as the individual dastgâhs contain. We then move to the order in which materials are presented, to the question of typology of gushes, on to consideration of the internal structure of dastgâhs and the interrelationship of gushes within a dastgâh, and then to the problem of the interrelationships of the dastgâhs themselves. Much of this involves and thus leads to the particularly interesting questions of the "modulatory" and the shared gushes, those, that is, that are present in more than one dastgâh. After a discussion of rhythmic typology in the radif, we turn again to the question of internal interrelationships. The progress of this chapter is thus from generally descriptive to more analytical; and it is a comparative approach, rather than a normative or chronological one, that dominates the general review of the nature of the radif that now follows.

I. The Nature of Dastgâhs and Gushes

In virtually all literature and in all experiences of my own in Iran, the radif is always presented as a series of twelve modes, or dastgâhs, each with a series of melodies attached to it. Each dastgâh is also said to have a basic scale. Initially, a dastgâh is ordinarily presented as comprised of a group of melodies—gushes—each of which is regarded as equally capable of producing music. In the published versions of the radif, and in my lessons as well, distinctions in the degree to which a gushe is normally the object of improvisation are not readily made. My teacher did not say, for example, that "this gushe is usually played straight in its memorized form, while that one should be the basis of creative improvisation." After the radif has been presented in this egalitarian fashion in lessons and classes—a kind of presentation also characteristic of the Iranian publications of the radif—the student will nevertheless have perceived that musicians do indeed make significant distinctions among gushes in terms of their importance. Singled out for special mention are the ones that tend to be longer than the others in the radif, or to appear with more consistency in the various versions of the radif. They can, furthermore, generally be distinguished by their greater length in performance and by the fact that the improvisations based upon them often depart substantially from the form in which they appear in the radif. Some of them are modulatory, departing from the main scale of the dastgâh through accidentals altering pitches, and they are characteristically non-metric. They of course are the ones that are listed as "important" in the presentations of the radif in the books of Caron and Safvate (1966), Farhat (1966 and 1990), and Sadeghi (1971).

Although first perceiving the radif as a series of equal dastgâhs with equally significant gushes, the student soon comes to the understanding that he is learning material with a hierarchical structure, and this perception can be substantially amplified through observation and analysis. Actually, the melodies that comprise a dastgâh differ enormously in structure and function; indeed, it may be possible to make a case for the suggestion that each gushe not only has a unique melody or motif and a unique scalar configuration within the basic scale of the dastgâh, but also that each is unique in function within the radif itself, and within the improvised performance of âvâz. Or at least I suggest that there are several functions that may be fulfilled by gushes and their subdivisions.

Considering that there is a large body of introductory and generalizing literature about Persian music, it seems almost a ritual, though perhaps a necessary one, to restate here the main ingredients of a dastgâh. While the dastgâhs differ substantially among themselves, most of them may be characterized as follows.

There is always an introductory section, called darâmad, which is present in each version of the radif, characterizes the dastgâh to listener and musician, contains one principal motif that occurs frequently in performance and at various times at the endings of other gushes, and emphasizes the tonal environment of the tonic. It is this basic motif of darâmad, using no more than a tetrachord, that is the most characterizing or emblematic portion of a dastgâh. The only departure in terminology occurs in dashti, which in some radifs begins with the extended gushe hajiâni.

The gushes that follow darâmad are presented in a series with a set order, though, as indicated, with some variation among the different versions of the radif, and even among the versions of one performer recorded at different times. Ordinarily the order of the gushes is roughly ascending. For example, in most radifs, the gushes of chahârgâh are presented as follows (I am also giving the scale degree most emphasized): Darâmad (tonic); zâbol (third); hesâr (fifth); mokhâlef (sixth); muye (fourth); maghlub (octave, mainly on tetrachord from fifth to octave); and mansuri (octave, emphasizing the tetrachord from seventh to tenth). In several of the dastgâhs, there is a gushe which presents material from the darâmad an octave higher, thus dividing the entire mode into two sections, the second shorter than the first. In the case of chahârgâh, the gushe maghlub fills this role, although it is a role not specified in the name (but maghlub means "anagram"). Elsewhere the name states the function; in shur, the "darâmad pâindaste" ("darâmad with the hand low"—i.e., lower on the lute or bowed instrument, which means higher in pitch) or shur-e bâlâ ("shur high or above") provides the octave division.

There is a characteristic cadential section, forud ("descent") which is used at the end of the dastgâh, and at several intermediate points, to modulate from material in some sense distant back to the tonic and the basic range of darâmad. The concept of distance refers to both tonality and range. Thus, an improviser may make use of a forud for moving down two octaves to the original pitch of darâmad. Or, for example, a forud may be employed in chahârgâh to move from mansuri back to darâmad, from the range at which mansuri material is being presented whatever it may be, as in the radif mansuri is an octave higher than darâmad, without however introducing pitches that cannot be used in darâmad. But most important, a forud covers "distance" in the sense of modal difference, difference in interval structure and sequence. With the use of common tones, it moves from a modulatory gushe, one using pitches not available or conceivable in darâmad, back to the main scale and tonality of the dastgâh. Hesâr and muye in chahârgâh are examples of such modulatory gushes, as are delkash and shekaste in mâhur. The concept of descent to express a return home is interesting, suggesting that altitude involves either higher pitch or tonal remoteness. Uniting these two functions supports the suggestion that octave equivalence is not to be taken for granted in Persian music.

Several foruds, or several versions of the same forud, may appear in the radif of a dastgâh. And short or condensed versions of the principal forud appear here and there at the endings of gushes in a radif without actually being labeled as "forud." The beginning of a forud is often marked by a short motif, or one or two characteristic pitches, and thus a forud functions very much like a gushe. Indeed, most of the published radifs list foruds among the gushes, and Farhat (1966) makes a point of giving the foruds a status of significance just after darâmads in being emblematic of the dastgâhs.

To return to the gushes: They differ greatly in length. Each dastgâh has some very long ones (requiring, in Boroumand's and Ma'roufi's radifs, some three to five minutes) and others that can be played in ten to twenty seconds. In all radifs of shur, it is salmak, razavi, and shahnâz which are long, while zirkesh-e salmak and golriz are short. In chahârgâh, mokhâlef is long, but pahlavi and rajaz, short. In some of the radifs, long gushes are presented in two to five sections (qesmat). Farhat (1966:32) and particularly Sadeghi (1971:56) speak to the functions of the differences in length.

The several "parts" or sections of a long gushe are in some ways similar, but each may have a unique and dominant theme or motif in addition to the main motif of the dastgâh; even so, in the radif, these "parts" are definitely presented as a sequence. But there are also gushes that are presented in one and the same radif in several "versions" (now'). In contrast to the gushe with several sections, all of which, one is sometimes told, should make an appearance in each full-blown performance, the terminological implication for the gushe with "versions" is that it provides the improvisor with several options. In most dastgâhs, there are several darâmads, and these are presented as versions rather than sections. In most of the versions of Boroumand's radif, there are four darâmads of chahârgâh, and four of shur.

The concept of options thus presented in the radif is realized in performance. While some performances clearly contain material from more than one darâmad in the radif, the idea in performance seems not to be to go through all darâmad material in each performance, but to select. In the case of gushes with several distinct parts, however, all of the material may be presented. This "darâmad" treatment applies also to some gushes which (particularly in Ma'roufi's radif and somewhat less in Boroumand's), appear in two or three forms. While the different intentions of dividing a gushe into sections and presenting it in different forms may be clear, there is of course substantial similarity between the structures of the two kinds of subdivisions in a radif.

II. Character and Types of Gushes

Among the major issues in the internal structure of the radif is the typology of gushes, already mentioned. The gushes of one group are comprised of non-distinctive materials that recur in many dastgâhs, a matter whose interest to several authors has already been noted. Farhat uses the word "tekke" ("piece") and (1966:32) defines it as one of a group of "small and irregular pieces which tend to recur in more than one dastgâh and can be shifted around or omitted altogether." He includes among these the following: kereshme, baste-negâr, naghme, zangule, dotâyeki, hazin, dobeyti, jâme-darân, and masnavi, separating the metric (zarbi) ones from the non-metric (bi-zarb) among them. Zonis (1973:120-21), using this grouping as a point of departure, analyzes the construction of the darâmad group of pieces in Ma'roufi's radif, pointing out the combination of several darâmads (i.e., gushe) with a few tekkes as comprising a major subdivision of a dastgâh.

Of special significance in Sadeghi's presentation of the radif is his division of the gushes into three groups, somewhat along Farhat's lines, but in a characteristic classification. Sadeghi proposes that the radif is dominated by a group of main gushes, which he calls "shahgushe," the best-known, longest, and—he implies (1971:56)—most likely to be distinctive. These are, he says, the "bones" of the dastgâh, while a group of secondary ones are the "tendons," less frequently subject to far-flung improvisation and also shorter, serving to "fill the gaps between the principal sections of the dastgâh" (1971:57). A third group of short, typically less elaborated, and often metric gushes (Sadeghi calls them "fixed" gushes) completes the picture.

Examples of Sadeghi's groups follow: In shur, the principal gushes are darâmad, shahnâz, qarache, razavi, and hosseini. Secondary gushes are rahavi, kereshme, salmak, mollânâzi, khârâ, qajar, and bayât-e kord. The third group of gushes includes dobeyti, greyli, masnavi, and greyli shassi. In some respects but not in all, this grouping coincides with the hierarchies of gushes presented by other authors and by my own consultants.

In the case of chahârgâh, Sadeghi gives darâmad, zâbol, muye, mokhâlef, and hesâr as the principal gushes; mansuri, kereshme, baste-negâr, hozân, moarbâd, dobeyti, and hazin as secondary; and zangule, hodi, rajaz, and pahlavi as additional fixed gushes. Again, this coincides in general but not always specifically with other studies and with my field information. And the same may be said of mâhur, for which Sadeghi gives darâmad, dâd, tusi, feyli, shekaste, delkash, irâq, and râk as main gushes; kereshme, khosrovani, khâvarân, naghme, neyriz, nahib, sorush, and hazin, as secondary; with a few others in the role of additional "fixed" gushes.

The situation may in fact be even more complex than any of these authors describes it. Rather than just two or three classes, a continuum seems appropriate. Just what is meant by “irregular” in Farhat’s description is not clear. The degree to which gushes “can be omitted altogether from radif or performance seems also to vary. Size (“small . . . pieces”) seems difficult to define, as gushes of all sorts vary in length, although, to be sure, the tekkes are never among the longest. It is true that Farhat’s tekkes tend to have a distribution among the dastgâhs quite different from that of most prominent gushes, but in this respect they also vary among themselves. Thus, kereshme is found in all dastgâhs, and in various places, following many gushes, and conforming quintessentially to Farhat’s description of tekke. The same to a smaller degree is true of naghme, although it has a less distinctive character than kereshme, which always clearly stands out on account of definitively prescribed rhythm. Zangule, on the other hand, appears in six of Ma’roufi’s dastgâhs, and jâme-darân in only four. Dobeyti appears in six of Ma’roufi’s dastgâhs, but in none of Karimi’s despite its essentially vocal character, and although in other respects these two radifs agree in their distribution of the gushes that Farhat calls tekke.

The tekkes are not all alike in distribution and characteristics, and not equally distinct in relationship to the proper gushes. At the same time, some of their characteristics are shared by certain gushes not called “tekke” by Farhat. The brief nahib (not a tekke) appears in several dastgâhs, as does hajji-hassani. And there are various others with overlapping distribution even without counting the substantially overlapping and thus exceptional navâ and râst-panjgâh. The idea that a tekke is distinct because it takes on the tonal characteristics of different dastgâhs is contradicted by various gushes found in both chahârgâh and segâh, in each case with the dastgâh’s distinctive scale.

Tsuge's identification of gushe types (1974:30-34) produces a system contrastive and yet not unrelated to Farhat's, as he groups the gushes by rhythm and by the type and content of the poetry to which they are sung, distinguishing metric and non-metric melodies. The non-metric (which actually turn out to have some ingredients of metric structure) are then divided by him into four classes:

> **1)** One category includes melodies associated traditionally with specific verses, such as deleymân in dashti;
> **2)** A second category is comprised of a good number of "melodies which are more or less fixed in terms of rhythm and sung only with the verses composed in a certain meter" (Tsuge 1974:31). Included here are the following: kereshme and dobeyti (both regarded as tekke by Farhat, and used in several dastgâhs); greyli in shur; sâqinâme and sufinâme in mâhur; masnavi (used in many dastgâhs, and also one of Farhat's tekkes); hodi, pahlavi, and rajaz in chahârgâh; bakhtiâri and Leyli va Majnun in homâyun.
> **3)** Another category is comprised of melodies that are to be sung with any type of verse; this category theoretically includes most gushes and darâmads—although it is hard to reconcile this with the stated fact that Tsuge is here dealing with the metric (zarbi) part of the radif.
> **4)** A large category is made up of melodies not associated with any verse, that is, materials that are primarily instrumental, and it includes some possibly programmatic pieces such as zangule and zang-e shotor ("little bell" and "camel's bell"), and also some vocal material sung only with vocables, such as hazin.

Tsuge's grouping of the radif materials in accordance with textual associations is significant, as it interestingly complements interestingly the taxonomies based principally on instrumental radifs.

Seeing the ways in which Farhat, Zonis, Sadeghi, and Tsuge classify and group the gushes and noting that the diversity of their approaches sheds light on the great complexity of the interrelationship among gushes motivates us to suggest than an even more extensive taxonomy may be necessary for describing properly the mentioned level of complexity. Concentrating only on relative complexity and type of role within the radif, the following criteria seem to be appropriate: ubiquity of a gushe or similar unit within one dastgâh; distribution among the dastgâhs in the entire radif; rhythmic structure, and degree of metric character; appearance of a gushe within several dastgâhs in the same modal framework, or adaptation to the scalar and modal patterns of the various dastgâhs in which it appears; and of course, length and number of parts or versions. Combining these criteria produces many different kinds of gushes. But we should also add to them frequency of appearance of a gushe in improvised âvâz and the presence (or absence) of a tendency to be performed independently of the rest of its dastgâh. On the basis of these criteria, about a dozen types or groups of gushes can be identified and placed very roughly in an order of degree of significance. But the reader is cautioned to avoid considering these types as hard and fast classes; again, they are best seen as notches along a continuum. Beginning with the level of high significance, the list follows with a few illustrations, taken largely from the radifs of Ma'roufi and Boroumand.

1) The darâmads of the various dastgâhs. They occur almost without exception in performance, and materials from them, or derived from them, appear throughout their respective radifs of the dastgâhs and in performances of the dastgâhs. They rarely appear in other than their home dastgâhs and are, as a group and individually, emblematic of the entire dastgâh system and of the individual dastgâhs.

2) The gushes that are often performed independently and may actually be on the way to becoming independent secondary dastgâhs: Shushtari (from homâyun), bayât-e kord (from shur), and, according to Sadeghi (1971:54), oshaq of dashti and bayât-e esfahân, mokhâlef of segâh, and irâq of mâhur.

3) Gushes that have several sections and play a major role in radifs and performances: delkash of mâhur, shahnâz of shur, bidâd of homâyun. A special subdivision here would be the group of "modulatory" gushes that depart from the home scales of a dastgâhs.

4) Gushes with several sections which appear in most performances, but which appear in two dastgâhs that have a special relationship: mokhâlef and muye of segâh and chahârgâh.

5) Relatively short gushes which appear in one dastgâh only, and are non-metric: khâvarân in mâhur; golriz and mollânâzi in shur.

6) Gushes found in one dastgâh in addition to the explicitly overlapping dastgâhs of navâ and râst-panjgâh: neyshâburâk (in mâhur and navâ); bayât-e ajam (homâyun, râst-panjgâh); the group labeled nowruz (homâyun, râst); the râk group (mâhur, râst); qarache (shur, râst); massihi (afshâri, navâ).

7) Gushes of a basically metric character that appear in only one dastgâh: moqaddame be greyli (shur); hodi and rajaz (chahârgâh); chahâr pare (mâhur).

8) Gushes that are found in three dastgâhs: âshur, esfahânak, and mohâyer (mâhur, navâ, râst); hesâr (segâh, chahârgâh, mâhur); zâbol (chahârgâh, segâh, râst).

9) Gushes found in four dastgâhs: neyriz (homâyun, mâhur, navâ, râst); rohâb and oshâq (bayât-e esfahân, homâyun, navâ, râst).

10) Gushes found in four dastgâhs, with metric or rhythmically regular structure: zang-e shotor (chahârgâh, segâh, homâyun, râst).

11) Gushes with a metric basis, relatively brief, not the basis for much improvisation, and found in five or six dastgâhs: dobeyti, bastenegâr.

12) Gushes found, at least by designation, in all dastgâhs, and in several places in each dastgâh: kereshme, naghme.

Although far from really complete, this list gives some sense of the variety of types and distributions on the basis of a group of related overlapping criteria; it should, I repeat, be regarded as an illustration of the complexity of the radif, but not as a firm classification of gushe types.

While it is clearly useful for us to examine and group all of the materials in the longer radifs, and to take into account various ways in which some of these units may or may not be considered to be gushes in the proper sense of the word, the following pages and other studies in this series are inevitably more inclusive when dealing with certain questions than with others. Take for example the various kinds of pieces called tekke in Farhat's study; simply making a blanket omission of these would not make sense. There are at least three types of tekke in terms of their character and use: Some, such as jâme-darân, actually "behave" like longer gushes, although they are brief and appear in only a few dastgâhs.

Then there are pieces such as dobeyti and baste-negâr (one a vocal melody and associated type of poem, the other an instrumental exercise), which nevertheless seem to belong only to a particular group of dastgâhs and may thus be regarded as proper gushes. And finally, there are the pieces with a lower degree of distinctiveness such as kereshme and naghme, as they in fact simply constitute styles in which the materials that precede them in a dastgâh may be performed. Essentially, they are renditions in specific rhythms of melodic materials which in their pitch movement have a greater degree of independence. It seems appropriate for most of our studies of individual dastgâhs to divide the tekkes. Thus, for example, in the calculations of gushes belonging to Ma'roufi's radif, we include all, with the following exceptions: kereshme, naghme, dotâyeki (a rhythmic type), hazin, and masnavi; and units that are clearly in the chahâr mezrâb style. All of these omitted units appear in at least a majority if not in all dastgâhs.

The radif is most frequently presented by teachers and in publications as a unit, and the intention is always to study it as such. Most teachers seem to make a good deal of the order in which materials appear, but in fact, the radifs available to me exhibit a good bit of variation among those of different masters, and even among the versions of one teacher. Identifying the environment of gushes seems pertinent in discussing matters of order, as there are patterns that supplement the general characteristics of order. Some gushes, for instance, bear a particular relationship to each other. In the radifs of chahârgâh, the gushes hesâr and mokhâlef are ordinarily found in immediate succession, and in performances too they often occupy complementary roles. In radif as well as performance, darâmad and zâbol appear at the beginning and together. In the dastgâh of shur, shahnâz and qarache are similarly related, ordinarily appearing near the end.

A dastgâh may consist of a number of gushes of varying character and importance, but it is also possible to group gushes so that minor subdivisions of a dastgâh are established. As suggested by Zonis (1973:49), this kind of grouping is most useful in analyzing the long and heavily subdivided radifs of Ma'roufi and Boroumand. Let us take, for example, Ma'roufi's dastgâh-e segâh, with its forty sections (gushes, their subdivisions, and other units). It may also be seen as consisting of seven subdivisions. The first, perhaps most conveniently labeled the "darâmad" group, consists of an introductory "moqaddame," the "darâmads," and a kereshme, all based on the darâmad's theme and tonal material. The darâmad group also includes the following three pieces, which have a more distinctive character but within the tonal orbit of darâmad: pish-e zangule, zangule, and zang-e shotor. They are basically metric in character. Pish-e zangule is a short metric piece with a characteristic theme that leads to zangule, thematically unrelated but also distinctive and a bit less strictly metric. Zang-e shotor, already designated as a possibly programmatic imitation of a camel's bell, consists of a characteristic motif elaborated through an oft-repeated rhythmic pattern (though without pulse or metric cycle). The darâmad group thus consists of units that are melodically and rhythmically not very specific (darâmads themselves) followed by pieces of greater specificity—and incidentally a lower degree of significance and thus less likely to be the basis of inventive improvisation.

Segâh then continues, with sections dominated by zâbol, muye, hesâr, mokhâlef, and maghlub. At the end of Ma'roufi's radif of segâh, a group of gushes that are not particularly related to each other are used to close the dastgâh. The progression of the groups of gushes is occasionally interrupted by the reappearance of a short bit from a gushe presented earlier. Thus, Sections

9 through 12 in Ma'roufi's radif of segâh, comprising the zâbol group, are followed by three sections of muye. But zâbol returns in Section 16, as does maghlub in Sections 31-32 and again in 39. And yet, despite these irregularities, one way to perceive a dastgâh is to regard it as a series of groups of pieces, each of them led by and centered upon one major gushe

The relationship of metric introductions to some of the gushes is interesting in this regard. In a few cases, pairs of gushes appear, the second bearing the distinctive name while the first is metric and in some way labeled as introductory. Pish-e zangule ("before zangule") in chahârgâh and segâh are examples, as is moqaddame be greyli in shur. It is also interesting to see that there has been (possibly just in the course of the last few decades) a gradual increase of emphasis on the metric introduction. Greyli itself appears in earlier versions of the radif, but not in some of the more recent ones, while its preface—moqaddame—continues an independent existence. The relationship between pish-e zangule and zangule has become blurred. In some performances and even versions of the radif, the tune of zangule proper is sometimes omitted, while the musical content of pish-e zangule remains but does so under the name of zangule. More often, the two are combined under the one name, zangule. This trend may be related to the general tendency to increased emphasis on metric materials and the decline of the non-metric.

III. Modulatory Gushes

We have had occasion to mention the significance of the so-called "modulatory" gushes, and turn now to their relationships to the main body of gushes (see Khaleqi 1961; Zonis 1973:46). As already pointed out, in mâhur they include shekaste (lowered third and flatted seventh, usually) and delkash (lowered sixth and flatted seventh); in chahârgâh, hesâr (lowered third and raised fourth) and muye (lowered fourth). Characteristically, these are long gushes described as "important" by performers.

Whether one is justified in distinguishing these from other gushes that depart from the home scale by introducing different emphases of tonic and range is not quite clear. The distinction may be more of an issue, at any rate, in modern times than earlier, when the concept of octave equivalence is likely to have been less significant, and in which movement from one gushe to another (or one maqam to another, in earlier times, if you will) through common tones was an important process regardless of the amount of common scalar material.

Thus, in chahârgâh, moving from darâmad to zâbol, that is, changing from the tetrachord below tonic to the one above the tonic, along with change from emphasis on the tonic to emphasis on the third, may once have been perceived as not radically different from the kind of modulation involved in moving from darâmad to hesâr. Nevertheless, in the twentieth century these explicitly modulatory gushes (stressed, for example, in Caron and Safvate 1966:47-48; and Khaleqi 1961) have occupied a special role. They have tended to separate themselves from a dastgâh and to be performed independently, occasionally going on to constitute a separate dastgâh. This may have happened in the case of bayât-e kord in shur (raised fifth degree as related to the scale of shur). The satellite dastgâhs of shur, all of which have slightly different scalar configurations, may also have got started in this way. Modulatory character, it must quickly be said, is surely not the only mechanism that has brought about the development of derivative dastgâhs. Shushtari, now probably in the process of spinning off from homâyun, uses the home scale. If there is any part of chahârgâh that is now showing signs of becoming an independent dastgâh by virtue of its prominence in chahârgâh performances, it is mokhâlef rather than the modulatory gushes perhaps precisely because of the fact that mokhâlef does not depart, but is rather, as its name implies, a kind of reflection of chahârgâh.

It is difficult to characterize the structural location of modulatory gushes, except to say that they are internal, do not appear too close to beginning or ending, and are not immediately adjacent. The dastgâhs differ greatly in their use of modulation. Shur does not use modulatory gushes very much, and where they do appear, they tend to have in common the raised fifth. Chahârgâh Maintains only two modulatory gushes, while in mâhur, on the other hand, departure from the basic scale is widespread. In Ma'roufi's radif of mâhur, out of 58 numbered pieces, 23 have explicitly different scales from the major-like scale. Not counting alternate versions or additional parts, they include the already mentioned delkash and shekaste, as well as hajji-hassani, tarab-angiz, neyriz, nahib, sorush, irâq, mohayyer, baste-negâr, the entire group of gushes named râk (râk-e hendi, râk-e keshmir, etc.), sufinâme, and harbi. But in addition, even pieces that use the major-like scale depart from it occasionally, particularly in using the flatted seventh degree.

IV. The Shared Gushes

We have noted the significance, in the radif, of gushes that appear in more than one dastgâh. In some cases, a melodic entity appears under two names, but much more frequently a gushe appears, under the same name, in two or more dastgâhs, sometimes in identical form, and in other cases, identical at least in the distinctively thematic parts. In yet a third group of instances, the melodic contour remains but there is a change in the specific intervallic relationship, usually brought about by differences among the scales of the various modes, as suggested in the discussion of the theme of darâmad of chahârgâh, above.

It is interesting to examine the collection of gushes by name and their distribution through the versions of the radif. The radif of Ma'roufi has 152 different gushe names, counting darâmads (i.e., the names of the dastgâhs themselves) but excluding names that result from the division of a gushe into several sections or presentation in different versions or forms; and also excluding metric materials such as chahâr mezrâbs, as well as most of the materials in Farhat's category of tekke, such as naghme, kereshme, etc., which suggest genres rather than distinctive gushes. Of the 152, only 45 appear in more than one dastgâh. Table R-2 gives the gushes that appear in more than one dastgâh, with their distribution in the radifs of Ma'roufi and Karimi. Several things may be noted about these overlappings.

First, they are not really voluminous. Considering the many statements of interrelationships among dastgâhs found in the literature, one might have expected a large proportion of gushes to crop up repeatedly. But when the tekkes (overlapping almost by definition) are omitted, less than one-third of the gushes are involved. Further, there are patterns in the sharing. For one thing, the number of gushes involved vary interestingly by dastgâh. It is perhaps significant that Shur and its satellites have the smallest number: shur (7), abu-atâ (4), afshâri (4), bayât-e tork (3) and dashti (none). The dastgâhs of navâ and râst-panjgâh were often described to me by Iranian musicians as consisting largely of borrowed materials, and to be sure, navâ has 12, and râst-panjgâh, 19 shared gushes. But homâyun, with 14, and mâhur with 12 are hardly behind. Segâh and chahârgâh have 9 and 12, respectively, but this reflects to some extent their special relationship, as five gushes appear in both chahârgâh and segâh and not elsewhere. Thus the majority of overlapping results principally from appearance in navâ or râst-panjgâh of a gushe from one of the other dastgâhs, or from the special relationship of segâh and chahârgâh.

Yet there are some other instances where distribution is worth noting. Continuing to use Ma'roufi's radif as the basis, hajjihassani and hesâr are both found in chahârgâh, segâh, and mâhur; mansuri, in chahârgâh and homâyun; zang-e shotor in chahârgâh, segâh, homâyun, and râst-panjgâh; ozal in homâyun and shur; and so on.

The general character of overlapping, considering both general patterns and the particular gushes that are involved, is roughly the same in Ma'roufi's and Karimi's versions, despite the important differences between vocal and instrumental radifs, and their differences in size and ways of designating subdivisions. Compared to Ma'roufi's total of 152, with 45 shared, Karimi has a total of 92 gushes of which 25 appear more than once. There is only a moderate amount of agreement. Only 22 of Ma'roufi's 45 shared gushes are also shared in Karimi's radif; and only seven of Karimi's 22 fail to have multiple appearance in Ma'roufi. There are a number of identical overlap patterns: Leyli va Majnun appear in both radifs in homâyun and râst-panjgâh. Maghlub, mokhâlef and muye have the same distribution, segâh and chahârgâh. Neyhâburak appears in mâhur and navâ in both radifs. The four gushes in the râk group (safir-e râk, râk-e hendi, râk-e keshmir, and râk-e Abdollâh) all appear, in both radifs, in the dastgâhs of mâhur and râst-panjgâh.

Yet there are important divergences between the two radifs. The nowruz group (nowruz-e 'arab, nowruz-e Sabâ, nowruz-e khârâ) in Karimi appear only in homâyun, but in Ma'roufi's radif, in both homâyun and râst-panjgâh. Shekaste appears in mâhur alone in Ma'roufi's radif; but in Karimi's, it is in mâhur, segâh, and bayât-e tork. Zang-e shotor does not appear in Karimi at all, being essentially an instrumental kind of work; but it is in four dastgâhs of Ma'roufi.

There is a tendency for prominent materials, with their greater length and several sections, to appear in only one dastgâh. Thus, the shur group, which is thought by many musicians to enjoy highest status, has the smallest amount of overlap; and navâ and râst-panjgâh, which are accorded secondary status and are in fact rarely performed, consist largely of gushes that also appear elsewhere. Moreover, some of the most prominent gushes in the various dastgâhs, and particularly some of the ones that are occasionally performed independently (the mentioned bayât-e kord and shushtari) appear in only one place in any radif. As expected, and as suggested by Farhat and Sadeghi, some of the gushes that reappear most seem to enjoy little free improvisation in performances, and may not be taken very seriously by musicians: jâmedarân, baste-negâr, dobeyti, zangule.

V. Rhythm

One of the major distinctions among types of gushes, and an important though not often articulated criterion of significance in the Iranian taxonomy, is rhythmic structure. In various respects, the over-all rhythmic structure of a dastgâh is interesting to examine. The radif is prevailingly non-metric, and the type of performance most closely related to it, the âvâz, is typically non-metric improvisation throughout. The vocal versions of the radif have virtually no metric materials, but the instrumental ones include a number of metric units, such as rengs and chahâr mezrâbs, whose status as properly belonging to the radif is questioned by some Iranian musicians. The non-metric materials themselves exhibit a good deal of rhythmic variety. Indeed, the distinction between metric and non-metric is significant in the Iranian taxonomy of musical materials (the term zarbi being used for metric music in general), but rhythmic analysis provides the basis for a much more complex classification. The various sections of the radif can be grouped in terms of the degree to which metric structure is present, and of rhythmic predictability and regularity. Such a grouping of melodies produces some in which there is no evidence of a regular beat, and no regularity to be derived from repetitions of sequences of note values, nor evidence of a pulse resulting from the repeated use of a single note value.

But there is actually not very much material with such a low degree of rhythmic predictability. More characteristically, one finds regularity of various sorts. Thus, there is music in which a beat is concealed under a kind of rubato, the spacing between the beats actually varying considerably in length. There are sections in which sequences of note values and stresses accompany melodic sequences. The radif contains sections in which a kind of pulse is set up through the emphasis on a single note value; short bits of rhythmic ostinato; rhythmic patterns that recur with different melodic content.

One kind of typology of rhythms is suggested in our chapter on mâhur; and further comments appear in our study of shur. It may not be appropriate at this point to propose a single overarching taxonomy of rhythmic types. But Tsuge (1974:112-40) has shown that the rhythm of âvâz is substantially based on patterns of Arabic and Persian poetry, and no doubt this accounts at least in part for the feeling of rhythmic regularity perceived by the auditor of vocal âvâz. In the instrumental radifs, the scope of rhythmic variety is enriched by materials derived from instrumental traditions. It is possible to distinguish a dozen kinds of rhythmic movement.

The taxonomy of types of pieces in the radif used by Iranian musicians includes elements of a rhythmic typology. Several kinds of rhythm are distinguished, indirectly or explicitly, in the terminology of the radif, and in explanations by teachers. Let me review: Some of the gushes are distinguished by their rhythm alone, as for example kereshme, based on a sequence of note values. Naghme is a type of gushe which is typically based on a pulse-like sequence of one or two note values. Chahâr mezrâb, a kind of composition as well as a style of playing, indicates rhythmic ostinato. Interestingly, the materials with the greatest rhythmic specificity and predictability seem to occupy the less significant roles in the radif. Kereshme almost always follows a less metric gushe whose melodic material it uses with its own characteristic rhythm. Naghme is similar, but most frequently part of the darâmad group. Some radifs include metric or semi-metric sections such as masnavi or reng. Farhat, as pointed out earlier, includes most of the metric material in his category of tekke.

A brief introduction to rhythm leads naturally to the question of tempo. This is one respect in which the recorded radifs (the only ones that can be examined for this purpose) are relatively unified. The metric sections, it is important to note quickly, may differ greatly; chahâr mezrâbs are quick, the kereshme is slow, and the gushes approaching metric structure such as zangule in chahârgâh or chahâr-pare in mâhur, are more varied in tempo. But on the whole, a radif moves along in measured pace. The various non-metric gushes do not differ much at all in their tempo, and indeed, the various versions of the radif conform roughly to a norm that seems to be implicitly if not verbally agreed upon. By contrast, performances such as improvisations based upon the radif exhibit great differences in tempo, and in the amount and kind of internal variation of tempo.

Speaking very generally, the same statement could be made about ornamentation. It is helpful to note the following contrast. Ornamentation is of course of enormous importance for giving identity to the Iranian classical style (see Caton 1974). Yet it seems not to be a great factor in distinguishing sections of the radif from each other, or even of versions of the radif. But on the other hand again, it may certainly play a role of great significance in distinguishing the styles of various improvising performers.

But to return to questions of rhythm specifically, two further points of a general nature are worth making. First, the rhythm of the main motifs of the principal gushes of a dastgâh are sometimes related to each other. For instance, several gushes of chahârgâh begin with a group of short notes followed by a long, stressed note, and several gushes of shur begin with a series of medium-length notes preceded by a short anacrusis. There are many exceptions to this tendency, which has not been studied in detail, but it is strong enough to require at least preliminary notice (see, in relationship to this issue, Zonis 1973:48, 128). And second, the close relationship between significance and absence of metric structure, accompanied by absence of great melodic specificity, suggests that improvised music and music that lends itself to improvisation are significant because of their unpredictability. By extension, the absence of a pulse or a metric cycle lends rhythmic unpredictability to a composed and memorized melody and thus endows it with some of the aspects of improvisation (although, to be sure, non-metric m a terial may be memorized and reproduced as well as metric).

VI. Relationships Among the Parts of the Radif

The previous sections have shown that in at least several if not all of the radifs available for examination, the overall structure of the typical individual dastgâh has several important characteristics: grouping of the gushes into a coherent series; continual emphasis on the main motif of darâmad; division into two sections by a gush that replicates darâmad an octave higher; special roles for modulatory gushes; a generally ascending sequence; the special relationship of certain pairs of gushes; functions of gushes determined partly in accordance with their metric character; and a particular role for metric introductions. Certain of the characteristics of a dastgâh are found as well in the macrocosm of the radif as a whole. In some respects, to be sure, the overall structure of the entire radif is not as consistent from version to version, from musician to musician, as is the structure of the individual dastgâh. The complexity of the interrelationship of the constituent parts of one dastgâh is reflected, however, in the overall structure of the radif.

Looking therefore at the radif as a whole, those of its versions available to me agree in numerous ways. Starting with the obvious, all have twelve dastgâhs—although some very early forms (see Khatschi 1962: 77-80) as well as oral statements by a few younger musicians list thirteen; and there are some differences in their classification. The dastgâhs live in a state of complex interrelationship. Most modern sources describe the radif as consisting of twelve modes, all of them dastgâhs to an equal degree. Some earlier ones, to be sure, from before ca. 1960, make more of the distinction between primary and secondary dastgâhs, the secondary being called âvâz or mota'aleqat. In any event, the dependence of some dastgâhs upon certain others is accepted in all versions. The dastgâh of shur has its satellites, abu-atâ, afshâri, dashti, bayât-e tork (and in some anomalous listings, bayât-e kord as well); homâyun has bayât-e esfahân. Segâh, chahârgâh, mâhur, navâ, and râst-panjgâh have no satellites. One might also make a case, however, for a satellite-like relationship between râst (primary) and panjgâh (secondary), the sequence here being opposite to the shushtari-kord pattern, a major gushe joining rather than abandoning a dastgâh.

But the ties between primary and secondary dastgâhs are not the only source of relationship among dastgâhs. Segâh and chahârgâh are related to each other, and navâ is to some extent related to shur, while râstpanjgâh is related to mâhur and homâyun. The twelve dastgâhs could conceivably be grouped in four classes: shur and its five relatives; homâyun with bayât-e esfahân; mâhur and râst-panjgâh; and segâh with chahârgâh. But on what are all these statements and claims of relationship based? To the outside analyst, dastgâhs may be related in several ways: by having common scales, common cadential motifs, common gushes by melodic content, or common terminology. All of these relationships would have some significance to informed Iranian musicians, but their emphasis would be on the shared gushes (by name) and on common cadential motifs.

Looking at it all in greater detail reveals greater complexity. The satellites of shur are related to shur because there is a good deal of commonality in tone inventory, even though the scales, as defined by interval sequences and stressed tones, are not identical. The forud (cadential formula) of shur appears in these satellites, and the simple fact that the folk taxonomy asserts the relationship is itself a factor in establishing it. Moreover, the brevity of the satellites and the fact that each is dominated by one or two gushes rather than seven or eight adds to their subsidiary or dependent kind of status. Navâ, on the other hand, is related to several other dastgâhs by the fact that there are some common gushes, but to shur because of scalar identities and overlappings. Somewhat the same is true of the relationship of râstpanjgâh to mâhur and homâyun.

There are other kinds of relationship. Homâyun is related to bayât-e esfahân by the use of similar scales and a common forud. Segâh and chahârgâh are related by the closeness of their names (segâh = third place; chahârgâh = fourth place), but more important, by the fact that they have many gushes in common. This commonality rests both on identity of terminology and on the similarity of melodic contour, although the latter is not true identity because the two dastgâhs have different scalar designs and thus require the use of modally altered intervals within a diatonic framework. Among Iranian musicians, however, segâh and chahârgâh are "brothers."

Mâhur and chahârgâh are related in having the ascription of similar non-musical character, and some similarity of scale in the sense of emphasis on major third and fifth above the tonic. While the second and sixth degrees in chahârgâh are a quarter-tone lower than those of a major scale, in actual practice they are sometimes raised, and chahârgâh may in fact approximate mâhur in scalar design. In this context, it is relevant that in Arabic music, the maqam jahargah sometimes has a major-like scale. In other respects, dastgâhs are related by the presence of some common gushes, but this kind of overlap is a common feature of most dastgâhs and, rather than establishing special relationships within the radif, serves more to unify the radif. The studies of mâhur and shur, Chapters 4 and 5 in this series, provide illustrations.

There are some rather specific ways in which the relationship of dastgâhs in the radif parallel the relationship of gushes in a dastgâh. The overlapping of gushes among dastgâhs is reflected in the commonality of motifs among the components of the individual dastgâh. As already stated, the gushes of any one dastgâh share rhythmic motifs and indeed, some general aspects of rhythmic character, and this reflects the general rhythmic unity of the radif. The conception of dastgâhs as in some senses equal and in others arranged in a hierarchy also has a parallel in the interrelationship of gushes. The internal grouping of gushes and their special interrelationships, commonality of scales, and motifs is a microcosm of the whole radif. The reflection is of course approximate and even sporadic. In general, the internal structure of the radif is, as already said, less consistent than that of the dastgâhs.

The order of the various versions of the radif have some features in common. Shur and its satellites tend to appear first, while navâ and râst-panjgâh are last. Bayât-e esfahân is maintained next to homâyun. The order of the middle group varies more, except that segâh and chahârgâh ordinarily appear together, with mâhur following. Beginning and ending are more consistent in order than the middle portion, something again reminiscent of the patterns of order within a dastgâh. This most obvious illustration appears in the dastgâh of chahârgâh, where darâmad and zâbol are almost invariably first, and mansuri, last. The order of the gushes appearing medially is less predictable, except that hesâr and mokhâlef are almost always adjacent.

A complex situation obtains for the dastgâh of shur, ordinarily regarded as the most important, the "mother of dastgâhs." This significance is supported by its tendency to produce spinoffs and also by its non-musical characterization, as it is believed to be particularly close to the Iranian cultural ideal. It is not, we must note, the dastgâh that was most frequently performed at least in the 1960's and 1970's, although, if one added satellites to main dastgâhs, shur would probably be the group most used. The prominence of shur is agreed upon by musicians; only Barkechli (1963:51) and Caron and Safvate (1966:82-83) imply otherwise, pointing to the age and importance of chahârgâh deriving from the symmetry of its two identical tetrachords. This structure underscores some important features of the modal system, symmetry in general and the integrity and structural role of tetrachords.

While the term "radif" implies order, and there is general agreement among musicians that a particular order of dastgâhs is essential, there is less agreement on the specific order to be followed than is typically the case for the order of gushes within a dastgâh. As a matter of fact, the order of the dastgâhs in the radif versions is not always easy to determine. Sometimes it seems a matter of little importance: Boroumand's official radif is presented in a set of recordings whose order is not clear. Roshanravan's set of records also is not numbered so as to provide a definite sequence.

In the case of Saba's published radif, the order also cannot be established with complete clarity, as it is different in the radifs of the group of instrument instruction books in which it appears. Nevertheless, it is instructive to note the order in one of Saba's sets. The four volumes of the santur radif present the dastgâhs in the following order:

Segâh and Shur (mixed)
the four derivative dastgâhs of Shur
Homâyun, Bayât-e Esfahân, Chahârgâh
Mâhur, Navâ, Râst-Panjgâh.

It is interesting to compare this with the specific order given in Ma'roufi's radif:

> Shur, Abu-Atâ, Dashti, Afshâri, Bayât-e Tork, Segâh, Chahârgâh, Mâhur, Homâyun, Bayât-e Esfahân, Râst-Panjgâh, Navâ.

The order of Karimi's official (1978) radif is similar, though not identical:

> Shur, Abu-Atâ, Bayât-e Tork, Dashti, Afshâri; Homâyun, Bayât-e Esfahân; Segâh, Chahârgâh, Mâhur; Râst-P., Navâ.

The older tradition, it would appear, determined order by criteria of importance, significance of the materials to the culture, and values such as originality (derived and overlapping materials come later), and nonmusical character (things thought to be especially "Iranian" come earlier). Units that generate others, that is, the parents of spin-offs or satellites, precede. More recently, technical matters and the significance of the radif as a teaching tool seem to have begun to play a role. In some radifs, and in the teaching practices of some musicians, dashti, thought to be lighter and perhaps easier to absorb, appears first.

The degree to which order is more theory than practice is also worthy of note. There is some, but not much, evidence that the radifs of Karimi and Ma'roufi, in their published versions, reflect an obligatory order of teaching. Yet Boroumand, in his teaching at the University of Tehran, was more interested in articulating the importance of order than in actually adhering to an established sequence.

As there are twelve dastgâhs, one would expect twelve scales; or perhaps, seven scales to go with the seven principal dastgâhs. Actually, there are five main types, derived from shur, homâyun, segâh, chahârgâh, and mâhur. Calculating quite differently, there would be many more scales in the Iranian classical system, as the so-called modulatory gushes are cast in unique scalar configurations. Furthermore, in some ways the scales are not simply diatonic sequences (including here, of course, the three-quarter and five-quarter tones characteristic of Middle Eastern music). For one thing, the roles of tonics vary; or, the number of tones may be fewer than seven; there may be variable pitches; and in these and other respects, the modal system of the radif goes well beyond a simple set of interval sequences such as the "modes" widely used in modern folk song analysis.

Some illustrations: First, take chahârgâh and segâh, closely related in the content of gushes and their melodic contours. Chahârgâh has a definite tonic that is constantly emphasized and reiterated, and whose repeated articulation characterizes the beginning of many sections in improvised performances. Segâh on the other hand has an ambiguous tonal structure, two tones separated by a neutral third both somehow functioning as tonic, the pair together occupying a role of tonic nucleus. Or take the dastgâh of shur: It provides another kind of structure, having a definite tonic, whose function is, however, sometimes usurped but the leading tone below it. Again, in mâhur, a scale approximating major is used, but the third degree is frequently lowered and in the higher octave, the seventh degree is flatted.

Modulatory gushes may, at least through the main body of their contents, have a scale of fewer than seven tones. Thus, hesâr of chahârgâh uses the fifth degree of the basic scale as tonic, and in its most characterizing portion includes the lowered third (koron), raised fourth (sori), lowered sixth, and the (natural) major seventh above the tonic. But an examination of the entire gushe in vocal and instrumental radifs shows that the rest of the chahârgâh scale appears in hesâr as well, and when this is transposed so that the fifth of the basic chahârgâh scale becomes the general tonic, the entire scale would then be (using C as the equivalent of the tonic) C, D-p, E, F, G-p, A-p, and B-p (the intervals from "C" thus being 3/4 - 5/4 - 1/2 - 3/4 - 1 - 1 - 3/4 tones), a scale not used in any of the dastgâhs.

This brief look at scales shows that there are strands of material that criss-cross the arrangement of the radif by dastgâhs, overlapping with and in various ways connecting and again separating them, in a style related to the familiar metaphor of the Persian carpet. The same may be said of melodic motifs. Take for example the gesture that is characterized by alternation of fifth and sixth degrees of a scale leading up to an emphasized articulation of the tonic, a theme briefly discussed earlier. It is most readily associated with darâmad of chahârgâh, and of course it also appears as maghlub of chahârgâh. It is likewise the most characteristic sequence in the forud of segâh (but with slightly different interval values), it is the theme of râk in mâhur, and we have pointed out that it is found in several other locations. These variants are alike in contour, but the differences in intervallic structure make them, in the Iranian musicians' taxonomy, less closely related, something a bit unexpected in view of the degree of variation of intonation found in Persian music at large.

Generally speaking, musical entities are labeled by unique terms in the radif. But there are exceptions, and proper understanding of the radif would require juxtaposing the structure of terminology to the structure of the music itself, its scalar and melodic units. Materials that are related by name may produce different groupings from those that result from consideration of musical content alone.

VII. Summary

The structure of the radif is complex and its history can in part be uncovered by a comparison of its versions and components. But listening to the radif in its various versions, one may be struck by the degree to which different gushes and dastgâhs present themselves in a variety of scalar patterns, motifs, and rhythmic types while at the same time providing a sense of strong stylistic unity. Dastgâhs and gushes differ, but the radif sounds very much like a single unified work, in a style not easily confused with Arabic or Turkish classical music, or with the folk and tribal traditions of the Middle East—to say nothing of the musics of South Asia.

If there is a general stylistic unity in the radif overriding the diversity of rhythms and modes, it is in good measure based on ornamentation and phrasing, areas that we can only touch upon in this group of studies. Even more specific to the radif is a group of techniques of treatment of motifs and gestures. In contrast to at least some non-metric music in Arabic traditions, the radif as a whole is perhaps best characterized by its dependence on a set of short melodic particles, which may (but not always quite accurately) also be called gestures or motifs. The composition techniques are quite unified. Typically, one short motif is presented and briefly developed in some way, sometimes separated from others by non-motivic and musically more generalized materials, followed by new motifs similarly treated or by the reappearances of motifs presented earlier. The techniques by which these motifs are developed include repetition, melodic sequence, extension, augmentation, and contraction. And there are also characteristic combinations of these techniques, such as repetition followed by upward transposition further followed by a second transposed version given in extended form. These techniques appear distributed throughout the radif and are equally present in all of the dastgâhs. Most important, they play a significant role in the performance of improvised âvâz and in composed works based on the radif. It is to a substantial extent the dependence on motifs and their brief development that give the radif, and the Iranian classical tradition, its unique character.

Second Part: Case Studies of Three Dastgahs

CHAPTER III

FROM RADIF TO IMPROVISATION IN CHÂHARGÂH

By Bruno Nettl, with Béla Foltin, Jr.

The dastgâh of chahârgâh differs from the others of the radif in its distinct scale and complement of gushes, but also in some other respects that establish its uniqueness. More than any other dastgâh, it consists of a group of gushes that are easily distinguished from each other in tonal and melodic respects, overlapping only slightly in their characteristics, gushes that are presented, in radif as well as in performance, as separate and easily separable units. Our purpose here is to survey briefly several radifs of chahârgâh in terms of their content of gushes, to go on to a more detailed discussion of darâmad in the radifs, and then to look comparatively at a group of performances of the âvâz of chahârgâh. The discussion of the performances is devoted to the following: an account of the contents in terms of gushes, their proportion and order; the treatment of darâmad in terms of its length and the use of its motifs; and a comparison of performances in Tehran with a few from Khorasan, of vocal with instrumental performances, and of performances on the setâr with those on some other instruments. Finally, attempts to characterize one group of performances of chahârgâh by one master of the setâr, recorded over a period of approximately fifteen years, and another group performed by a young violinist, from 1968-69, conclude this study.

I. The Radif of Chahârgâh

Table C-1 indicates twelve radif savailable for this study at the time it was revised (1985, from Nettl with Foltin 1972). The reader will note that their times of documentation extend from 1913 to 1978. Six of these are available in recorded form (some of them also notated, and one evidently recorded from a notated version); three are available only in notated form, and three only from description, that is, listings of their constituent gushes and their order. It is quickly evident that there is a strong consensus on content. The table gives these radifs in approximately chronological order and does not list materials that are not part of the consensus, that is materials not found in the majority of radifs. One of the special characteristics of chahârgâh is the consistency of the presence of a number of principal gushes: darâmad, zâbol, hesâr, mokhâlef, muye, maghlub, and mansuri. Another group of three, hodi, pahlavi, rajaz, ordinarily presented together, is barely outside the scope of this consensus, while a few further gushes appear here and there, sometimes as subdivisions of the major gushes. The small group comprising this consensus is quite different in nature to the large but less firmly established group of principal gushes in mâhur and shur. It is noteworthy that the complement of gushes found in the earliest radifs continues essentially intact. To be sure, a few of the radifs (and this includes Mirza Abdollah's radif as described by Nazir and Hedayat) include some gushes not generally found. Gini and badr, present in the early radifs, seem to have been dropped or to have been assimilated or included in other dastgâhs. The custom of appending some rengs at the end was evidently established already by the time of Mirza Abdollah, and continued in the instrumental radifs. A few of the kinds of pieces labeled as "tekke" by Farhat are found here and there in the instrumental radifs; and the custom of closing the radif with the use of a masnavi is observed by Karimi.

But as already stated, there is a substantial group of gushes held in common by virtually all of the radifs; and as these are also the ones held in common by the main body of performances, we may consider them as the heart of the dastgâh. The inclusion of the tekkes, of masnavi, and of rengs blurs the distinction between the radif—as a kind of theoretical body and a teaching device—and the actual performances; but then the performances themselves depart from theory as well. Thus, while a performance is said to be comprised of five parts, the middle one of which is the improvised âvâz, performances that seem to be comprised exclusively of âvâz nevertheless may contain, internally, chahâr mezrâbs and tasnifs. Moreover, performers often do not, in analysis or in audible practice, separate the introductory pishdarâmad or the closing reng from the âvâz, any more than the gushes of the âvâz are distinguished or separated from each other.

The radifs of chahârgâh share a general order. Darâmad is always first, zâbol ordinarily second. Hesâr and mokhâlef almost always appear together, and always in that order. Maghlub always comes after mokhâlef, and mansuri, after maghlub. The basic order of the six—D-Z-H-Mo-Mq-Mn (we will use these abbreviations occasionally in this chapter)—is firm. It reflects, it is important to note, an ascending order of tonal centers. Darâmad (let us recapitulate) dwells on the tonic, zâbol on the third, hesâr on the fifth, mokhâlef on the sixth, maghlub and mansuri both on the octave of the tonic (with maghlub concentrating on the tetrachord below the tonic, and mansuri on the seventh and the ninth). The substantial consistency in order is disturbed by muye and the group of three which in character also depart from the rest—hodi, pahlavi, and rajaz.

Muye seems to have been near the beginning at earlier times, but to have been gradually moved back and in some cases even omitted. It appears immediately after zâbol in the two earliest radifs. In the vocal radifs of Karimi, it does not appear at all (although it does appear in his segâh). In the recent instrumental radifs it has a more ambiguous role. In Ma'roufi, it actually appears twice, both times briefly, consisting of only one section in contrast to the other major gushes. Its first appearance is after darâmad, and it occupies a role almost of subdivision of darâmad; later it reappears briefly after maghlub. In Boroumand's officially recorded radif, the version in which he probably wished most clearly to show his adherence to the tradition, muye appears after zâbol, as it does also in the earliest descriptions. But in a recording made by Boroumand in 1968, it appears after maghlub. Roshanravan's radif, produced under different circumstances and based on Ma'roufi, has muye second. In the performances of âvâz of chahârgâh, in which the order of gushes is generally less consistent than in the radifs, the position of muye is also less consistent than that of the other gushes. And it is always presented briefly.

The trio of hodi-pahlavi-rajaz, three gushes with rhythm more closely approximating the metric, usually appear in the radif as a group. Their melodies, each of them a reverting form with arc-shaped melodic contour, are closer in style to those of tasnifs, and as a group they are related in a kind of A1-B-A2 structure, with B (pahlavi) somewhat higher in range. It may be noted that they appear as a group in some of the earlier radifs, but again their presence and position is inconsistent. In Saba's "bare-bones" radif, they do not appear at all, and in Karimi, they are only in the most official and formal version. When the trio does appear, it is ordinarily near the end, just before mansuri, but there are two exceptions, and in one of these, rajaz appears alone. Interestingly, this group of gushes seems to be extremely rare in performances, but in the radifs, it has somehow held its own.

It is instructive, of course, to compare the radifs by investigating the specific versions of the individual gushes. As a sample of what would otherwise, in totality, require far more space than is available, we look at the darâmad group. Two approaches may be helpful. First, several of the radifs present not one darâmad, but several sections, usually designated as "first darâmad", "second darâmad", etc.; sometimes these are what Farhat calls tekkes, but they may be given other names, e.g. "kereshme" or "third darâmad, called kereshme," or "zangule," sometimes "pish-e zangule" or "third darâmad, called zangule." The character of these subsidiary versions of darâmad relates them closely to the principal version, as they use the main theme in some way and hover around the tonic. Whether zangule and pish-e zangule, which appear in several dastgâhs, should be considered part of darâmad was questioned by some musicians with whom I spoke, but there is no doubt that at least some of them regard it as a portion of the darâmad group. The "kereshme" that is part of the darâmad group simply presents the melodic motif of darâmad with the kereshme rhythm, / . _ . _ . ._ _ / a rhythm that is used in conjunction with many melodic motifs throughout the radif.

The musical concept of zangule appears to be a set of two tunes that have in the last several decades become absorbed in the more powerful darâmad group. In the listings of Nazir and

Hedayat, 1903 (i.e., 1913) and 1928, it appears after the darâmad group and seems to be a unit of its own, and it consists of two sections identified as pish-e zangule and zangule. It is also treated thus in the Ma'roufi radif, in which pish-e zangule, with its characteristic duple meter and its tune slightly resembling "Yankee Doodle" is followed by a hemiolic tune basically in triple meter, zangule itself. In Saba's radif, on the other hand, zangule proper appears, but it comes after (and presumably as part of) hesâr, that is, with half-raised fourth and half-flatted third.

The radifs of Ma'roufi and Boroumand explicitly present several darâmads, labeled "first," "second," etc. The radif of Karimi provides one darâmad in each version, but this is divided into sections in accordance with the traditional subdivisions of vocal gushes. Thus there is "darâmad" (theme of the darâmad, on one syllable, melismatic); she'r (words of the poem) and tahrir (melismatic virtuosic passage). Four principal identities seem to appear in this repertory of various darâmad of chahârgâh. They may most conveniently be labeled in accordance with their identifications in Boroumand's 1969 radif, and although the identities are somewhat larger than the particles and motif as given in Table C-2, can nevertheless be characterized in accordance with its designations:

1st darâmad: Main motif, followed by a generalized section between tonic and third, followed by the main motif (C-2, no. 1, 2, 1).

2nd darâmad: Main motif, followed by a memorable theme presented in ascending sequence, followed again by main motif (no. 1, 6, 1).

3rd darâmad: Kereshme rhythm with the melodic contour of the main motif (Table C-2, no. 1, with special rhythm).

4th darâmad: Zangule tune, (i.e., pish-e zangule), preceded by the main chahârgâh motif (C-2, no. 1, 9).

The radifs in which darâmad appears in several sections, or in which there are several darâmads, have arrangements as follows:

Boroumand 1967	2nd dar.	1st dar.	zangule	kereshme
Boroumand 1969	1st dar.	2nd dar.	kereshme	zangule
Boroumand 1975	1st dar.	1st dar.*	zangule	2nd dar.
Ma'roufi	1st dar. 1st dar.**	1st dar.* kereshme	2nd dar. zangule	
Karimi 1968	2nd dar.	1st dar.	extension of 1st dar.	
Karimi 1978	2nd dar.	extension of 1st dar.		

**second version **third version*

Examination of the list above leads to the conclusion that while the complement of gushes in the radifs of chahârgâh is consistent and their order largely the same, the radifs differ more in the presentation of darâmad. The several darâmads are not all present, their order varies, and even the darâmad versions of Boroumand's several radifs present the materials in different order. Indeed, there is more variation in the order of these sections than in the motivic and other musical content of any one of them in the three Boroumand recordings. Boroumand himself spoke to this issue, thus (paraphrased): You must have darâmad, and each of the other gushes, and their order is important; but within one section, it is important to realize that, in performance, you have a number of options. Thus, when telling me that he would play a section of shur (zirkesh-e salmak) in different ways, he said, in Persian, "I will play three darâmads for you" and explained that this meant three approaches, a concept not distant from the literal translation of *darâmad* ("coming in").

The differences among the radifs of darâmad of chahârgâh are also evident if we look at the motifs, or perhaps better said "musical gestures" or even "musical particles" that are used.

Table C-2 lists twelve bits of melody found in several or all radifs. Rhythms are notated, but they should be interpreted as indicating grouping and relative length and stress only in the most general sense. Thus, in the table, Motif no.1 is intended to represent all versions of the characterizing chahârgâh motif, including those that use the kereshme rhythm. Some of the gestures, e.g. no.6 (which characterizes "second darâmad") and no.9 (the theme of pish-e zangule), have a greater degree of specificity or consistency than others such as No.2, which is principally an alternation between two pitches near the tonic. But the gestures listed appear with some frequency through the radif of darâmad of chahârgâh or in the performances. They do not comprise everything that happens, melodically, in the radif of darâmad, but they do not indicate the most important signposts or melodic movements.

It is interesting to see that a list of melodic materials used in darâmad of chahârgâh includes a substantial amount of memorable motivic material, that is, of themes easily recognized in a variety of contexts and capable of being transformed and developed in the fashion of motifs in 19th century European art music. An attempt to divide performances of Arabic improvised taqsims into sections characterized by gestures resulted in a list of very general types of melodic movement or contour, such as ascending and descending scales, and three-note motifs sequentially repeated. Contrasted with non-thematic material, the themes comprise much more of the Persian music than of the Arabic. But it also seems to be the case that thematic material is more characteristic of chahârgâh than of some other dastgâhs, and that this may be related to the greater tendency in this dastgâh to divide the material into well rounded sections, as well as the specific individuality of the various gushes.

Table C-3 shows the distribution of the gestures as they actually appear in the radifs. It reflects of course the distribution, discussed above, of the darâmad types, but additionally, some aspects of the distribution of gestures are interesting. First, the darâmad is divided in all of the radifs. In those of Boroumand and Ma'roufi, the divisions are numbered and labeled, and in Karimi's radifs, sections are divided by textual considerations. But also in Saba's radif, sections with cadences appear internally. Only in Farhat and Roshanravan do we lack subdivisions; but these radifs are explicitly presented in abbreviated form.

The characteristic structure of a darâmad begins with the main motif (gesture #1, Table C-3), then moves to one of the motifs that characterizes the individual darâmad (#2, #6, or #9, for example) after which there may be movement to one of a group of gestures that normally fall between the main thematic material of a section and the final close on gesture #1. These penultimate materials are most typically 3, 4, 8, 10 and 12. The typical structure of an extended section, then, begins with the motif that characterizes the dastgâh, followed by a motif specific to a particular darâmad, followed by more generalized material and ending on the return of the main motif. This general structure is also encountered in the improvised performances of darâmad, but in many more varieties.

II. Performances

Having briefly compared the radifs of chahârgâh, we now take up consideration of the ways in which the radif is used in actual performance. In order to show the relationship between radif and performance, and to elucidate the degree to which one grows out of the other although both are forms of the same phenomenon, the description of the performances here is carried out somewhat along the same lines as the description of radifs.

Forty-four performances of chahârgâh are available for analysis. A few of these come from recordings made before 1968, about half are field recordings made by Nettl and in some cases Stephen Blum in 1968-69, and a number are recordings made for the Iranian radio corporation in 1968-69. Further ones come from commercial recordings, about a third of them made in Iran, the rest in Europe and the U.S. Table C-4 lists the performances and indicates the types and sources, and the performers. The great majority of the performances were made by performers residing in Tehran; most of the remainder were by musicians active in Meshhad and elsewhere in Khorasan. The accompanying tables and lists arrange the performances by instrument. It will be noted that there are a large number of performances on setâr, several on violin, not many on târ, and not many vocal. This distribution reflects the materials generally available to me; but the proportion may not be properly representative, and our study is presented with that caveat.

There is, to be sure, a great difference between instrumental and vocal performances; but while Iranian classical music performance tends to be instrument-specific in such matters as rhythm and ornamentation (to a degree greater than is true, for example, in Carnatic music, but far less than is the case in

Western classical music), the overall structure of performances does not seem to vary greatly among instruments. A more significant caveat involves the degree to which the performances available to me were especially elicited. Virtually all of my field recordings were explicitly elicited by myself. Musicians were contacted and invited to perform; when they asked what dastgâh was desired, my reply was first of all "chahârgâh" (although other dastgâhs were also recorded). Some musicians tried clearly to provide a particular kind of performance for my benefit, perhaps with a didactic purpose. It turns out, upon analysis, that the performances recorded by myself were not substantially different from those performed for commercial recordings, but there again the matter of elicitation may have played a role in determining length, style, and structure. On the other hand, I could not record (although I heard) performances at informal parties (majles) such as those at a dowreh ("period, cycle," referring to regularity of meetings), a kind of small club of men which devoted itself to a special interest area—which might be music. While such performances, too, were not substantially different from those that I was able to record, there is still a chance that my sample is statistically not really quite representative. I have no doubt that the performances, individually, are acceptable in the context of Iranian classical music culture; but the proportion, average length, and inclusion of materials may be skewed.

The transcription of performances (not included in this edition, but published earlier (Nettl with Foltin 1972 and Nettl 1972a) was carried out largely by Foltin, and the analysis of recordings, by myself, often with aid and guidance of musicians who had performed them and in a number of cases with the help of Dr. Nour-Ali Boroumand. The performances are usually of âvâz alone. The introductory and closing pieces of a full-blown performance are sometimes present and occasionally inserted into the âvâz, but usually they are absent. The complete five-part performance was obviously carried out only in larger, formal concerts, not at majlesi performances, and in solo performances for recordings. Musicians who recorded for me took it for granted that it was principally the âvâz that was desired. Despite the fact that the five-part performance is said to be the ideal, there were a number of performance types, with greater or lesser inclusion of composed materials before and after âvâz. These are selected substantially on the basis of social context of the performance.

The performances in our sample of 44 vary substantially in a number of ways. In length, they extend from about six minutes to over forty. Although the sample may not be large enough to be reliable, there is some correlation between length and medium. The vocal ensemble performances are relatively long, while those performed on piano and setâr are, on the average, the shortest. The considerable average length of the violin performances recorded in Tehran may result from the proclivity of one of my principal performers to go on at length; but also, there is a pronounced tendency for violinists to perform at a slower tempo than performers on the traditional instruments, a tendency perhaps related to what may be perceived as a characteristic expansiveness in the style of 19th century European violin music—which is what Tehran violinists study along with Persian music. There is some correlation between length of performance and the residence of musicians. The recordings made in Khorasan average about seven minutes, the rest about twice as long. But even in the Khorasan recordings, the violin performances are longest. The musicians in Khorasan were, by general estimation in Iran, much less accomplished and less accustomed to giving concert or concert-like performances.

There is little correlation between length of a performance and the number of different gushes that are used. Table C-5 provides detailed information on lengths of performances and of darâmads, and on use and order of gushes. There is a very modest degree of correlation between length of darâmad and length of performances. There is also a very slight correlation between relative length of darâmad and number of gushes in a performance. But a look at the three performances on kamânche (by one musician), Nos. 29-31, indicates the degree of variation in proportional lengths of components even in one medium.

Characterization of the performances of chahârgâh as a whole, to show both consistency and the important kinds of variation, involves the consideration of complement and order of gushes. First, it is clear that the components of the radifs are not used equally. Indeed, of the gushes found in the radifs, with the exception of pahlavi, all appear somewhere among the performances. But hodi and rajaz are extremely rare, and several others—maghlub, muye, and even mansuri and hesâr—appear in fewer than half of the performances. In terms of their presence in the performances, there are actually three distinct groups of gushes: 1) those that appear in most of the performances (darâmad, in 42 of the 44; zâbol, in 41; and mokhâlef, in 34); those present in fewer than half, but nevertheless quite common (hesâr, in 19; mansuri, in 14; muye, in 10; and maghlub, in eight); and 3) those that appear once or twice—hodi and rajaz, which come from the chahârgâh radif, and a few intrusive characters that either come from other dastgâhs, or have no basis at all in the radif—hozân, shahkatâ'i, yati maq, râk-e Abdollah, and chahârbeyti). It is interesting that the gushes that tend to appear early in the radifs also are the most common in performances.

The average number of gushes in a performance is four, in a somewhat symmetrical distribution.

No. of gushes	No. of performances
1	1
2	5
3	15
4	6
5	9
6	5
7	3

But if one looks only at the performances recorded in Khorasan, the average number of the gushes is three, which accounts in part for the bulge of 15 performances in this category. The characteristics of order are moderately unified, and the variety in order of appearance is somewhat related to the variation in the order that is found within the radifs. Thus, darâmad is first in all but three of the performances in which it appears, and zâbol, second in all but six, being first in two performances, third in four, and seventh in one. Muye, a "wandering gushe" which appears in various places in the radifs, is also most variable in order when it comes to performance, appearing in second, third, fourth and fifth position. In general, however, muye appears later in the performances than in radifs, half of the time following several gushes, and never preceding zâbol.

In performances as well as the radifs, hesâr and mokhâlef operate as a pair; they adjoin in twelve of the fifteen performances in which both appear, with hesâr preceding in seven performances and mokhâlef in five. On the other hand, while there are 29 performances in which one does not find the two of them, there are only six in which neither appears. Thus, hesâr and mokhâlef, which revolve around the fifth degree and in that sense fulfill similar functions, also complement each other in other ways. Often only one of the two appears, but when both are there, they are usually united in the sense that they occupy, towards each other, similar roles. This is made clear by the ambiguity of order.

Mansuri is last in eleven of fourteen performances in which it appears; and followed only by the reng-like shahkatâ'i in another. In the two remaining performances, it is followed by muye, whose position is, as we have said, unpredictable in a fashion totally unlike that of the other gushes. In the radif, maghlub occupies a position of dividing the dastgâh into two sections that are separated by the octave, a position described by Farhat as the "owj" or climax of the dastgâh. Under the circumstances, it seems to be relatively rare, found only in eight performances, and ordinarily following mokhâlef or hesâr, whichever came last, occasionally also appearing earlier. The positions of the other gushes, which appear only in one or two performances, are highly variable.

The role of mokhâlef in the performances of chahârgâh is worthy of some special attention. Not only is it found in many performances, but it also occupies a larger amount of time than all but darâmad. And it is occasionally first. Moreover, during lengthy sections normally devoted to materials from darâmad, the tetrachord between third and sixth degrees, with emphasis on the sixth, frequently appears as the basis for performance, and mokhâlef can in such instances be considered almost as a subdivision or close relative of darâmad. In this respect, it functions quite differently from zâbol, which is always presented as directly contrastive to darâmad and following it; and with hesâr, whose accidental changes in third and fourth scale degrees provide a marked contrast with the surrounding material.

Indeed, the role of hesâr also requires special note. Despite lengthy expositions within the radifs, it tends to be treated briefly, and a good deal of the time spent on it may be devoted to its concluding parts, the forud, and to the separate division of pas hesâr, which may actually be longer. Thus, the materials of hesâr which accentuate the "accidental" tones (Ap, F# and Ep) may be touched upon only briefly. Nevertheless, this "modulatory" material tends to occupy an important and perhaps climactic role in chahârgâh.

According to Farhat, the climactic point in the dastgâh of chahârgâh occurs in the gushe maghlub, which covers material also found in darâmad, but does so an octave higher, thus being in the "owj" (soaring) area of the dastgâh. Maghlub, however, appears to be rare in performance, appearing in only eight of the 44 recordings discussed here. At the same time, the type of treatment often accorded to hesâr indicates that it too occupies a climactic position. Its departure from the dastgâh's central scale and the brevity of its appearance is frequently accompanied by emphasis, manifested in loud, marked, and sometimes slow presentation. Other kinds of stress can also be identified, while, of course, the newly introduced tones themselves appeal to the listener's attention. This kind of emphasis is found more frequently than in vocal performances.

The number of gushes, and the kinds of order, is substantially varied to justify Dr. Boroumand's statement to me to the effect that in a performance, contrary to the radif, gushes can appear in any order, and indeed, that variation of order is desirable. While radif and performance have much in common, the belief in consistent order in radif and varied order in performance is one of the main conceptual differences. As the foregoing discussion of individual gushes has indicated, there is much that at least the majority of performances hold in common. Even so, in laying out the performances in terms of the order of gushes (see Table C-5), the 44 performances actually follow thirty different schemes, and we would have to admit that most performances are idiosyncratic within the context of certain regularities.

Thus: Only one scheme, darâmad-zâbol-mokhâlef, is found in a substantial number of performances—ten. Darâmad and zâbol comprise the total complement in three. Darâmad-mokhâlef-zâbol is found in two, and darâmads zâbol-hesâr-mokhâlef, also two. The somewhat odd sequence of darâmads zâbol-mokhâlef-mansuri-muye is found in two performances. Each of the other performances is unique in its order of gushes.

Nevertheless, there is a kind of typology that can be discovered by matching presence, numbers, and order of gushes. The most common type consists of three gushes, normally darâmad-zâbol-mokhâlef. Performances with four gushes all have darâmad, zâbol, and mokhâlef, along with one other gushe which always comes from the group most common in the radif's standard group—hesâr (in three), mansuri, maghlub, and muye (one each). The performances in which there are five, six, or seven gushes vary more, but almost always the movement is from darâmad to zâbol, then to hesâr (or both), on to maghlub and then mansuri, again following the trends of the radif. We see, then, a corpus of great variety that nevertheless seems to be built around a set of widely observed guidelines.

The structuring of the performances in terms of emphasis on individual gushes, the relative amounts of time devoted to each, motivic transformation, and other internal interrelationships provide, of course, a large number of types which can be studied as a whole, by instrument, social context or performer. The sections "a" through "l" of Table C-6 provide relatively detailed if approximate accounts of the course of events in twelve of the performances, as a sample. Appearances of gushes and other major events are noted by minutes and seconds.

In order to provide a basis for closer study of one instrument and one performer, six of the performances are played on setâr, and of these, four are by Ahmad Ebâdi, arguably the most distinguished setâr player then active. The remaining six are also instrumental—two each performed on santur, violin, and piano, in order to provide a spectrum of traditional and modernized. Vocal performances were analyzed as well, and the conclusions given here are based on these performances as well as the rest available to us, which were similarly analyzed. The performances differ greatly, of course, in many ways; but in terms of overall structure, the points to be most considered involve, beyond selection and order of gushes, 1) their relative length and the patterning of their appearance; 2) tempo and dynamics; and 3) degree of stability and consistency through a performance, and between performances as a whole, on one instrument, and by one performer.

There are some general trends. Darâmad is almost always longest, dominating the beginning and also showing its presence, i.e., its characteristic motifs, in the course of the use of other materials. For materials other than darâmad as well, there is a relationship between appearance early in the radif, frequency in the performance, and length of time. Maghlub, which comes late in the radif and appears in only eight of the performances, is also touched upon only briefly where it does appear. Zâbol, the second gushe, is almost always present, and is dwelled on at some length in almost all performances. The major role of mokhâlef and the rather exceptional roles of hesâr and muye have already been noted, hesâr also being the subject of more extensive discussion below.

For the following discussion of types of treatment of gushes in performances, we rely on my sample of twelve performances given in Table C-6. In the interrelationship of gushes, there are fundamentally three kinds of performances.

1) In one kind, the gushes that appear occupy roughly equal amounts of time. This is true of nos. 19, 22, and 28, all rather long performances (two on violin); and also of several of the vocal performances, as well as those recorded in Khorasan. But this equality is in certain respects a relative matter. In no.19, darâmad, zâbol, and mokhâlef are considerably longer than the others, yet if one subtracts the metric and presumably composed material attached to them (chahâr-mezrâbs and do-mezrâbs), they are about even in quantity of âvâz material. In no.22, darâmad and mokhâlef predominate but the rest are also relatively long, hence the classing of this performance in my first group.

2) A second type of performance structure presents the darâmad at considerable length, followed by successively shorter appearances of other gushes. Performances of this sort may sometimes result from lack of time (or inadequate planning), where a performer, having gone into detail in the exposition of the first gushe or two, realizes that time is short and that there is much material to be touched upon if there is to be a satisfactory rendition of the dastgâh, and makes brief forays into two or three gushes just before the end. There are few performances in the sample in which the last minutes or seconds are occupied by a sudden telescoping of materials or even the briefest allusions to some of the less central gushes. To be sure, three of the performances in my sample of twelve in which this kind of structure prevails are shorter than the average of my first group. This second kind of structure is found in performances no. 3, 20, 35, and 36. In nos. 3 and 36, darâmad is overwhelmingly longer than the rest, occupying almost half of the time and leaving the rest divided among three gushes.

3) A third and particularly interesting performance type is divisible into two major sections, each headed by a principal gushe that is usually (but not always) followed by others, or by brief allusions (Persian eshâre) to others. Such an allusion may consist, for example, of a single rendition of the lowered fifth characterizing muye, or a momentary alteration of the fifth with the raised fourth typical of hesâr. The second of the two major sections is shorter than the first and is headed by mokhâlef or, occasionally, by hesâr. I have classed a few performances with three gushes in this category as well; Performance no.1, for example, can be seen to consist of two sections, the first beginning with long darâmad and brief zâbol, the second comprised of mokhâlef which in the end returns to cadence on the main darâmad motif. No.7 is characteristic in that it begins with a long darâmad which is succeeded by a brief presentation of zâbol with allusion to muye; there follows a long presentation of mokhâlef which is followed by a very short rendition of mansuri and allusions to zâbol and muye. No. 4 is similar except that it begins with mokhâlef and moves to darâmad, both presented at length, making a kind of unit. Maghlub and muye appear briefly, and then a second section is headed by hesâr, which is followed by brief allusions to zâbol and mansuri. Performance type No.3 is found in nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, and 7, all of them, we should note, played on setâr. Most important, all four of the performances by A. Ebâdi are included in this sample.

III. Darâmad of Chahârgâh in the Âvâz

We return to consideration of Ebâdi's performances below, but, meanwhile, take up consideration of the parts of the performances that are devoted to darâmad. Fifteen of these darâmad sections of performances were provided in published transcription (Nettl with Foltin 1972) and the numbering in Table C-4 follows that of the original notations, which were not, to be sure, intended to provide a complete record of the sound.

As indicated in the discussion of relative lengths of gushes, there is only a bit of correlation between length of darâmad and length of total performance. On the contrary, there is great variation in the structure of the darâmad section of performances. One approach to summarizing the content of the darâmads is provided by examining the motifs and gestures from the list of Table C-2 that are actually used. Table C-7 provides a listing of these gestures, performance by performance. To be sure, these musical gestures cannot be identified with a high degree of specificity, and it is not easy to distinguish between material that can be seen as definitely belonging to a gesture and other melodic material of a more general sort. There are thus severe limits to the degree to which this table can be considered as accurate. For what it is worth, however, it may be noted that virtually all performances begin with gesture no.1, the principal motif of the dastgâh, and that most darâmads end with it as well. In the various performances, the number of separate sections, each marked by cadence and pause, differs from one to five, and there is some correlation between numbers of sections and total length. It is also clear that some musicians move much more rapidly than others from gesture to gesture within a section. In those performances that have several distinct sections, there is a slight tendency for the later ones to use more gestures or motifs than the first. There is all together a tendency for the performance to begin with material somehow restricted (limited in range or perhaps restricted to the main motif) and to move gradually to a wider variety of materials.

There is also a tendency within the section of a performance devoted to darâmad, to move from lower to higher materials, returning finally to the low. And in those performances of darâmad that are divided into paragraph-like subdivisions, there is a tendency to use, as the basis of each, material from only one of the several darâmads of the radifs—e.g., the first or second, kereshme, or zangule. Interestingly, as the widespread use of gesture no.6 shows, there is a strong tendency to use Ma'roufi's third darâmad (the same, that is, as Boroumand's second or fourth) at the beginning. All of the gestures identified in the radif appear in the performances, at least here and there; and those that are most common in the corpus of the radifs are also most common in performances.

Comparison of lengths and of use of motifs gives some idea of range and commonality of materials in the performances; but the degree to which the performances differ must be established also on the basis of many other criteria, some of them difficult to analyze objectively or to quantify. Rhythm, tempo, and dynamics play a major role, as does the degree to which a performance adheres to the radif or departs from it. According to some musicians, a performance should adhere to the radif, but not too closely or constantly. Defining these degrees of adherence seems beyond easy verbalization, but the concept that there is a set of limits between which rests the ideal performance, adherence to the radif on the one hand and a high degree of individual contribution on the other, is important for understanding the system. Some musicians were criticized by my consultants because they "simply played the radif, which they had memorized," while others were said to play so wildly that it was clear "they simply don't know the radif." The latter criticism evidently referred to their avoidance of or inability to use motifs, include essential gushes, and similar issues. Departure from the radif was criticized in the case of musicians who evidently did it habitually, and who, it was known or believed, were not very well acquainted with the radif. In the work of musicians who were recognized as masters of the radif, substantial departure from the model was not criticized but in fact sometimes praised as an occasional exhibition of their true musical personality. This difference between those recognized as knowledgeable and the ones declared ignorant was particularly articulated in instances in which gushes from outside the radif of a dastgâh were introduced.

In matters of rhythm, tempo, and dynamics, performances and musicians differed substantially. Take the performance of darâmad in the âvâz. There are performances that were divided into several sections and others that were presented as one unit. In some, non-metric rhythmic structure was observed throughout; in a second group, long sections of metric zarbi or chahârmezrâb were introduced, and in a third, short metric sections were merged rapidly into brief bits of non-metric. Sometimes tempo and range remained more or less constant; but elsewhere there was frequent change. In some performances, brief allusions to a motif from the radif alternated with personal invention; but in others, material from the radif was performed at length and only after a memorized section was finished did improvisation take place.

It is clear that some musicians develop personal styles that are easily recognized, with certain kinds of consistency in their performances and their structuring of âvâz. Also, some instrument-specific styles have developed, and there is some but not much difference in the performance of the âvâz of chahârgâh between Tehran and Khorasan musicians. Regarding a comparison of these two locations, there is no significant difference in simple length of darâmads, but there is, in the Khorasan performances, somewhat greater density of motifs and gestures, suggesting that there is less of a tendency to work out ideas at length, but more of an inclination to present as much of the material from the radif as possible. On the other hand, in the Khorasan performances, changes in tempo or dynamics are not frequent. In terms of quality, the Khorasan performances would be regarded by most Tehran musicians at best as only moderately good. But the Khorasan tradition of performance on the radif-derived materials did not seem in essence different from that of Tehran.

In the Tehran recordings, there is a major difference between instrumental and vocal performance. Many instrumental performances changed constantly or at least frequently in tempo, dynamics, and rhythmic structure, while vocal performances moved along at a consistently measured pace, made no special use of dynamic effects, and were uniformly non-metric. Metric material, improvised or composed, might be performed by accompanying instruments scattered within the âvâz between gushes, something that may also be the case in the purely instrumental performances. But rapid (and also gradual) shifts from metric to non-metric, and among varying degrees of "metricness," as is found in many instrumental performances, is not present in the vocal performances. As G. Tsuge points out in his dissertation (1974), the rhythmic structure of vocal âvâz, based as it is on principles of Persian poetry, is substantially different from that of instrumental âvâz.

While Iranian theory distinguishes in the first instance between metric and non-metric (âvâz and zarbi), perception of Persian music requires considerable rhythmic discrimination. The Persian terminology of musical types and genres in the classical repertory distinguishes various kinds of rhythmic structure, such as ordinary âvâz (with as little rhythmic regularity as one can conceive), naghme (not metric, but with primary use of one or two note values, giving some semblance of a pulse), kereshme (a specific rhythmic pattern that can be recognized in metric or non-metric context), zarbi (general metric), pishdarâmad (slow, metric), chahâr mezrâb (quick, metric, with a tendency to use a rhythmic ostinato). One may, of course, analytically designate various other degrees of metric regularity, thus establishing a continuum between the most general and the most specific. Leaving this option aside for the moment to consideration elsewhere in other chapters of this study, however, let me simply point out that the tendency to move among these types rapidly and frequently is characteristic of instrumental performance, more of those from Tehran than those of Khorasan, and also more in those of certain performers than others. Rapid rhythmic change is also more characteristic of the music of some instruments than others—more typical, for instance, of music on the setâr, târ, and santur than of gheichak, nei, violin, and kamânche.

Among Western instruments introduced recently, the violin follows the kamânche in exhibiting little rapid rhythmic change, while the piano follows the santur in having more. Evidently the possibility of using sustained tones associates an instrument more with the rhythmic unvaried vocal performances than with the plucked instruments. These characterizations, however, are generalizations and are surely not applicable to each performance. There are also some târ performances that are rhythmically quite unvaried, and occasionally kamânche performances move rapidly.

The available recordings of chahârgâh and other dastgâhs also suggest some possible correlation between rhythmic variation in an âvâz performance and age of the performer. At least two of the older musicians provided performances with more rhythmic variation than was typical in renditions by younger performers. And beyond this, the degree of rhythmic variety and rapid rhythmic change seemed to correlate with dastgâh. Accordingly, in instrumental performances of chahârgâh and mâhur, there was more rhythmic change than in shur and homâyun.

IV. An Excursion to Hesâr

The conclusions drawn here on the basis of a study of darâmad of chahârgâh, and of performances of the entire dastgâh of chahârgâh, can be amplified with a brief examination of the use of hesâr in performances, based on a group of transcriptions largely made by Nettl (and available in Nettl 1972a). First we review its role in the radif. Farhat (1966:125) ascribes to hesâr a number of characteristics. Its scale departs from the standard pattern of chahârgâh, and uses primarily the raised fourth, fifth, a lowered sixth degrees (that is, with C as tonic, the tones F-sori, G, and A-koron), which provide most of the melodic material; also the seventh and the lowered third (B and E-koron), which are less common, as well as tonic and lowered second (C and D-koron), which appear rarely. Most of the melodic movement alternates A-koron, the initial tone, and G, the most central and also the final tone of most of the phrases. Boroumand, Ma'roufi and others refer to the last section of their versions of hesâr as "pas hesâr" ("After Hesâr"), a name signifying the performer's modulation from the scale of hesâr to the central scale of chahârgâh, that is, the performance of a forud to the tonic of chahârgâh. According to Nour-Ali Boroumand, Khatschi (1962:108), and other musicians, hesâr is one of the "important" gushes of chahârgâh. This designation is supported by the preferential treatment given to the hesâr group in Boroumand's radif, and also by the fact that in Ma'roufi's radif, ten out of sixty labeled sections use its scale.

Despite the considerable attention accorded to hesâr in at least some of the radifs, the amount of easily identifiable thematic materials is fairly small. Farhat gives a "basic formula" of hesâr (Example H-1), and on the basis of both the published radifs and those played by Boroumand and other masters, we conclude that a number of brief motifs dominate (Example H-2). These have primarily melodic but also some rhythmic characteristics. The substantive content of hesâr can, indeed, be even more compressed. On the basis of analysis of radifs as well as of improvised performances, and of interviews about the subject with musicians, and further by using a quasi-Schenkerian technique, its essence can arguably be reduced to a simple four-note motif (Example H-3). Persian musicians consulted agreed with this interpretation.

While there exists for hesâr an elaborate set of models, the basic concept is simple. Its importance in chahârgâh is surely not due to any extensive nature of its contents, as might be the case in some of the gushes of other dastgâhs that have become independent (and are sometimes performed alone, like bayât-e kord of shur), but more likely to the fact that the hesâr introduces new tones and intonations. Farhat (1966:24-26) indicates the flexibility of tuning and intonation in Persian music, especially of the three-quarter and five-quarter tones, which he labels as "neutral second" (135 or 160 cents) and "plus second" (270 cents). It appears that perhaps those gushes that depart from the main scale of a dastgâh may experience even more variation in intonation. This, at least, appears to be the case in hesâr. Even the published radifs exhibit this variation, for while various authors, including Ma'roufi and Farhat present its scale as being G Ap B C D Ep F# G (again considering C as the tonic of chahârgâh)—a simple transposition of the chahârgâh scale to the fifth—A. Saba, in his violin radif, uses G Ap B C D E F G, and in his santur radif, G Ap B C Dp Ep F# G. To be sure, in practice this difference is minor, as D and Dp are very rare. The intonation in performances (whose study here is based on ordinary rather than machine-aided transcription) appear to vary from these standards as well. Incidentally, while Caron and Safvate (1966:83) definitely label hesâr as a "modulation," Khatschi (1962:108) takes the opposite stand, saying, "es handelt sich um reine Versetzung des Grundtetrachords [des Chahârgâh] um eine Oktave höher," a statement that evidently takes a rather special view of the concept of modulation in Persian music.

Among the recorded performances of hesâr studied, the third, fourth, and sixth tones of the chahârgâh scale are most variable. The following configurations have been found using E, F, and A (C as tonic) for convenience:

E-koron, F-sori, A-koron
A-koron varying with A, F-sori varying with F
E-koron slightly low, A-koron slightly low, F-sori

E-koron, F-sori slightly high, A-koron slightly low
E-koron slightly low, F-sharp, A-koron
E-koron slightly high, F-sharp slightly low, A-flat
E-koron, F-sori, A-koron quite variable
E-natural, F-natural varying with F-sori, A-koron
E-koron, F slightly high, A-koron
E-koron, F-sharp slightly high, A-koron slightly low.

For the moment, and lacking more detailed measurements for analysis, there is not much that can be said about the configurations that emerge, except to note the large number of possibilities that is realized. The highest degree of variation from the theoretical norm as stated by Farhat is found in performances by violin and voice. Moreover, those musicians who are known to have experience in Western music tended to move their intonation in the direction of the Western tempered scale. On the basis of recordings used for this study, the greatest amount of intonational variation among the gushes of the chahârgâh is found in hesâr, and in muye, the other main gushe requiring a modulation from the basic chahârgâh scale.

The published and recorded radifs place hesâr rather early in the prescribed sequence of the gushes of chahârgâh, typically after zâbol (which follows darâmad), and sometimes muye. The same is true in the performances. In the 44 recordings, hesâr appears in eighteen. It is second in two performances, third in seven, fourth in four, fifth in two and sixth in two. In a total of only three performances is it the concluding gushe. In frequency, as we have seen, it follows darâmad and zâbol, which are virtually always present, and mokhâlef, which is absent in only a few performances. It is more common than mansuri, which appears in fourteen performances; the remaining gushes, of course, are relatively rare.

As already pointed out above, hesâr is especially and closely associated with mokhâlef, whose range is approximately the same, although it uses tones of the chahârgâh scale proper. Fifteen of the eighteen performances that contain hesâr also contain mokhâlef. In seven of these, hesâr immediately precedes mokhâlef; in five it immediately follows; and in only three performances are the two gushes separated. Three performances contain hesâr but not mokhâlef, and twenty contain mokhâlef but not hesâr. And in only six performances are both absent. The two gushes thus function as a pair, appearing close together when they are both present; at the same time, there appears to be a feeling among the performers (never, to be sure, explicitly stated to me) that at least one of the two is needed in a proper performance of chahârgâh.

It may be instructive to put these characteristics into musical context, indicating some of the kinds of things that occur in performances of hesâr. In one setâr performance, the entire recording (all of it non-metric) takes about twenty minutes; hesâr appears after fifteen minutes, and takes up 85 seconds, after which a forud to chahârgâh begins and the performance gradually concludes. Hesâr is almost entirely loud, and its slower sections are performed "marcato," each note stressed. The position of this section in the performance definitely lends it the character of climax. In a santur performance, hesâr appears after about eleven of a total of fifteen minutes, without the expected chromatic alterations, and appears to have the same function; the material is stressed and performed loudly, the individual tones are marked.

Other performances also distinguish hesâr in various ways. Some performances on the setâr exhibit more use of the riz (tremolo) technique in this gushe than is common elsewhere.

Some of the violin versions, in which a wide ambitus is possible, make use of the highest octave for hesâr. A substantial amount of metric or semi-metric material, inserted in short stretches within the non-metric âvâz, is found in the majority of performances. While the gradual increasing of intensity that is exhibited in the Persian music performances tends to make each gushe more stressed than its predecessor—despite the possibility of singling out special climactic points—one very frequently hears an especially sharp rise in intensity at the onset of hesâr.

Some of the performances make use of hesâr as a minor point of climax, followed by other equally or more prominent climactic points such as maghlub or mansuri, both centered on the octave of the tonic. It is interesting to find, therefore, that mokhâlef, which uses a range similar to that of hesâr but is even more prominent, is usually not singled out for climactic treatment, tending rather, like darâmad and zâbol, to occupy a role of filling major periods of time which are relieved by brief appearances of more climactic gushes. Thus, it might be possible to classify the gushes in chahârgâh (and perhaps also in other dastgâhs) as either substantive (i.e., containing the main substance of the performance) or episodic (i.e., functioning as short, contrastive episodes). In this working hypothesis, the episodic gushes are ones that appear briefly and, on account of this brevity as well as other characteristics such as range and the use of unexpected tones, may assume particular functions in relation to the rest, such as providing a climax.

The conclusion again to be drawn from this discussion is that a performance of dastgâh may amount to much more than a simple, ordered group of items, each treated potentially in the same way. It is rather a highly sophisticated structure, based on a sequence of gushes but using each of these in distinctive ways, so that there emerges an organic structure with components such as themes, developments, variations and episodes, tension and relaxation, higher and lower degrees of interest, and intensity of curves. Examining the role of hesâr in chahârgâh may help to provide an understanding of these functions in one particular dastgâh.

V. And a Foray to Segâh

Although we are not in a position to present a detailed study of the dastgâh of segâh, which would make a thorough comparison with chahârgâh possible, selected comparative remarks may nevertheless be instructive. The radifs of these dastgâhs, which are regarded as "brothers" and whose special relationship—the sharing of most gushes by name and melodic contour (but with different scalar formation)—has been described, present the gushes in roughly equal proportions of significance. Thus in Ma'roufi's radif of segâh, the gushes darâmad, zâbol, and hesâr appear to be the most significant, occupying the largest number of sections. They are followed closely by maghlub and muye. Mansuri does not appear in segâh.

The characteristic use and order of gushes in the seven performances of segâh available for analysis are somewhat different. In distribution of gushes, segâh performances do not differ greatly from those of chahârgâh; darâmad, zâbol, and mokhâlef appear in all; hesâr in only one; and maghlub and muye, in two each. This indicates a rather sparse use of the materials available in the radif, but, to be sure, our sampling is comprised of a group of short performances. On the other hand, the ubiquity of three gushes and the very occasional appearance of the others provides a different kind of core in relation to other gushes than is found in chahârgâh. In particular, considering the importance of hesâr in the radif, its virtual absence in the eight performances is noteworthy.

Further, it is interesting to compare the amount of time devoted to the various gushes in the performances. Here it turns out that darâmad and zâbol are by far the most prominent. Mokhâlef typically puts in a much briefer kind of appearance, much in contrast to its dominant role in chahârgâh (and to the modest performance role assigned to zâbol). Maghlub plays a stronger role in segâh than in chahârgâh. Clearly, while segâh and chahârgâh are closely related and in certain ways parallel, the different roles of the various gushes in the performances suggest separate and individual traditions. Again we see evidence for the conception of dastgâhs as the units of musical thought best described by the term "kinds of music."

VI. Chahârgâh Again: Two Performers

It remains to look briefly at the characteristics of the performances by the two musicians who provided three or more performances of chahârgâh in our sample, the distinguished setâr virtuoso Ahmad Ebâdi and the young (in 1969) violinist Nasrollâh Shirinabâdi.

The two groups of performances are not comparable in all respects. Ebâdi's recordings (Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7) were recorded over a period of several years, and most of them were made for commercial recordings. Shirinabâdi's were made within five weeks, all three of them (Nos. 21, 22, and 23) elicited by myself. The violinist may have wished to produce three quite different performances for me or, as he once implied in conversation, he may have wished to show consistency. In any event, the style of

Ebâdi's performances may strike the listener as highly consistent and recognizable, but in their structure and length they actually vary quite a bit. Ebâdi's performances use the following gushes:

Perf. no.	Gushes
1	D – Mo – Z
2	D – Z – Mo
4	Mo – D – Mq – Mu – H – Mn – Z
5	D – Z – Mo
7	D – Z – Mo – Mn – Mu

The gushe content of Ebadi's performances parallels the range of lengths and kinds of order of the entire repertory; and this is true as well of the total lengths of the performances and the proportion of time devoted to darâmad. On the other hand, Ebâdi is highly consistent in his frequent change of tempo, dynamics, and degree of rhythmic specificity. He is constantly on the move, changing from the chahâr mezrâb style to ordinary zarbi to slow âvâz, making gradual though rapid transitions. In particular, he tends to divide his performances into short bits ending with definite cadences on the tonic, sometimes using the main chahârgâh motif for this. The sections tend to begin loudly and forcefully, metrically or with allusions to the kereshme rhythm.

It is of course difficult to identify all of the personal idiosyncrasies of a performer, but among those of Ebâdi when playing chahârgâh one should include the tendency to use material properly belonging to mokhâlef, that is, using the tetrachord between third and sixth degrees, within the section normally devoted to darâmad; and his tendency to emphasize elements of mokhâlef elsewhere in his performances. Also, he tends less to use Motif no. 6 of the darâmad ingredients than most other performers.

Further, the tendency to change tempo gradually in the course of a metric section should be noted. There is constant change of character and mood in Ebâdi's playing, and a kind of structural looseness easily recognized.

The performances by Shirinabâdi are longer. Nos. 21 and 22 required well over a half hour, and no.23, almost 20 minutes. Nos. 21 and 22 were performed two weeks apart and are in some ways very much alike, using essentially the same materials in substantially the same order. All three share a tendency to emphasize mokhâlef, and the relative length of gushes is about the same. In overall structuring all three of the performances are readily comparable. But in its complement of gushes, the third performance (no.23) is quite different from the others, beginning with hodi and including yati maq, a gushe not found in the standard radifs. The order of no. 23, ending with mokhâlef and hesâr, is unconventional as well. However, this curious performance may be the result of Shirinabâdi's desire to show me, after having recorded two âvâzes that are quite similar, that substantial diversity is possible, and that he himself was capable of playing chahârgâh in many different ways.

Shirinabâdi's performance style is less personal than Ebâdi's but is closely related to that of other violinists, particularly R. Badi'i and M. Khâledi, both of whom are represented in the sample of performances in this study. He differs from Ebâdi in his consistent use of a slower tempo, his continued maintenance, for long periods of time, of a style, tempo, and set of ornaments once these have been introduced, of sharper divisions between sections that are characterized by rhythmic type. The gradual movement from metric to non-metric typical of Ebâdi is less pronounced in Shirinabâdi's playing. He makes more (or, one may say, *even* more) extensive use of melodic sequence than does Ebâdi, and he uses a wide range, switching frequently between low and high strings.

One of the areas in which personal style plays a role is intonation. Comparing Ebâdi and Shirinabâdi may be misleading, as one played a fretted instrument while the other bowed. It is nonetheless interesting to see that there is a great deal of difference among performers in the size of an interval between tonic and second degree, and between fifth and sixth. There is a tendency, on instruments in which the intervals are not determined in construction or tuning (i.e. violin, kamânche) for these particular intervals to be smaller than elsewhere. On all kinds of instruments one may find substitution of an ordinary minor second for the standard neutral second. This occurs in two of the piano performances but explicitly not in the third. But further, there is a particularly large amount of variation in the intonation of tones whose pitch is changed through the “accidental” of modulation, as in muye and hesâr. The fourth degree in hesâr is sometimes raised almost a half-step instead of the expected quarter-tone, and is subject to much variation, as indicated. In the case of muye, the lowered fifth is sometimes ignored. The point already made by several authors in the past is that the specific intonation of intervals in the dastgâhs is probably less important to musicians as an identifying mark than the melodic gestures and themes, and the contours.

VII. Conclusions

A comparison of the various radifs of chahârgâh shows considerable congruency among the versions of the radif tradition, some differences—especially in order of materials—among even the different versions of the radif by individual musicians, and substantial contrast between instrumental and vocal forms. The kinds of variation found among radifs is reflected in variation among performances. The difference between chahârgâh and other dastgâhs probably goes beyond simple distinctions of thematic and modal materials, but extends to general matters of structure, performance practice, and overall character, to the extent that chahârgâh, like each of the dastgâhs, may be considered and treated like a genre or form of composition. Certain practices in establishing interrelationships of themes and gestures are characteristic. At a more restricted level, criteria involving the relationship among sections serve to distinguish vocal from instrumental, and the work of individual musicians.

The tendency for each performer to be relatively consistent in his use of material from chahârgâh indicates that preparation and planning play a substantial role, and that far-flung inventiveness may play a smaller part here than does the importance of showing that one has thorough control of the radif.

It is interesting to see that a small group of structural types appear to have been established as part of the tradition of performance. At the same time, it is noteworthy that certain aspects of order (e.g. the beginning with darâmad and zâbol, the close association of hesâr and mokhâlef, the tendency to end with mansuri) form a central core of performance. The recordings we have examined vary more in overall length than in anything else. It is also significant that the performances can be divided into units dominated by individual gushes, and that in each, thematic content from the radif is presented first in order to establish the identity of the current section, after which material with greater individuality is used, but is finally followed by cadential portions again directly derived from the radif. In this respect, the radif itself, the entire dastgâh and its shorter components, as well as performances as a whole and as seen in their constituent sections, all share in the uses of a group of general principles of musical structure.

CHAPTER IV

FOUR MODERN RADIFS OF MAHUR

by Bruno Nettl and Daryoosh Shenassa

This chapter makes a number of observations based on comparative study of the dastgâh of mâhur as it is found in four modern radifs—those of Ma'roufi and Saba, and the "official" (i.e., most recently recorded) radifs of Boroumand and Karimi. All but those of Saba were available to us in recorded form, and all but that of Boroumand have been published in Western notation. We should remind the reader, however, of the different purposes of the notations. Karimi's was recorded as sung by himself, and the recordings transcribed by a trained and accomplished ethnomusicologist, Mohammad Taghi Massoudieh (1978). Ma'roufi's transcription (Barkechli 1963) was made by the author, who was also a performer; the recorded version available to us was made by Soleiman Ruh-Afzâ, who evidently used the printed music during (or in preparation for) his performance. Saba's notations, on the other hand, are not transcriptions of performance at all, as far as one can tell, but were made by the author—that is, in some respects the composer, and to some extent in his capacity as disciple of Vaziri—from memory and creatively. The Ma'roufi and

Saba notations (see various publications by Saba in the bibliography) are technically prescriptive, made for the practical instruction of Iranian music students, although Ma'roufi's may have had a substantial descriptive component among its purposes. The Karimi transcriptions are descriptive, made for ethnomusicological analysis.

Our study, like the others in this group, provides a comparison of radifs with a group of approaches. We are interested in comparing the overall organization and in detailed comparison of individual sections, taking into account their identity in name as well as in melodic content. We wish to know how different musicians have labeled the same music, and about the representation of one or a number of different melodic segments by one name. We are also interested in internal interrelationships within the dastgâh, the radif, and among the four radifs examined.

I. Designation of Gushes

We first turn to a consideration of the number of gushes used in each radif, and to their names. It is necessary to keep in mind that the melodic content of gushes of the same name may differ, while gushes with similar musical content may be represented in different radifs under a variety of names. Table M-1 gives the names of the gushes of the dastgâh of mâhur found in the four radifs. The number of gushes per radif obviously varies; and in some measure this is due to the lack of standardization in nomenclature. Yet some gushes are clearly absent in certain radifs; khosrovâni, for example, is found in Ma'roufi and Boroumand, in the târ and setâr books of Saba (but not in his others), but not at all in Karimi's radif.

In the introductory chapter of this group of studies, the sources of names of dastgâhs and gushes are briefly surveyed. These present an interesting subject for study, although their significance is certainly far from clear. We review briefly the nomenclature of the gushes of mâhur, as they appear in Ma'roufi's radif.

Moqaddame is, of course, a general word for "preface" or "introduction," and is used for pieces that may elsewhere be called "darâmad" as well as short, metric particles. Koroghli could not be identified, but may be a reference to a place name. Kereshme, the familiar "tekke" with a specific rhythm, is a word meaning something like "amorous gesture" but actually refers to a type of poetic meter. Darâmad, as we know, is "introduction," and âvâz, a music-specific term referring to singing. Goshâyesh means something like "opening" or "inaugural"; and dâd, "justice" or a "cry for justice." Khosrâvani seems to come from the personal name Khosrow, as for the Emperor Chosroes of the Sassanid Empire. Delkash means "fascinating" or "attractive," a word literally derived from "drawing the heart." Chahâr mezrâb, of course, is a specifically musical term but may be derived from "four beats" or "four plectra." Hajji-hassani comes from a personal name, and kharâzmi seems likely (but not definitely) to be a place name, as is khâvarân. Dotâyeki is a rhythmic designation for a metric style—"two of one," perhaps. Tarab-angiz means "joyous," or "stimulating joy."

The gushe Neyshâburak, referring to the town of Neshabur (Nishapour), once a great city in Khorasan and home of Omar Khayyam, may indicate a style, or a particular song, and possibly (on account of the diminutive form) a folk or folk-like tune. Tusi refers to the town of Tus, near Neshabur and on the outskirts of Meshhad, once home of the poet Ferdowi. Nasirkhani evidently refers to an individual. Chahâr-pare means "four parts," and refers to a type of poem with four lines, though not the "chahârbeyti" common in folk poetry of Northern Iran. Åzerbâijâni refers to the region, and feyli could not be identified. Zir-afkand may be a characterizing term, as it means "thrown down" [as a carpet]. Mâhur-saghir means something like "minor mâhur," or "smaller mâhur." Åbol may be a personal name, or refer to the town of Abol near Tehran on the Caspian Sea. Hesâr-e mâhur is "the hesâr of mâhur," although its relationship to the hesâr in chahârgâh and segâh is not clear; but the word hesâr alone means "fortification" or "walled village."

Zangule ("little bell"), naghme ("melody"), âvâz-e âbol are self-explanatory, and forud is well-known as descent. Neyriz may be a place name, but could not be positively identified; and it could also refer to "nei," the flute, and "riz," a word for something finely woven or spun and used in music to mean tremolo or trill. Shekaste, "broken," seems to refer to tonal and modulatory aspects of the tune. Nahib, "terror, dread," would appear to characterize its melody, although just how is not clear. Sorush means "inspiration" or "glad tidings." 'Arâq or Iraq is of course a place-name, as is âshur (Assyrian). Mohayyer means "stupendous" or "wonderful," and baste-negâr, a "framed picture" or "framed face." Esfahânak refers to the city of Isfahan, possibly (again on account of the diminutive) but may have something to do with the dastgâh of bayât-e esfahân. Hazin refers to sorrow or sadness.

The well-known etymology of râk as a form of the Indian raga or "rag" is supported by the names of the related gushes of râk-e hendi (Indian rag) and râk-e keshmir (Kashmiri rag), but "drum of battle" was also found as a translation. Safir-e râk means ("whistling râk" or perhaps "whistled râk"), and râk-e abdollah, clearly a personal name, may actually mean the "râk of Mirza Abdollah," creator of the radif. Masnavi is a melody to be set to parts of the poem by the Sufi poet Mowlavi, and the mystical aspects of the subject are continued in saqinâme, a “kind of bacchanalian verse,” and sufi-nâme, “verse or writing of the Sufis.” The dastgâh ends with negative connotations—koshte (“killed”), harbi (“war-like”), and shahr-âshub, (“riot” or “rioter in the city”).

Needless to say, one can frequently make only the vaguest guesses about the origins, meanings, and implications of these terms. There are, in any event, a number of music-specific terms, some derived from poetry; a good many terms that are clearly descriptive; and place names, personal names, and non-musical characterizations all playing a substantial role. The terminology points up the greatly varied origins of the materials comprising even one dastgâh.

II. Structure of the Darâmad

It is important to reiterate that there is variation in nomenclature for material that appears in the different radifs. This is particularly conspicuous in the material that is present in the introductory gushes central to the concept of a dastgâh, that is, what we have called the darâmad group or section. In each radif, mâhur has material that can be designated as the darâmad group, and in each case there are at least three characteristic units of musical content: a) a motif that moves from tonic to fourth below; b) a section with the characteristic kereshme rhythm or a variant thereof, beginning with the fifth degree and moving gradually up to the tonic; and c) a section beginning on the fourth degree and moving down to the tonic. The darâmad groups of all four radifs of mâhur therefore contain essentially the same material, but the order and designation of the subdivisions varies, as explained in the next paragraph.

Ma'roufi's radif begins with moqaddame (containing the material designed above as "a"), moves to a metric gushe designated as koroghli, then to kereshme (containing "b"), and on to first darâmad (recapitulating moqaddame, or "a"), second darâmad ("c"), and âvâz (continuation of "c"). Boroumand divides the darâmad group into three sections, first darâmad ("a"), kereshme ("b"), and âvâz ("c"). Saba, in his radif for târ or setâr, has two sections, labeled darâmad-e benafsheh (containing "a" and "b"), and darâmad-e qadim (i.e., "ancient darâmad," containing "c"). Karimi presents the entire darâmad group in one section which he simply labels as darâmad; it contains, briefly stated, a, b, a, and c.

The term "moqaddame" is sometimes used to introduce the darâmad group, but it may also identify a section introductory to another gushe, as in the case of Boroumand's moqaddame-ye dâd, preceding the gushe of dâd itself. In some cases, the term moqaddame designates material that is later also stated in the main gushe; in other instances, such as that of moqaddame be greyli in the dastgâh of shur, it is clearly distinct and separate. The term âvâz, while on the one hand referring to the entire non-metric portion of a classical performance, is used in the radif to indicate a variety of materials. In Ma'roufi, it normally follows a gushe designated by a distinctive name. Elsewhere it may substitute for darâmad, as in the mâhur sections of Saba's radifs for violin.

But while introductory gushes in the dastgâh of mâhur have the greatest amount of terminological variation, variety is also found further on. For example, a particular melodic entity is identified by Boroumand at one point as chahâr pare and at another, as moradkhâni. In the radifs of Karimi and Ma'roufi, on the other hand, the two names represent two different melodic entities. Variants of a gushe appearing in one radif may also be designated in such a way as to show relationship. Thus, in

Boroumand's radif, râk-e hendi, râk-e keshmir, and râk-e abdollah are clearly variations of the same melodic material. The term "gushe" itself sometimes precedes the actual name of a gushe, thus indicating brevity or anticipation, though sometimes with no discernible significance. The unit called "gushe-ye neyriz" in Karimi's radif of mâhur is called simply "neyriz" in Ma'roufi and Boroumand.

It is to be noted that among the four radifs of mâhur, there is more difference in nomenclature than in musical content. Differences in the latter more frequently involve the omission of materials present elsewhere than outright contradiction.

III. The Twenty "Common" Gushes

Viewing mâhur in the four radifs again in terms of the designation of material, there are twenty gushes that are found in all of them. Since Iranian musicians place considerable emphasis on the order in which the gushes appear in one dastgâh, it is interesting to compare the radifs from this viewpoint. Table M-2 illustrates. The composite nature of the radif of Saba, however, presents a special problem, as none of the individual instrumental versions has all twenty, but each gushe appears in at least one. We solve the problem of determining the order of all twenty in Saba's radif as follows. His radif for santur is the most comprehensive, including sixteen of the twenty "common" gushes of mâhur, lacking only dâd, ney-riz, nahib, and râk-e abdollah. Based on the place which each of these occupies in the other Saba radifs, we have suggested a place for each of these four gushes in the santur radif. Thus, the order given in Table M-2 for Saba is that of the santur radif, with the four lacking gushes placed where, on the basis of their position in Saba's other radifs, one might expect them to have been placed.

What strikes one first is the considerable amount of agreement among the orders of these common gushes in the four radifs. Particularly to be noted is the identical order at the beginning and end of the listing. The first two common gushes, darâmad (i.e., the entire darâmad group discussed above) and dâd, appear in this order. The last eight of the twenty also appear in one order: nahib, irâq, mohayyer, âshur avand, hazin, safir-e râk, râk-abdollah, and saqinâme, in the radifs of Ma'roufi, Karimi, and Saba; and in only slightly different order in Boroumand, where two pairs of gushes, ʻarâq and nahib, and râk-e abdollah and safir-e râk, are reversed.

There is less agreement in the order of appearance of the remaining ten of the common gushes: delkash, khâvarân, tusi, âzerbâijâni, feyli, zir-afkand, mâhur-e saqir, hesâr-e mâhur, neyriz, and shekaste. Yet their arrangement too indicates a fundamental patterning. Thus, delkash is immediately followed by khâvarân in three radifs, as the third and fourth gushes in Ma'roufi and Boroumand, and as ninth and tenth in Karimi. Neyriz and shekaste are adjacent in all four radifs. Feyli usually appears later than delkash; the two are about equidistant in three of the radifs, but adjacent, and in reverse order, in Karimi's.

It is worth noting that in the corpus examined by us, no two gushes, and no two versions of any gushe, are absolutely identical. There are a few instances in which similarity is very great, as in khâvarân in Boroumand's and Ma'roufi's radifs; but more frequently, great similarity is found in the melodic content at the opening and therefore characterizing sections of like-named gushes, while later there is greater divergence. The differences at this point results from extension, reduction, or elimination of melodic figures, rather than from the use (by the two units) of unrelated materials. Occasionally, however, versions of a gushe in different radifs exhibit similarity in the middle section rather than near the beginning; see for example, râk-e abdollah in Boroumand's radif, and in Saba's for setâr or târ.

Finally, a few gushes with the same name share no melodic content and would appear to be different entities that happen to have been named identically. An example is moradkhâni in the radifs of Boroumand and Karimi, where there is no resemblance. Instead, Boroumand's moradkhâni is similar to Karimi's nasirkhâni, suggesting that at some point confusion caused a change of name. But such instances are rare. Normally, melodic content and name coincide. But if reckoned by content rather than name, the "common" gushes would appear in slightly different order than that indicated by our list of the materials by name.

IV. Aspects of Rhythm

A brief introduction to the rhythmic character of the radif as a whole is given in the first chapter of this study. While it has generally been assumed that the major differences among radifs and among sections of a radif can be perceived best through the use of melodic and modal criteria, rhythmic elements may also play a role. A dastgâh does to some extent have its own rhythmic character. The earlier literature on Persian classical music does not deal much with rhythm. In most cases, bifurcation of Persian music in two types, composed and improvised, is simply continued in a dichotomy between metric and non-metric. Tsuge (1974) concentrates on the rhythmic aspects of the vocal radif, but he does so mainly by associating them with metric analysis of Persian poetry. Farhat (1966:243-50) discusses various types of material within the radif as having greater or lesser degrees of metric regularity, but he actually does not go into great detail on what this means. His classification of the content of radifs as consisting of gushes and tekkes—the former typically non-metric and prone to far-flung improvisation, and the latter more typically performed the same way every time and thus likely to have rhythmic regularity—is insightful.

Persian musicians, in dealing with the issue in a practical way, move further in the same direction. (See Vinogradov 1982 for one of the better discussions of rhythmic diversity in Persian music.) Their terminology includes a number of kinds of music distinguished chiefly or importantly by their rhythmic character. Âvâz implies a generally non-metric structure; and zarbi, metric structure in general. Chahâr mezrâb adds the concept of virtuosity and rhythmic ostinato. Naghme, at least according to Boroumand, implies a non-metric performance with considerable prevalence of one or two note-values, and thus the semblance of a pulse. Kereshme and chahâr pare imply specific rhythmic patterns in an irregular metric scheme often performed rubato and broken by non-metric bits.

The impression one receives on hearing a large section of a radif, such as an entire dastgâh, is that it is essentially non-metric, and readily distinguished from consistently metric composed pieces such as the pish-darâmad or the tasnif. But it is also clear that rhythmic movement of many kinds follow each other in quick succession. A convenient way of analyzing rhythmic structure is to use the Persian musician's tendency to develop musical classes on the basis of rhythmic criteria in identifying a number of kinds of rhythmic movement that one may find in the radif, and to plot their distribution. In this volume, several approaches to this classification appear, suggesting that there are alternatives. For mâhur, we present an informal typology of rhythm in categories based on several overlapping criteria that include the degree of dominance by one note value, the presence or absence of a regular succession of beats, repetition of short or long rhythmic motifs, a consistency of tempo. The following list is thus only an illustration of the various ways in which the different kinds of rhythmic movement in the radif may be grouped or described. Table M-3, in addition to comparing two radifs in length of sections, shows something of the distribution of the rhythmic types enumerated below:

A) completely non-metric movement with no perceptible regularity of any sort.
B) a slow section with a few tones of roughly the same length.
C) a faster section otherwise like B, also with a few tones of roughly the same length.
D) a repeated rhythmic pattern that is internally non-metric, something frequently found in connection with melodic sequence.
E) a relatively long section in which most of the notes are of the same standard note length, or its value doubled, e.g., quarter and eighth notes, characteristic of some section named naghme.
F) short metric bits, with a beat clearly present, separated by pauses, and presented rubato.
G) like F, but with longer basic patterns.
H) very short, rhythmically accented groups of three to five notes, each repeated four to eight times, often associated with a long melodic sequence moving the melody up or down a fifth or more.

I) a section of simple metric material with little repetition of rhythmic motifs.
J) rather complex rhythmic patterns repeated two or more times; the sections named kereshme in the radif ordinarily begin like this.
K) sustained use of rhythmic ostinato with strong metric organization, as in a chahâr mezrâb.

The types are listed in order from least metric to most metric, from least to most predictable, and from least to most repetitive. An individual gushe may be dominated by one of these, but normally, one hears several of the kinds of rhythmic movement in rather quick succession, each holding sway for no more than a few seconds. The general characteristic of the radifs is not their essentially non-metric nature, but their tendency to move quickly from one kind of rhythmic movement to another. The question is now to what extent the individual radifs and their components can be distinguished in this way.

First, there is a fundamental difference between the vocal radif of Karimi and the instrumental ones of Boroumand and Ma'roufi. The vocal radif contains far more material having little in the way of rhythmic movement from the beginning of the alphabet in the table above; and indeed, much of its rhythmic structure may, as Tsuge suggests, be based on the rhythmic structure of poetry.

The radifs of Ma'roufi and Boroumand, on the other hand, differ from each other significantly in one way related to a major difference in their structure. Boroumand's radif of mâhur (in contrast to the almost equal length of the two in shur) is considerably the shorter. Mâhur occupies forty minutes, in contrast to about 70 minutes for Ma'roufi's. The number of separately labeled sections is somewhat, but not proportionately, greater in Ma'roufi. Yet the number of different kinds of rhythmic movement is about the same in any typical section of the two, and actually perhaps a bit greater in Boroumand's. One may conclude that Boroumand's radif has a tendency to move more rapidly from one kind of rhythmic motion to another, and that the kind of material which occupies a particular type of rhythmic movement is elaborated more in Ma'roufi's. At the same time, it seems possible that the rendition of a gushe in the radif requires a certain amount of change in rhythmic movement, and therefore, if a gushe is given in brief form, it changes in rhythmic type more frequently than would a gushe performed more extensively. Boroumand stays with one kind of rhythm briefly; Ma'roufi sticks to a pattern or style at considerably greater length, establishing it thoroughly. This typical contrast between the two radifs is found in the darâmad group, in dâd and neyshâburak, but not everywhere, as indicated in the listing of delkash, Table M-3.

If there is a difference in rhythmic structure among radifs, there is some difference also in the rhythmic character of the dastgâhs. It is difficult to describe, but to give one characteristic, the beginnings of the gushes of one dastgâh, the principal thematic bits, tend to have similar rhythmic patterns. Thus, mâhur and chahârgâh show more contrast between long tones and groups of short values, while shur flows more evenly. These very general characterizations are weakened, however, by the fact that there is very substantial variety of rhythmic character among the gushes of one dastgâh; and yet, to some small extent, each dastgâh has its individual rhythmic feeling.

The classification of rhythmic movement types, as stated above, is highly approximate; sharp lines cannot be drawn. Nevertheless, a comparison of the radifs of Boroumand and

Ma'roufi indicates considerable correspondence in terms of the rhythmic movement in each gushe. Table M-3 shows that in selection of rhythmic types per gushe, they are very much alike; for instance, where a gushe uses predominantly Type A, its analogue in the other radif typically follows suit. Table M-3 gives only a few examples from the two radifs, indicating length of the gushe and, more or less in succession, the types of rhythmic movement used. Where the table indicates the use of Type H, however, this is intended to indicate that it appears occasionally but prominently throughout the gushe. Even where H is not mentioned in Table M-3, it may nevertheless appear occasionally, as connecting material and as a way to move from one part of the tonal range to another. Other rhythmic types that are used briefly or sporadically are given in parentheses.

V. Mâhur and Other Dastgâhs

One of the fascinating aspects of the Persian radif is the way in which materials from various dastgâhs are shared. Thus, as already suggested in Chapter 1, the names of certain gushes in mâhur are also found in other dastgâhs. Except for a few instances, the melodic contents of such gushes are similar; but possibly we can refine this statement by identifying and distinguishing degrees of similarity. Greatest resemblance in melodic content appears in the situation in which one master repeats an entire gushe almost exactly in another dastgâh within his own radif. For example, several gushes of mâhur also appear in râstpanjgâh, and a few in navâ. In Ma'roufi's radif, esfahânak appears in all three of these dastgâhs.

Somewhat less similarity is found where a gushe appears in different dastgâhs with essentially the same melodic content, but adjusted to a different scale. But this phenomenon is not important in mâhur. A yet smaller degree of melodic similarity is found where gushes with the same name share identical beginnings but then diverge. Chahâr-pare in mâhur and abu-atâ in Boroumand's radif is illustrative. There are also some very rare cases in which the melodic content of a single gushe in mâhur differs completely from that of the identically named gushe elsewhere. Table M-4 gives examples of some gushes of mâhur whose names appear also in other dastgâhs.

While the name of a gushe tends to be associated with a particular piece of melodic material, no matter in whose radif or in what dastgâh it appears, there is a tendency for certain characteristic motifs to appear under a variety of names. While a detailed account of this phenomenon is not yet available, we cite here again an example already encountered in our introductory chapter: The motif beginnings the gushe neyshâburâk in mâhur and navâ recurs in the various gushes of mâhur named râk but also at the beginning of darâmad and maghlub of chahârgâh, at the end of various gushes of chahârgâh and segâh, as well as the beginning of mavâliân in homâyun.

VI. The Âvâz of Mâhur

The number of performances of mâhur available to us for analysis is much smaller than is the case for the chapters in this volume devoted to chahârgâh and shur; and what we have is a corpus of a different sort. We were able to locate eleven performances, all taken from commercial recordings, eight of them recorded in Iran and produced principally for Iranian audiences. Thus, not only in number but also in range and context, the mâhur corpus is far more limited. Thus, the kinds of conclusions that it has been possible to make for the performance practice of chahârgâh, and even for shur (in Chapter 5), cannot be attempted for mâhur. Nevertheless, the eleven performances do provide a sense of the differences in the performance of âvâz between mâhur and the other two dastgâhs (see Table M-5).

In contrast to shur, the performances of mâhur present their gushes rather distinctly. It is usually not difficult to show that a selected section is based on the material from a particular gushe. The performances are divided into sections somewhat—but not quite as clearly—as is the case for chahârgâh.

The total number of gushes that appear in the eleven mâhur performances is eighteen, but five of them appear in only one particular rendition. Six others as well are confined to one performance each. Only seven gushes therefore appear in more than one performance: darâmad (including kereshme of darâmad, which might deserve independent status, as it is a very distinctive and accentuated bit of melody), dâd, khosravâni, delkash, shekaste, chahâr-pare, and râk (including râk-e hendi). This provides a kind of core similar to the core groups in the corpus of performances of chahârgâh (darâmad, zâbol, hesâr, mokhâlef, maghlub, mansuri, muye) and shur (darâmad, razavi, salmak, shahnâz, qarache).

And there is also, in mâhur, a central group of gushes that dominate the performances: darâmad (in all eleven), dâd (5), delkash (9), shekaste (7), râk (4), and chahâr pare (4); with darâmad, delkash, and shekaste perhaps the heart of the dastgâh. Similar central groups could be identified in shur (darâmad, razavi, shahnâz) and chahârgâh (darâmad, zâbol, mokhâlef).

In the configuration of this core, mâhur differs from mâhur and chahârgâh in two important ways. For one thing, there is the mentioned large number of gushes that appear in only one performance—though admittedly the small sampling may be a factor. In chahârgâh, there are far fewer such gushes; and in shur, the radif contains many that were not found in any performance.

The other distinction involves the nature of the principal gushes. Both shekaste and delkash are "modulatory," departing significantly from the basic scale of mâhur. Of the gushes otherwise in the core, dâd and chahâr pare are not modulatory, although the râk group is. All of this indicates that the relationship of the main gushes to the dastgâh of mâhur at large, as represented by darâmad, is different from that of the other two dastgâhs. A performance of mâhur, typically, moves from one tonality (or "modality") to another, and while the gushes have distinctive motifs, the alternation of scalar configurations makes mâhur rather more like a taqsim in Arabic music, in which movement from maqam to maqam, with final return to the home maqam, provides similar modal changes.

The role of modulatory gushes differs greatly in the three dastgâhs examined here. In the case of mâhur, as we have just pointed out, they comprise the bulk of the material contrastive to and following upon darâmad; they are in effect the main events in performance. And there are several of them, although just two dominate. In the case of chahârgâh, the two modulatory gushes play a somewhat different role. Muye is merely of medium importance, and it is characterized by its indefinite position in the order in which it appears in radifs and performances. We have shown that hesâr, of somewhat greater importance, occupies a kind of climactic position in performance and has a special relationship to mokhâlef, a relationship that we have described in Chapter 3 as conceivably analogous to the relationship of the dastgâhs chahârgâh and segâh. Shur does not really have a group of modulatory gushes and, in general its content is more unified than is the case of chahârgâh and mâhur. Indeed, perhaps the satellite dastgâhs, and the tendency to produce spin-offs like bayât-e kord, may have fulfilled the function that is elsewhere carried out by modulatory gushes.

The more pronounced division of the dastgâh into two parts, low and high, may be related. The most dominant gushes after darâmad are razavi, shahnâz, salmak, and qarache, three of them in the higher octave. Conceivably they, because of their distance from darâmad, a distance of only theoretical consequence in the instrumental performances, occupy a role somewhat like those of shekaste and delkash in mâhur. In other words, the gushes of the upper octave are in a sense modulatory. The fact that the group of modulatory gushes has a particular role in each of the various dastgâhs is a significant characteristic of the Persian music system.

The matter of order contributes further to this distinction. Chahârgâh has a characteristic order of gushes in the radifs, and despite departures, the performances of chahârgâh present their gushes in a rather similar way. In the case of shur, three groups of gushes, the second and third alternating in order, were identified in the radif. In a performance of shur, however, a gushe may often appear more than once, and in any event, hardly any characteristic order can be identified. In the case of mâhur, there is a relatively clear order in the radifs, although it is most consistent near beginnings and endings, and less so in the middle of the series. In the performances of mâhur, there is some correlation of order of gushes with the typical order in the radif. Those performances that have many gushes tend to present them in the order in which they appear in the radif. In the majority of performances, however, where there are only a few gushes, the order also follows roughly (though with definite departures) the typical patterns of order of the radifs. This includes the ambiguous order of some of the dominant gushes, delkash and shekaste, each of which precedes the other in some performances. The point is that in the radifs of Boroumand and Ma'roufi, delkash precedes, while in those of Karimi and Saba, it is shekaste. In mâhur, then, the relationship of performance to radif is much closer than is true of shur, and in some respects even a bit closer than is the case in chahârgâh.

All together, in most respects, the performances of mâhur are more like those of chahârgâh than of shur; nevertheless, they follow a distinctive set of patterns. The radif of mâhur as well is closer in general character to that of chahârgâh than of shur. But in melodic content, mâhur exhibits a characteristic independence. The comparison of mâhur with the other dastgâhs underscores yet again the diversity of dastgâhs in both radif and performance.

CHAPTER V

INTERRELATIONSHIPS IN SHUR

by Carol M. Babiracki and Bruno Nettl

In earlier studies of Persian music, the dastgâh of shur has received more attention than the other dastgâhs. Gerson-Kiwi (1963), while providing a general introduction to the radif, devotes her short book substantially to an accounting of shur. The first detailed study of performance as related to the radif is Massoudieh's *Awâ-e Sur* (1968). Khatschi, following his general introduction to the dastgâhs (1962), made a special study of shur (1967). No other dastgâh has received even this rather modest degree of attention. Surely this is in part the result of the generally recognized significance of shur in the radif; but considering that it is evidently not the dastgâh selected most for performance or for composition of set pieces such as pishdarâmads or tasnifs, it is also a curious twist in the history of scholarship.

In contrast to the study of chahârgâh in Chapter 3, in which the thrust is to show the relationship between the dastgâh and the performances on the basis of a careful look at the darâmad section, this chapter concentrates on the structure of the radif of shur, taking into account as many sources as could be found. Some emphasis on darâmad is inevitable, given its centrality in the dastgâh, but our interest here is in the structure of the entire radif. A short study of a group of performances and their use of radif materials follows the exposition of the radif. Most of our data is presented in tables (Tables S-1 through S-14), and the text should to some degree be considered as accompanying commentary.

I. Eighteen Sources of Radifs of Shur

As pointed out in Chapter 1, the sources of radifs vary greatly; nevertheless, a picture of considerable clarity emerges if all that can be gleaned from these forms and versions, recordings, transcriptions, and descriptions are taken into account and compared. It is a picture that suggests an at once unified and variegated tradition. Eighteen radifs were used for this study, and a list of these appears in Table S-1 (and thus is not further documented in this text).

As was said in Chapter 1, these sources are diverse, intended for different purposes. We review briefly: For seven of the eighteen radifs—those of Mirza Abdollah (as reported by Nazir), Hedayat (another account of Mirza Abdollah), Khaleqi, Davami, and Ney-Davoud—we have only lists of their constituent gushes. Two radifs exist in notated form only. Of these, Sabâ's three instructional books present selections from his radif, although presumably they are what he considered to be the most important gushes. Farhat, who himself did not pretend to be a teacher of the radif, presented in his doctoral dissertation (Farhat 1966, 1990) a list of the contents of the radif, with transcriptions and analytical notations based primarily on his own knowledge and experiences as an ethnomusicologist and to a smaller degree, a performer. It is, incidentally, quite similar to Ma'roufi's radif.

The two versions of Boroumand's radif and that of Roshanravan exist only in recorded versions. Of Boroumand's, one is a set of field recordings made by Nettl during lessons in Tehran in 1968-69. The second was recorded seven years later, in 1975, for the Ministry of Fine Arts in Tehran, and may be regarded as the closest to an "official" version of this master's work. (The notated version of Boroumand's radif of 1966 which appears in Tsuge's dissertation, 1974:402-45, and excerpts recorded by Stephen Blum in 1967 are not used here.) The Roshanravan radif is contained in a series of commercial recordings produced for the Institute for Intellectual Development of Children and Young Adults. Only selections of the radif were actually included in it, and in each dastgâh, the various gushes are performed by different musicians.

The remaining radifs, those of Ma'roufi and Karimi, are versions of great significance because of their influence in the development of classical music in recent decades, and they exist in both notated and recorded forms. Ma'roufi's radif, having in part been compiled by a committee under the direction of the Ministry of Culture, may include materials from several personal radifs, although it is generally conceded that in the end Ma'roufi himself, chairman of the committee, made most of the decisions (Zonis 1973:63). It may be a more comprehensive radif than any individually personal version of Ma'roufi and is in any event the longest. The prescriptive notations are transcriptions made by Ma'roufi himself, and the accompanying recording was made by Soleiman Ruh-Afzâ from the notations.

The most complete version of Karimi's radif (#12 in Table S-1) available to us was recorded under the direction of the Ministry of Fine Arts as a vocal counterpart to Ma'roufi's instrumental radif. A detailed, descriptive transcription by M.T.

Massoudieh (1978) was published to accompany the recordings. The other two versions of Karimi's radif are briefer forms, recorded earlier, but clearly closely related to the "official" form published in 1978. The radif of Karimi that Tsuge (1974: 315-401) presents in his dissertation (#10, Table S-1) is his notated transcription of a performance of the radif by this master himself. Although this is a highly abridged version, it does present those gushes that Karimi, himself, felt were the most important. Radif #11 is a set of field recordings made in Tehran in 1968 by Nettl, again performed by Karimi himself.

These eighteen versions of the radif, by eleven different musicians, represent forms extending from the late 19th century to the late 1970s. The radifs of Mirza Abdollah, Hedayat, and Saba may be considered the oldest stratum in the sample, dating from the late nineteenth century to the 1930s. At the other extreme are ten versions, of seven teachers, dating from the 1960s and 1970s and representing the most recent forms of the radif available to us. Filling the temporal gap between these groups are the two radifs of Khaleqi, both dating from the 1950s. We are able, therefore, to construct a skeleton of the history of this material in the twentieth century. Parenthetically, it is worth reminding ourselves that identity in nomenclature need not correlate with musical identity, a point made emphatically by Khatschi (1967:70) in criticizing the assumptions of those who would associate ancient names with a pre-Islamic musical system: "Die überlieferten Namen, die man lediglich als Traditionssymbole aufassen darf, dürfen nicht darüber hinwegtäuschen, dass eine Identität zwischen der vor- und frühislamischen und der modernen traditionellen Musik recht fragwürdig ist." Of course, our period of consideration is short, and the sampling relatively dense, and therefore we feel that we can cautiously draw conclusions on the basis of verbal identification where the music itself is not available. But most importantly, we are concerned with recorded and transcribed radifs.

The radifs of Sabâ, Ma'roufi, Boroumand, Farhat, and Ney-Davoud are clearly intended as instrumental, while those of Karimi and Davami are vocal. The remainder of radifs in our sample are not specifically for voice or instruments and may be considered suitable for performance by either, but are more likely to have instrumental orientation.

Normally, each of the eleven musicians represented in our sample would be a teacher of Persian classical music in the sense that each radif is a "teaching" version of the musical material of shur. But, in fact, the eleven are a mixed group of performers, theorists, and trained musicologists associated with different traditions of Persian music.

II. The Universe of Gushes of Shur

The total number of gushes that appear somewhere in the radif of shur is vast. Table S-2 is an alphabetical list of the names of fifty gushes found in the eighteen radifs examined. The following notes clarify the list and make some observations about its contents:

> **1.** Certain gushes have been excluded from the list. In most cases these are composed pieces or types of pieces or styles that can be found in any dastgâh and adapted to any melodic material; they correspond in part to the tekkes of Farhat or the third group of gushes in Sadeghi's taxonomy. For example:

a. kereshme - a rhythmic pattern that can be applied to any gushe, and can be found throughout a dastgâh; its melodic material is usually drawn from what precedes or follows it.

b. zarbi, chahâr mezrâb, domezrâb - rhythmic styles that can be applied to any material.

c. tahrir - a vocal style that can be applied to any melodic material.

d. naghme - a style of rhythm and type of formal organization that can be applied to any melodic material but is usually associated with darâmad.

e. hazin - a melody type that can be performed in any dastgâh, that takes on the scalar patterns of the dastgâh and is not subject to improvisation.

f. reng, zarb-e osul, shahr-ashub - composed metric pieces based on preceding material or on the darâmad, neither new material nor the basis for improvisation.

g. masnavi and ghazal - types of poems that can be sung to any melodic material.

h. forud.

i. moqaddame and owj - respectively, “introduction” and “climax,” names of functions using any melodic material.

j. âvâz - included as a constituent gushe only where it is like darâmad in nature, as in Sabâ’s 1st violin radif and the first occurrence of âvâz in Ma’roufi’s radif. The âvâz after shur-e bâlâ in Ma’roufi is essentially a forud and so was excluded. In the case of Hedayat’s radif, for which we have only a listing, the âvâz is assumed to be in the character of darâmad, since there is no other darâmad listed.

2. Table S-1, and also the tables that follow it, list gushes by name rather than by musical content. It has been noted in our study of mâhur that two similar-sounding gushes in different radifs or even within the same radif may be designated by different names. Some examples in the radifs of shur are noted below:

a. As in the case of the dastgâh of mâhur, a variety of names designating the same musical material is particularly common in the opening gushes of a dastgâh. In this study of shur, gushes of the opening darâmad section (whether called moqaddame, 1st darâmad, 2nd darâmad, etc.) are collectively designated as darâmad. Although shur-e bâlâ and darâmad pâindaste are also darâmad-like in nature, they remain distinct here because of their octave displacement and structural importance. The terms darâmad pâin-daste and shur-e bâlâ are themselves different designations for the same material.
b. Sarani and dastân-e arâb are both alternate names for the gushe (and dastgâh) of abu-atâ (see Khatschi, 1962:78 and p. 154, footnote 52; and also Ma'roufi's title page to the dastgâh abu-atâ). Ashq-kosh and oqdeh-e gusha refer to the same gushe (see Khatschi 1962:13).
c. Establishing the identity of rohâb with rahâvi is a bit more complex. Khaleqi uses the terms to designate the same gushe (quoted by Khatschi (1962:77): "Gushe ye Rohab [Rahawi auch Rohawi]"), but Farhat (1966) treats the two as distinct gushes. In our eighteen sources of the radif of shur, rohâb and rahâvi (and variants of these names) appear to be two names for the same melodic

> material. Both appear alone and with the prefix "gusheye." In Sabâ's first santur book, the gushe appears with the prefix "darâmad-e." All of these variants have been labeled either rohâb or rahâvi in the tables that follow.

The words rohâb and rahâvi are probably linguistically related. This alone would not be enough to allow us to regard them as two names for the same gushe, as we have found instances of similar names designating different melodic material in mâhur. *Steingass's Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary* (New Delhi, revd. ed. of Johnson and Richardson, *Persian, Arabic and English Dictionary*, 1981), however, gives the following entry for rahâv: "(for râh-âb), a traveler by water; an aqueduct, a canal; (for rahâwi): a note in music." More importantly, rohâb and rahâvi are similar in sound material, similar to and closely associated with darâmad of shur, and never found together in the same radif.

In shur, gushes called rohâb or rahâvi not only resemble the darâmad in melodic content but are also positioned close to it, either within the darâmad group or immediately following it. Boroumand also includes rohâb after darâmad pâindaste. Among our eighteen radifs of shur, the only exceptions to the association of rohâb and rahâvi with darâmad are the older radifs of Mirza Abdollah and Hedayat, in which rahâvi appears in the second half of the dastgâh but is not preceded by shur-e bâlâ or darâmad pâindaste (see section IV, below).

Most of the versions of rohâb and rahâvi share melodic content that is close to that of the darâmad of shur: scale and finalis of shur, emphasis on descending melodic movement within the lower tetrachord, descending phrase endings and final cadence of shur. But unlike darâmad, rohâb and rahâvi characteristically begin with an ascending perfect fourth from the seventh degree to the third, as a leap or scalar line. This interval may be emphasized throughout the gushe, alternating with material that is indistinguishable from darâmad. The only exception to this among our notated or recorded examples is the rohâb of Sabâ's second violin radif. Although it follows the darâmad and uses the scale and finalis of shur, this rohâb emphasizes the third below the final as well as the tetrachord above and gives no particular attention to the perfect fourth between degrees 7 and 3.

When the designations rohâb or rahâvi appear in other dastgâhs (see Table S-9), they also seem to refer to the same melodic material; in these, too, the two never appear together in the same dastgâh. Ro-hâb/rahâvi in other dastgâhs is not associated with darâmad sections and usually appears near the end of the dastgâh. Its mode and melodic motifs are those of shur's rohâb/rahâvi.

In dastgâhs other than shur, both rohâb and rahâvi (and their variant names) tend to be paired with the gushe massihi, particularly in other dastgâhs. In shur, we see this pairing only in the older radifs of Mirza Abdollah ("Rahâwi u. Masihi") and Hedayat ("Rohâb-e Masihi" followed by "Rahawi"). This may account for their positions, in these radifs, in the second half of the dastgâh rather than at the beginning. The association between rohâb/rahâvi and massihi is stronger in other dastgâhs, particularly in segâh, bayât-e esfahân, navâ (which is in part derived from shur), and afshâri (one of the "spin-offs" of shur; see Table S-9). Massihi is paired with both rohâb and rahâvi in these dastgâhs, but more often associated with rahâvi. But when massihi is present, it is preceded or followed by either rohâb or rahâvi. The association of massihi with both suggests that the two names, rohâb and rahâvi, are closely related and may be considered interchangeable by some teachers.

3. All variants of the name of a gushe, when alike in musical content, have been subsumed under one name. For example:

> Kordi, bayât-e kord and panje-ye kord are all designated as kord, while greyli and greyli shasti are both simply called greyli. In these cases, the gushes subsumed under one name also tend to be alike in musical content. (But note: panje-ye kord and bayât-e kord, both in Ma'roufi's radif, do differ somewhat in musical content and might perhaps have been better treated as separate gushes.)

4. However, just as similar musical content may be designated by different names, similarly named gushes may actually differ in musical content. Where that is the case in shur, we have treated the like-named gushes as separate units:

> **a.** Neyshâbur and neyshâburak, although similar in name, are generally different in content and so have been listed separately here.
> **b.** Zirkesh-e salmak (or zirkesh) and salmak share the same scale and finalis as well as similar names. In the dastgâh of shur, they tend to be paired, and Farhat (1966:51) treats them as one gushe. But because they differ in melodic character and appear separated in some radifs of shur (Boroumand, Davami), they are treated separately in this study.
> **c.** We also treat darâmad-e khârâ and khârâ as separate

gushes, despite the similarity of name. Darâmad-e khârâ (Sabâ's 1st santur book, Karimi) is based on darâmad material with a flavor of khârâ and is usually positioned with other darâmad-related gushes. The gushe khârâ, on the other hand, is independent of the darâmad in position as well as musical content. This independence is also true of darâmad-e shahnâz and shahnâz. Darâmad-e shahnâz (Sabâ's 1st santur book) is a mixture of darâmad and shahnâz but resembles darâmad more, in particular bearing a similarity to Boroumand's 4th darâmad. Despite this similarity, darâmad-e shahnâz is positioned not in the darâmad group but just before shahnâz. Still, because of the differences in musical content between the two gushes, they are treated as separate gushes here.

d. It should be noted that darâmad-e rahâvi (Sabâ's 1st santur book), unlike the two examples above, is not treated as a gushe distinct from rahâvi. There is no significant difference in musical content between this gushe and others called simply rahâvi or rohâb. On the other hand, rohâb-e masihi (Hedayat) is treated as a variant of masihi rather than rohâb. In this case, we have no way of determining the musical content of Hedayat's rohâb-e masihi, but masihi does exist elsewhere as a separate gushe. And rohâb-e masihi is immediately followed in Hedayat's shur by rahâvi. Since both rohâb and rahâvi are not found together in any other of our eighteen sources of shur, it seems logical to assume that Hedayat's rohâb-e masihi was a version of masihi rather than of rohâb. Of course, without information about the specific musical content, we can only speculate.

III. Constituent Gushes of the Eighteen Radifs

Table S-2 presents the constituent gushes, in order, of each of the eighteen sources of radifs of shur. The same information is presented in Table S-3 in a comparative chart, listing the gushes of each radif in numerical order. In both tables, each recurrence of a gushe within a radif has been indicated.

The radifs of Mirza Abdollah and Hedayat, as reported by Khatschi in his book *Der Dastgâh*, are unique among our sources in that they include a large number of gushes that are not found in any of the other radifs of shur. Most of these gushes are now considered members of one or more of shur's four satellite dastgâhs, abu-atâ, bayât-e tork, dashti, or afshâri. In the tables that follow, those gushes which are considered constituent units of at least one of the four "spin-offs" in at least two of the modern radifs have been deleted from the radifs of Mirza Abdollah and Hedayat.

Thus, the gushes deleted from Abdollah's radifs include the following: bayât-e tork, dogâh, ruh-ol arvan, qatar, and mehrabâni, all now considered part of bayât-e tork; dashti, hajiâni, and bidakâni, now considered gushes of dashti; afshâri and qarâi, gushes of afshâi; sayakhi and hejâz, gushes of abu-atâ; and gilaki and ghamangiz, now considered gushes of both dashti and abu-atâ. The following gushes were deleted from Hedayat's radif: bayât-e tork, shekaste, qatar, ruh-ol arvah, and mehrabâni, all gushes of bayât-e tork; dashtestâni, dashti, bidakâni, and hajiâni, all gushes of dashti; sayakhi, baghdâdi, hejâz, and gabri, now gushes of abu-atâ; nahib and qarâi, gushes of afshâri; jâmedarân, a gushe of afshâri and bayât-e tork; and ghâm-e angiz and gilaki, gushes of dashti and abu-atâ. Following the above reason-ing, the gushe abu-atâ could also have been deleted from Hedayat's radif. It was not, however, because abu-atâ is also found in Ma'roufi's radif of shur. It is interesting to note that, despite these deletions, both the Mirza Abdollah (i.e., Nazir) and Hedayat versions of shur name a large number of gushes that are not found in any of the other fifteen versions. Of the fifteen gushes that the Abdollah and Hedayat radifs do not share with other radifs of shur, seven are also not found by name in any other dastgâh of our sample (see Table S-9 and sec-tion VI).

IV. Multiple Versions of Individual Radifs

We are, fortunately, able to get a sense of the individual musician's conception of the radif by comparing different versions of the same master. Tables S-2 and S-3 are particularly useful for making this kind of comparison. Our sample includes sets of multiple versions of five teachers: Mirza Abdollah, Sabâ, Khaleqi, Karimi, and Boroumand. As might be expected in such a diverse sample, these sets of multiple versions are different in nature. In the case of Mirza Abdollah, what appear to be two versions of the radif of shur ("shur" and "other gushes used in shur") should perhaps be considered two parts of one radif. The two share no common gushes, and they correspond, respectively, to the first and second halves of the radif of shur as it is conceived by the more recent teachers.

Of the four multiple-version radifs that remain, the two versions of Boroumand's radif of shur show the most consistency. Our study of mâhur notes the same consistency between versions of Boroumand's radif of that dastgâh. All fifteen of the gushes in Boroumand's radif of shur recorded by Nettl in 1968 are also present in the 1975 "official" recording, and in the same order, despite the gap of seven years. The 1975 version is simply more complete than the earlier one, adding three other gushes—rohâb, ozal, qajar—as well as a repetition of shahnâz.

The three versions of Karimi's radif of shur bear the same general relationship to each other as do the Boroumand versions, but their differences are greater. In number of gushes, at least, Karimi's versions of shur show less agreement over time than do his versions of mâhur. Tsuge's abridged version of Karimi's shur is the shortest, containing only darâmad, shahnâz, qarache, and hosseini. In the 1968 Nettl recording, five gushes—rahâvi, salmak, razavi, bozorg, dobeyti—join this core of four, which maintain the same relative positions as found in Tsuge's version. The most recent version, published with Massoudieh (1978), may be considered Karimi's comprehensive statement of the radif, and is thus the most complete and extensive. All of the gushes in the 1968 recording, with the exception of salmak, are found in it, and there are two additional gushes, zirkesh-e salmak and greyli.

Due perhaps to the special form in which they were published, the three versions of Sabâ's radif have less in common than do those of Boroumand and Karimi. Sabâ's three instructional books used here as sources for his radif differ even in the number of dastgâhs they include. Only his second violin book contains all twelve of the dastgâhs; the first violin book contains ten, in the same order as in the second; and the first santur book contains only two dastgâhs, segâh and shur. Comparing the two violin books, we find that each presents the same ten dastgâhs in different tunings and usually using different melodic material. Sabâ's three versions of shur contain nearly the same number of gushes (ten in the first violin book, nine in the second, and ten in the first santur book), but they have only four gushes in common: darâmad (called âvâz in the first violin book), shahnâz, hosseini, and khârâ. Three further gushes are found in two of the three versions: rohâb/rahâvi, greyli, and mollânâzi. The relative positions of these shared gushes are the same in each version. Putting the three together, one gets some sense of Sabâ's thinking regarding necessary and optional gushes, and the order in which they should be placed.

The differences between Khaleqi's two versions of shur are also greater than is the case in Boroumand's and Karimi's versions, and they are somewhat more difficult to explain. The two Khaleqi versions reported by Khatschi originally appeared in two different publications, one of them Khaleqi's significant work, the first volume of *Sargozasht-e Musiqi-ye Irân* (History of the Music of Iran, 1955), and the other, in an issue of a semi-popular periodical, *Musik-e Iran*, dated ca. 1954. Both contain approximately the same number of gushes, seventeen in the first and sixteen in the second. Eleven gushes are found in both and in the same relative positions: darâmad, zirkesh-e salmak, salmak, golriz, bozorg, dobeyti, qajar, mollânâzi, shahnâz, qarache, ashq-kosh. Three other gushes are found in both versions but in slightly different positions: khârâ, shahnâz, razavi. We can perhaps conclude that these fourteen are the gushes that Khaleqi considered the most significant in shur. That leaves six gushes that are each found in only one of his versions, and it may be that Khaleqi regarded these as less important gushes, as substitutions for one another. Rohâb is positioned immediately following darâmad in our first version of Khaleqi's shur, while muye has that position in the second version. Similarly, safâ falls between golriz and bozorg in the first version, while kuchek has that position in the second. Ozal and majles-afruz are found, as a pair, only in the first version. Thus, Khaleqi's two versions represent not necessarily different degrees of completeness as do those of Karimi and Boroumand, but rather different options for the choosing and ordering of gushes.

V. The Common Gushes

The central portion of a dastgâh, seen both diachronically and in synchronic distribution through the tradition, would have to be the gushes held in common by different masters and their versions of the radif. Table S-4 lists the contents of each version of shur, in numerical order, in a chart designed for easy comparison. The diversity of these eighteen versions of shur has already been noted. They range in length from Karimi's version (quoted in Tsuge 1974) of only four named gushes to Ma'roufi's version of 34. The length and comprehensiveness of Ma'roufi's version of shur reflects his radif at large; his dastgâh of mâhur is also longer than those of his contemporaries. We have also observed earlier that Nazir's (Abdollah) and Hedayat's versions of shur contain some 15 gushes not found in any of the other versions. Most of these gushes appear towards the end of their respective radifs of shur (see Table 5-S). Only one other gushe, nashib-o foraz, is found in only one version, in this case that of Ney-Dâvoud. Similar idiosyncrasies in the order of gushes in Ney-Dâvoud's version of shur are discussed below.

Tables S-5 through S-8 summarize in various ways the information presented in Table S-4. To make some of these charts less cumbersome and more meaningful, the multiple versions of shur by Mirza Abdollah, Sabâ, Khaleqi, Karimi, and Boroumand have been combined into one composite version for each. Tables S-6, S-7, and S-8 do, however, retain the separation of Abdollah's two versions, although they might logically be considered one.

Sabâ's two violin versions have been combined into one, and his santur radif omitted for the purposes of these charts. And the 1969 and 1978 versions of Karimi's Shur are presented separately; in some respects, the 1978 version is a more complete form of the one recorded in 1969, but the two also differ enough to justify presenting both of them here.

An unusually large number of gushe designations is found in these 18 versions of shur—a much larger number (50) than that found, for example, in the radif of mâhur (ca. 30). But many of these, even disregarding the fifteen present exclusively in the Abdollah and Hedayat versions, are found in only a handful of radifs and are presumably less essential for defining the dastgâh than are the rest. In Table S-5, the number of gushes of shur has been reduced to only the 23 present in at least three of the eighteen versions. (Note: because five of these versions are composites of multiple versions, the numerical order of gushes is not given). These 23 still represent nearly half of our original 50 gushes. In this table, Karimi's radif is again the shortest; this time along with Davami's to which it seems closely related. Further similarities between the versions of these two teachers will be noted as our discussion continues. Ma'roufi's version still remains the most complete, but the difference between the two extremes, Karimi and Ma'roufi, has been diminished.

Table S-6 lists the three gushes—there are really surprisingly few—that are present in each of the eighteen radifs of shur. (Note: qarache is found only in Sabâ's first santur radif). Possibly the number of common gushes is so small because our sample is large and covers a long period of time; but in fact, the cases of chahârgâh and segâh, while suggesting the same kind of history, are less extreme. It is probably significant that these three common gushes appear in the same order in each teacher's radif of shur, even though their versions otherwise show great diversity in the order of gushes (compare, for example, versions of Boroumand and Karimi).

A consideration of the gushes that are common to most radifs (that is, found in all or all but one) produces a somewhat larger group of eight (Table S-7). A look down the columns shows that Sabâ's and Karimi's versions are each lacking one gushe, and Farhat's and Davami's each lack two. But the radifs of seven teachers of the eleven in our sample contain all eight.

These eight shared gushes, as one might expect, exhibit more variety in their relative positions in the radifs than did the three found in all eighteen versions. But initial inspection may be deceptive, for what looks like a large group of different organizations of gushes can actually be reduced to just two, as follows.

1) In the versions of Abdollah, Hedayat, Khaleqi, and also Farhat, the shared gushes of Table S-7 appear in exactly the same relative order. This is not surprising, since Hedayat and Khaleqi (and Farhat as well, as his work has a primarily historical thrust) are generally based as directly as possible on Mirza Abdollah. But the sequences of these eight central gushes in the radifs of Ma'roufi, Boroumand and Roshanravan, all modern radifs, are also nearly identical with those of the older radifs. The only exception is the position of the gushe razavi, which precedes the pair shahnâz-qarache in the three modern radifs rather than following it.

2) The versions of Sabâ, Karimi, and Davami all share a second ordering of these eight central gushes. Again, these three differ from each other only in the position of the

> gushe razavi. It has been suggested in our study of mâhur that vocal and instrumental radifs differ significantly, particularly in their treatment of rhythm. The distinction between instrumental and vocal, however, does not appear to be a factor in the ordering of the most common gushes in shur.

The radif of shur of Ney-Dâvoud fits neither of the two patterns discussed above. In Ney-Dâvoud's shur, even the gushes shahnâz and qarache, which are paired and in this order in the other ten versions, are separated by the gushe bozorg. And razavi neither precedes nor follows the pair here. Ney- Dâvoud, however, like the other ten masters, did pair bozorg with dobeyti.

Table S-7, then, provides us with a group of eight gushes that are the most common and stable in position in the eighteen versions of shur. Provisionally, and on the basis only of the nomenclature of the gushes, we may be justified in considering these eight to be the central core of the dastgâh of shur.

VI. Comparison of Older and Modern Radifs

This large sample of radifs of shur affords an opportunity to compare the older versions of Abdollah, Hedayat, and Sabâ (dating from the late nineteenth century to the 1930s), as a group, with the more modern versions. The comparison might contribute to our understanding of the history and development of the dastgâh. Table S-8 is actually two separate charts, combined to facilitate comparison. On the left side of the table are listed only those gushes that are found in each of the three older radifs; on the right side are those common to four of the modern radifs, those of Ma'roufi, Boroumand, Karimi, and Roshanravan. For each radif, gushes are ordered numerically according to their relative positions.

The fact that nine of the total of thirteen gushes listed in the table are common to all seven of these radifs—both the old and the modern—indicates that there has been some degree of consensus over some sixty or seventy years in the conception of what constitutes the most essential contents of shur. Within each period there is a somewhat larger consensus, twelve in the older group as compared to ten in the modern. Three of the gushes common to the older radifs—mollânâzi, khârâ, and qajar—are missing from the modern radif of Karimi (as well, incidentally, from Davami). On the other hand, zirkesh-e salmak, present in each modern radif, is missing in the Sabâ versions of the older group. One should be careful, however, in extrapolating generalizations from this modest quantity of data about trends in the popularity of these gushes over time. Sabâ's radifs, after all, were never specifically intended as complete versions of the dastgâhs in the sense of Ma'roufi and Boroumand. Furthermore, all of the older versions are instrumental, while in the modern group, those of Karimi and Davami, which disagree most with the older radifs in contents, are vocal. The instrumental-vocal distinction evidently has some significance in determining the contents of shur.

One rather clear and interesting difference between the old and modern versions of shur is the position of the gushe rohâb/rahâvi. In the modern versions, rohâb/rahâvi is strongly associated with the darâmad, appearing immediately after it at the beginning of the dastgâh. In the oldest versions of shur, those of Mirza Abdollah and Hedayat, rohâb/rahâvi appears much later in the dastgâh, preceding the gushe greyli. Boroumand also places a reappearance of rahâvi here in his comprehensive version (ca. 1975), following darâmad pâindaste and preceding greyli. In both cases, rohâb/rahâvi may have the function of returning the musical course of events to material from darâmad; or it may have some special association with greyli. Rohâb/rahâvi is also the only gushe that is common to both the old and modern radifs but not included in our group of eight central gushes.

In both the old and modern radifs of shur, we do see pairings of the gushes bozorg and dobeyti, in that order, and of shahnâz and qarache, also in that order. Shahnâz and qarache are also associated with razavi, which either precedes or follows that pair. It was earlier noted that our eight central gushes tend to be ordered in one of two ways in the eighteen sources. In smaller groupings of gushes, there is even greater consistency among both the old and modern versions of shur.

In the history of the radif in the twentieth century, there has been some change in the use of the designation "darâmad." The use of the term to designate the opening gushes of shur is standard practice in the modern radifs but was found with less consistency among the older. The term is lacking altogether in Hedayat's version of Mirza Abdollah, and one of Sabâ's versions, his first book for violin radif. Consulting its notation, we discover that what he calls "âvâz" is actually material from darâmad. The same may well have been true of Hedayat's âvâz. The designations of these opening gushes of shur seem thus to have changed more over time than their actual musical content, a tendency also found in our studies of mâhur and chahârgâh. The lack of consistent designation of introductory material was also found among generally informed members of the listening audiences, who frequently confused the term "darâmad" and "pishdarâmad," insisting that the initial metric, composed piece was simply to be called "darâmad."

Our earlier observations concerning the relative order of central gushes of shur are confirmed by Table S-8 as well. The order of common gushes in Abdollah and Hedayat's radifs of shur resembles that of Boroumand, Ma'roufi and Roshanravan's versions; and Sabâ's is similar to Karimi's. The distinction between instrumental and vocal radifs is evidently not a factor in the relative ordering of gushes, although it may be in the choice of gushes. And age, the distinction between old and modern radifs, is also not a factor in the relative position of gushes.

It is instructive at this point to reexamine our group of eight central gushes (Table S-7) in light of the information provided by Table S-8. The older versions of shur of Table S-8 share three additional gushes beyond the eight central ones—mollânâzi, khârâ, and qajar. And both modern and old radifs of shur have two other gushes in common—rohâb/rahâvi and greyli. Adding these five to the original eight would produce an expanded group of 13 gushes of major significance to the identity of shur (the original group of eight is underlined):

> darâmad, rohâb/rahâvi, zirkesh-e salmak, salmak, bozorg, dobeyti, khârâ, qajar, mollânâzi, greyli, shahnâz, qarache, razavi.

All of these gushe designations are found in radifs of at least eight of the eleven teachers in our sample. There remains only one other gushe—golriz—that is found in at least eight radifs but is not found among these 13 common gushes of shur; we shall return to it.

VII. The Central Gushes

At first consideration, the dastgâh of shur may appear to be far more complex and less consistent in its number and ordering of constituent gushes than do other dastgâhs, such as chahârgâh and mâhur, to say nothing of its satellite dastgâhs. Closer examination, however, shows broad patterns and a general stability within those patterns. We have found thus far that, among different versions of shur of a single teacher, the number of gushes may vary but their relative ordering tends to remain constant. We have also noted that, despite the size of our sample and the different natures of these radifs, there are a good number of gushes present in most radifs of shur (23 found in three or more; 14, in at least eight). There is a group of eight central gushes that are shared by nearly all, and their organization is fairly stable.

Close comparison of the radifs also uncovers small groups of gushes that evidently retained their integrity through the transmission of the radif, as noted earlier. These groups fall into only one of two general patterns. Each pattern is found in both instrumental and vocal radifs and both older and modern versions. In order to examine these patterns and their implications further, it is necessary to discuss at some length the relationship between designation and musical content of gushes. One can clearly make some comparisons of radifs of shur based solely on the designations of gushes by teachers. But to what extent are judgments about commonly named gushes and their order in these radifs a useful, accurate way of determining the most significant gushes of shur?

We may begin to answer this by considering what performers and theorists of Persian music, themselves, consider to be the essential gushes of shur. Their statements tend to be based on considerations of the musical content of gushes rather than their designations.

Of our eighteen sources of shur, two—Karimi's, as reported by Tsuge, and Farhat's—were intended to present only the most important gushes of shur. Of the four gushes in Karimi's abridged version of shur, three (darâmad, shahnâz, and qarache) are present in our group of eight central gushes. But Karimi also includes hosseini, which is not included even in the expanded group of 13 central gushes. Farhat's list of the 14 principal gushes of shur (darâmad, zirkesh-e salmak and salmak, mollânâzi, golriz, bozorg, khârâ and qajar, ozzal, shahnâz, qarache, hosseini, bayât-e kord, and greyli), includes all of our 13 central gushes, with the exception of dobeyti, razavi, and rohâb/rahâvi. But among his principal gushes, Farhat also names others that are not included in our group: golriz, ozzal, hosseini, and bayât-e kord. Mohammad Taghi Massoudieh, in his study of shur (1968) lists nine gushes as comprising shur (kereshme, rahâvi, zirkesh-e salmak, mollânâzi, bozorg, shur-e bâlâ, shahnâz, qarache and hosseini). Only hosseini is not one of our 13 central gushes.

Manoochehr Sadeghi's accounting of the relative importance and roles of gushes of Shur (Sadeghi 1971), already discussed in our Chapters 1 and 2, is more detailed and very insightful. He calls five gushes the "bones" of the dastgâh. Of these most important gushes, darâmad, shahnâz, qarache, and razavi are all among our group of eight central gushes. And, like Karimi, Farhat, and Massoudieh, he includes hosseini among the most important. His second group of gushes, perhaps as significant but with a function somehow different, he calls the "tendons" of the dastgâh, the units that hold the bones together. Five of his six "tendon" gushes (rahâvi, salmak, mollânâzi, khârâ, and qajar) are in our group of thirteen central gushes. But, like Farhat, Sadeghi also includes bayât-e kord in this group. Finally, Sadeghi presents three gushes (dobeyti, greyli, and greyli-shassi) as less essential. These tend to be more fixed in melodic material, less melismatic, less often the basis of improvisation. But these three are also included in our group of thirteen (greyli and greyli-shassi both under the designation greyli). Sadeghi does not include bozorg in his list of the gushes of shur.

The chart below lists the gushes of shur considered to be most important by these four authorities as well as our expanded list of thirteen central gushes (abbreviated as in Table S-2):

Karimi:	D									Sh	Qa	H		
Farhat:	D		Zi/S	M	G	B		Kh/Q	O	Sh	Qa	H	Ko	Gr
Massoudieh:	Ker	R	Zi	M		B			Sb	Sh	Qa	H		
Sadeghi:	D	Ra	S	M				Kh Q		Sh	Qa	H		
13 central gushes	D	R/Ra	Zi/S	M		B	Do	Kh Q		Sh	Qa	Rz		Gr

Although this list of 13 central gushes has been determined by their frequency of use and stability of relative position, it is in general agreement with the stated judgments of Iranian scholars or scholar/performers. Our list of 13 includes only one gushe, dobeyti, which is not considered important by these authorities. But it also fails to contain some gushes which clearly are considered important by the others—primarily hosseini and bayât-e kord, but also golriz and ozal, which receive some attention in the next section.

VIII. Order and Organization

We return now to our observation, made above, that our original eight common, and presumably central, gushes of shur (Table S-7) appear in only two different general patterns of order in the eighteen radifs of shur. Using these eight common gushes and their orderings as a starting point, we can now look more closely at the internal logic of the ordering of gushes in the radif of shur. As they are distributed through the radifs, the eight central gushes are consistently grouped together in three more or less indivisible blocks. In each radif, these three blocks are ordered in one of the two overall patterns discussed earlier. The gushes of each block are indivisible in the sense that, when they are present, they always appear together and are almost always in the same order:

I	II	III
D - Zi -s	B-Do	Sh - Qa - Rz
		or
		Rz - Sh – Qa

Other gushes are occasionally interpolated within a block, but more often they appear before or after the core members of the block. Still other gushes exhibit far less stability, appearing in a number of different positions from radif to radif or even within the same radif.

It is the order of these blocks that constitutes the consistent patterning. Among the eighteen versions of shur, these three groups of central gushes are ordered in only two different patterns: 1) in the sequence I II III, found in the radifs of Abdollah, Hedayat, Khaleqi (both versions), Farhat, Ma'roufi, Boroumand (both versions), and Roshanravan; 2) in the sequence I III II, in Sabâ (all three versions), Karimi (all three versions), and Davami. As observed earlier, Ney-Dâvoud's radif of Shur fits neither of these patterns. But if one were to attempt a rough description of his radif on this basis, it would look something like I III+I II III.

To these three basic blocks, we can now begin to add other gushes from our expanded group of 13 shared and stable gushes.

Three of them, rohâb/ rahâvi, khârâ, and qajar, occupy fixed positions in relationship to the eight core gushes in each of the eighteen versions:

Pattern (1):

I	II	III
D R/Ra Zi S	B Do Kh Q (Sb/Dp)	Sh Qa Rz
		(Rz Sh Qa)

Pattern (2):

I	III	II
D R/Ra Zi S	Sh Qa Rz	B Do Kh Q
	(Rz Sh Qa)	

Two remaining gushes (greyli and mollânâzi) of our group of 13 central gushes are common to most radifs of shur, but their positions vary more from radif to radif. Greyli is usually associated with the gushes of section III, coming either before or after the shahnâz-qarache-razavi group, whether this group appears at the end or in the middle of the dastgâh. Karimi places greyli after the gushes of section II, at the end of the version. Mollânâzi appears equally often at the end of section II, whether in the middle or at the end of the dastgâh, and at the end of section I, as a kind of link between sections I and II. Boroumand places it in Section I, between zirkesh-e salmak and salmak.

Earlier we noted that our group of 13 central gushes is missing four gushes that are considered important by some Persian musicians and theorists. Although these four—hosseini, kord, golriz, ozal—are not included in radifs of shur as often as the other 13, they do rather consistently occupy fixed positions.

The gushe golriz appears in a relatively fixed position in relation to our core gushes in the seven radifs in which it appears (excluding Ney-Dâvoud). All seven of these radifs present their gushes in the pattern I II III, and golriz shows up at the beginning of II, before the bozorg-dobeyti-khârâ-qajar group. As golriz shares modal traits with bozorg (reproducing Shur's lower tetrachord a perfect fourth higher), it seems logical to place it at the beginning of our group II rather than at the end of group I.

The position of hosseini is somewhat less stable than that of golriz, but still relatively fixed when compared to some other, definitely unsettled gushes of shur. Regardless of which group of gushes, II or III, comes last, hosseini tends to appear near the end of shur. The only exception to this is in Davami's version, in which hosseini follows the gushes of group III, in the middle of the dastgâh. Since both hosseini and golriz are found in the radifs of eight of our eleven teachers, occupy fairly stable positions, and appear in performances of âvâz and are thus used as the basis for improvisation, it is appropriate to include them in our group of central gushes, now bringing its number up to fifteen:

D R/Ra Zi S G B Do Kh Q M Sh Qa Rz H Gr

Bayât-e kord (kord) and ozal are found far less frequently than golriz and hosseini, but both have relatively stable positions. Kord is found only in the instrumental radifs of shur and tends to appear after the gushes of group III. Ma'roufi and Roshanravan, following Ma'roufi's radif, also places it at the end of gushe group II, perhaps indicating this as another alternative. Ozal's position is stable, not in relation to a group of gushes, but to the dastgâh as a whole. Ozal tends to appear in the middle of the dastgâh, no matter what the order of gushe groups. In this connection, two points should be borne in mind. Bayât-e kord has been mentioned in these essays as a unit frequently performed independently, and occasionally even accorded the status of independent dastgâh, and its absence from some radifs of shur is probably related. In the case of ozal, it is interesting to recall that in his lessons, Boroumand unprecedentedly exhibited some ambivalence about a gushe, had some difficulty deciding whether he wished to include it or not, and finally declined to do so.

It is now possible to construct a more complete analytical diagram of the two basic patterns that characterize the most frequent orderings of gushes in shur. Gushes whose positions are not fixed are indicated with brackets ( ):

Pattern (1):

I
D-R/Ra-Zi-(M)-S-(M)

II
G-(O)-B-Do-Kh-Q-(M)-(O)-(Ko)

III
(Gr)-Sh-Qa-Rz-(H)-(Ko)-(Gr)-(Ko)
(Rz -Sh-Qa)

Pattern (2):

I
D-R/Ra-Zi-S-(M)-(H)-(Gr)

III
(Gr)-Sh-Qa-Rz-(O)-(H)
(Rz-Sh-Qa)

II
B-(H)-Do-Kh-Q

We have argued that fifteen gushes of shur can be considered central to the "performed" (in contrast to the strictly theoretical) radifs, on the basis of their frequency and stability, and, in some cases, their musical content. But these gushes do not seem to play similarly significant roles in the musical exposition of shur, not being equally, the basis for improvisation, for example, as indicated in more detail below and in Table S-11. Some of them clearly use darâmad or "shur" material, and most of these usually appear at the beginning of the dastgâh, as would be expected. Of the "Group I" gushes, darâmad and rohâb/rahâvi both emphasize the lower tetrachord of the shur scale, while zirkesh-e salmak and salmak center around the upper tetrachord. The remainder of the dastgâh is dominated by gushes that are quite distinct from shur. The stable gushes of "Group II" (golriz, bozorg, khârâ, qajar) are in a sense, though not in the sense of hesâr of chahârgâh or delkash of mâhur, modulatory, having their finals a perfect fourth above that of shur and reproducing shur's lower tetrachord and descending melodic movement on that new tonic. This group of modulatory gushes is normally interrupted, however, by the gushe dobeyti, which returns to the mode and finalis of shur. Dobeyti, a common gushe with a stable position in the radif, has a relatively fixed melody that is varied little and is not the basis of extended improvisation. It functions as a return to shur in the middle of a modulatory section. The core gushes of Group III (shahnâz, qarache, razavi) are considered by all authorities cited by us to be among the most important gushes of shur. These gushes, like the core gushes of Group II, have their finals a perfect fourth above that of shur. Shahnâz and qarache are both in the mode of shur, but shahnâz covers a wide range and is the basis for extended improvisation. Qarache uses a narrow range and is melodically more static.

Most of the gushes with some prominence but less stable positions (hosseini, mollânâzi, greyli, ozal, kord), share the mode and finalis of shur. Hosseini is more important than the others, however, for its clear melodic identity, an ascending melodic line quite distinct from shur. Like other distinct and independent gushes, it is used as the basis for extended improvisation in performances of âvâz. Mollânâzi is a common gushe but has the mode, final, and melodic character of shur, although somewhat higher in range and emphasizing the fifth and sixth degrees above the tonic. It seems to function as a return to shur, a link between episodes that depart from shur. Greyli and ozal have a similar function. Both use the mode and final of shur (ozal an octave higher), have relatively fixed melodic identities, and are varied little in performance. Kord, although not a common gushe in our sample, is one of the more distinctive and widely improvised gushes in shur. Kord uses the mode of shur but not the final and in improvisations tends to cover a much wider ambit than shur itself. Whereas the fifth above the final is moteghayyer (changeable) and weak in shur, it is stable and prominent in kord. Performers and theorists of Persian music clearly consider the most important gushes in a dastgâh to be those that are most distinct from the darâmad and leave the most room for improvisation. If we consider frequency of use and stability of position among the criteria defining centrality, however, then we must also include gushes that resemble shur and have relatively fixed, unvaried melodic material in a list of the important gushes of shur.

The above characterizations of the prominent gushes of shur are, of course, very sketchy. To test the validity of the classification of gushes of shur presented here according to musical considerations would require a detailed analysis of what is similar and different in gushes of the same name, and also different names. To this might be added comparisons of the relative lengths of sections of performed radifs and a consideration of the frequency, position, and function of gushes in non-radif performances as well.

IX. Shur and Other Dastgâhs

Table S-9 lists gushes (left-hand column) found in Shur that are also found in other dastâhs (listed across top). The radifs in which the gushes are found are abbreviated as follows:

Mirza Abdollah - A
Boroumand - B68, B75
Farhat - F
Hedayat - H
Karimi - K
Khaleqi - Kh1, Kh2
Ma'roufi - M
Roshanravan - R
Sab - S
Davami and Ney - Dâvoud not available

Of the eight gushes common to most of our eighteen radifs of shur (Table S-7), only dobeyti and qarache are found in other dastgâhs. One of these dastgâhs (abu-atâ) is a satellite of shur, but the others (esfahân, segâh, chahârgâh) are quite independent of it. The other six most common gushes of shur, and a majority of the fifteen central gushes discussed in the previous section, are not found in other dastgâhs. They include most of the gushes using tonics other than that of darâmad, such as golriz, bozorg, khârâ, qajar, razavi, and shahnâz, as well as some gushes similar to the darâmad of shur, such as zirkesh-e salmak, salmak, mollânâzi, and greyli.

Of the prominent gushes of shur, then, a total of only six are found in other dastgâhs: in addition to dobeyti and qarache, they are rohâb/rahâvi, hosseini, ozal, and kord. The majority of gushes of shur that are also found, by name, in other dastgâhs are themselves not common in shur. They range from muye, common in segâh and chahârgâh but found in only one radif of shur to majles-afruz, found in navâ (related to shur) and in five of our examples of shur. Most of the gushes shared with other dastgâhs appear in only one or two of the radifs of shur, many of these in the radifs of Abdollah and Hedayat. To look at this another way, most of those gushes that are rare in shur, found in only one, two, or three radifs, are also present in other dastgâhs. But the "rare" gushes of Shur are not all simply borrowings or strays from other dastgâhs. Thus, the gushes (or names) sarwa-el moluki, nehzat, neyshâbur, bargârdan (which simply means "return" and thus implies the repetition of something earlier), and khorovani, all present only in Hedayat's radif of shur, are not in any other dastgâh in his or other radifs. The same is true of nashib-o foraz, found only in Ney-Dâvoud's shur.

X. Anatomy of Darâmad

In our study of chahârgâh, it was suggested that one could identify a number of units of musical thought that characterized the various versions and variants of darâmad; the terms used were motif and gesture, distinguishing degrees of specificity and use in development. A conceptual division was made between thematic material, memorable and easily identified, that appeared, was transformed, and served as the basis for various kinds of development, and other, non-thematic material consisting of scalar bits, alternations of adjacent tones, and particles of music characteristic of the Persian repertory at large rather than of a specific dastgâh or gushe. Here, this approach is carried somewhat further, in part because the basic character of shur makes more difficult to distinguish the thematic from the non-thematic, and also because it is our wish to show the distribution of all melodic particles. We use the familiar word "motif" to refer to all of them. Again, the findings are presented largely through tables.

Table S-10 gives a census of the musical particles used in the radifs of Boroumand, Ma'roufi, and Karimi, but using Boroumand's 1975 radif as the basis of terminology. There are 22 motifs, some of them highly specific, others, such as no. 5, represented by a generalized kind of melodic movement. They are presented roughly in terms of their typical position or function: opening motifs, materials associated with opening motifs, motifs characterizing "darâmad 1" and "darâmad 2," bits of music that extend the contents of these motifs to a higher range, and cadential materials. While the similarities among these motifs are sometimes substantial and we cannot claim to have a highly discrete grouping, the materials in Table S-10 nevertheless provide reasonably complete coverage of all that happens, melodically, in the radifs of these darâmads. They are the musical content of this part of the radif.

It is interesting to see that the motifs differ in the degree to which they appear in variant forms. They can be viewed in terms of a continuum from motifs that represent general movement to those with a more defined melodic shape, and finally, to others with a well-defined melodic shape and rhythm. Thus, motifs no. 3, 5, 6, and 13 represent general movement of only two or three pitches that may take different melodic and rhythmic shapes. In Motif no. 19, the melodic movement is longer and better defined, but rhythm varies. Motifs no. 7b and 8, a bit longer, have melodic movement and rhythm yet more defined, while Motif. no. 12 is an easily recognized and remembered bit of melody, but with somewhat variable rhythm. Motifs no. 4, 9b, and 10 are melodic particles that almost always appear with a particular fixed rhythm. In chahârgâh, the proportion of music corresponding to the last group is larger.

Table S-11 gives the distribution of the motifs from Table S-10 in the radifs of Boroumand, Ma'roufi, and Karimi. The reader should bear in mind that it is based on the *shared* materials, and thus does not include things that are particularly idiosyncratic to one radif. It is interesting, then, that while the composition techniques of Boroumand and Ma'roufi clearly have more in common than either has with the vocal radif of Karimi, there are some respects in which Boroumand appears idiosyncratic, as for example in his greater emphasis on Motif No. 4, and his tendency to end sections with a descending perfect fourth.

One is struck, however, by the large amount of shared material, by the fact that the three radifs are really composed of the same group of musical particles. Equally striking is the fact that despite characteristic locations given in Table S-11, motifs do as it were "swim around" the radif, appearing early in one darâmad, later in another, near the beginning in one radif and nearer the end in a second. The same melodic materials are found in several gushes, but sometimes at different positions. This supports our interpretation of the multiplicity of darâmads in the radif as having a function of showing options, of teaching improvisation, as it were, by showing that the same materials can be presented in different arrangements. This is not true to the same extent in chahârgâh or in mâhur, where the distinction between memorable themes and "noodling-around" materials is much more pronounced, and where the relative positions of these particles is therefore more fixed. And indeed, the importance in shur of generalized materials, and the possibility of characterizing radifs and performances of shur by giving their distribution, shows this dastgâh to be more closely related to improvisatory practices in Arabic music, particularly in the taqsim (see Nettl and Riddle 1974). It is conceivable that shur characteristically preserves an older form of music making, or that the relationship between shur and Arabic practice supports the notion of the primacy of shur in the Persian classical music system, which eventually absorbed material (e.g. mâhur and chahârgâh) from other sources whose original character is still present in vestige.

It is interesting also to compare the gushes from the darâmad group in one radif (e.g., Boroumand's) with each other. They tend to share with each other those things that Boroumand's radif also shares with other radifs, that is, those things that musically personify shur; in other words, all gushes in this group contain the essentials of shur itself. The special roles of kereshme and naghme may be noted. Naghme differs from the rest by having its own pattern of emphases on the various pitches. Both kereshme and naghme have their own rhythmic character. Kereshme, rhythmically highly specific, is less associated with a melodic pattern, as is evident from its ubiquity in the radif and even more in performances. The more general character of naghme rhythm seems to require that it be associated more consistently with melodic patterns close to those of darâmad.

XI. Improvised Performances of Shur

We turn now to the way in which the radif of Shur is transformed, by improvisation, into performances of the âvâz, making special reference to the more extended study of this problem for the dastgâh of chahârgâh, above. In so far as their relationship to the radif is concerned, the performances of shur seem to be quite different from those of chahârgâh. This statement is based on the analysis of a group of performances, but it must first be said that for the purposes of such a comparison, the sources of these performances and their number differs greatly from the sample available for the study of chahârgâh. In the latter case, 44 performances, about half of them especially solicited with most of the rest from commercial recordings, were used. For the dastgâh of shur, we use sixteen performances, four of them field recordings made by Nettl (some of them together with Stephen Blum), but the rest are from commercial recordings, eight of them from the series of solo renditions, *Taknâvâzan Musiqi-ye Sonati-ye Irân*. Yet the general difference between the two dastgâhs that emerge is such that we cannot lay it simply at the door of differences in sampling, but are inclined to accept it as significant.

Table S-12 lists the sources and gives lengths. But because of the inclusion, within the âvâz, of extended metric sections that may or not be improvised, the timings are accompanied by comments and should in any case be regarded as extremely approximate guides to the nature of the performances.

It is important to note that the differences among the gushes of shur are less pronounced than in chahârgâh or mâhur. There is less in the way of distinctive thematic or motivic material. When asked to follow a performance and to identify the current material of the moment, Iranian musicians who made analyses for Nettl were less certain of their identifications than when carrying out the same kind of analysis for chahârgâh, sometimes declining to commit themselves by saying that a particular stretch of music was simply "âvâz of shur." It is therefore more difficult for us here to describe a performance as consisting of a succession of sections each based principally on one major gushe. Such a description is nevertheless provided, but the degree of certainty with which it can be presented is far lower than was the case in the analyses of chahârgâh and mâhur performances.

There is also much more of a tendency for a gushe to appear more than once in a performance. In particular, several sections based on darâmad may occur, separated by other gushes. But there is also a tendency for these others to appear only very briefly, perhaps through mere allusion, making their presence known with no more than a distinctive tone or two-note gesture. The listing of gushes that actually appear in the performances, and their order, in Table S-13 refers therefore to the first appearance or the major appearance if it can be singled out. The various sections of Table S-14 outline a number of individual performances, giving greater detail and timings.

The reader will be able to draw various conclusions directly from these tables. But a few points may be worthy of additional statement. It should be noted that the first four "gushes" in Table S-13 are actually part of the darâmad group, although they are easily distinguished and the fact that they are presented separately provides insight into the thinking of the performers. For a number of reasons, then, Table S-13 has a somewhat different significance from similar tables (C-5 and C-6) describing chahârgâh, and M-5, which does somewhat the same thing for mâhur.

The variety of inclusions and orders is greater in shur than in chahârgâh. This may in some measure be related to the differences between the radifs of the two dastgâhs, and in part to the larger number of gushes extant in the radifs of shur, particularly if we compare the more abbreviated radifs. As already explained, chahârgâh has a smaller radif, and a smaller number of gushes recognized to be central to it, and there is less consistency in the order of shur than of chahârgâh, despite the regularity of patterns pointed out above. The performances of shur begin, in any event, with darâmad. But the other gushes most widely used in performance are not those that appear near the beginnings of the radifs, but they are, rather, from the blocks II or III, and very often from the higher octave of the sequence, most frequently, razavi and shahnâz. The other gushe that is widely used (and occasionally even performed independently) is salmak. The order of the three varies. In the three performances that include all three of the gushes, three different orders appear. Further, razavi and salmak both appear near the beginnings and endings of performances, while shahnâz is found near the middle or the end.

But while razavi, salmak, and shahnâz are the most common in performances after darâmad, their frequency does not match that of the almost ubiquitous zâbol and mokhâlef in chahârgâh. Except for razavi, found in 13 of 16 performances, the others are present only half of the time. And while the total number of gushes found in the performance is considerable, fifteen in fact, not counting the darâmad group or the five not ordinarily in the radifs of shur but introduced in a few performances, most of them do not appear frequently. Considering the inconsistency in order or inclusion, shur and chahârgâh are clearly very different in the relationship between radif and performance.

Indeed, then, while the radifs of shur differ greatly in size, the total number of gushes that are touched upon in the performances is about the same, or perhaps just a bit larger, on the average, than is the case in chahârgâh performances. But in the case of shur, and in contrast to its radifs, it is much harder to establish types of sequences of gushes that are used in performance. Two performances in our sample may represent extremes.

Performance no. 1 moves through the gushes of the radif one by one (it is closest to the radif of Boroumand), with relatively little improvisation, and may in fact be of an order similar to that used for extended analysis by Massoudieh (1968). No. 13, on the other hand, devotes its four-and-a-half minutes to a thorough and unrelieved perusal of darâmad. Most of the other performances move from darâmad (or through parts of the darâmad group) to razavi, shahnâz, and salmak, occasionally also qarache, and add to these at irregular points one or two other gushes.

There is another aspect in which the shur performances differ from those of chahârgâh and also, for that matter, of mâhur. In this instance, the reason may in part be the different types of sources used for assembling the recordings. Nevertheless, it may be significant that the performances of shur include, within the âvâz, a larger amount of metric and composed material. It is characteristic of the performances of shur to alternate between the non-metric âvâz style and zarbi, kereshme, chahâr mezrâb, and other metric types. The same may indeed be found, but to a smaller extent, in performances of chahârgâh. But also, in chahârgâh performances on the whole, there is a greater tendency to move gradually from non-metric to metric, while in shur, we found that material could more easily be designated as specifically metric or non-metric. If there is a rather sharp line between metric and non-metric materials in shur, there is also much less of a line between one gushe and another in the non-metric âvâz style. In chahârgâh, the tendency is for material in one gushe to move to a cadence using the main motif of darâmad and closing on a definite caesura, after which the performance moves explicitly to another gushe. Sectioning of the âvâz, with many definite cadences, is typical of chahârgâh. In the case of shur, there is much more of a tendency for the music to move gradually and almost imperceptibly from one gushe to another, and there are far fewer clean breaks, except of course those setting off the metric pieces within the âvâz.

This lack of distinctiveness in the character of the gushes, the accompanying unwillingness of performers to state the specific radif sources of improvised materials of any given moment, the gradual transitions between non-metric gushes, and the absence of a group of characteristic procedures in structuring performances comprise the major differences between shur on the one hand and chahârgâh and mâhur on the other. Radif and performance differ greatly in shur; but the relationship between radif and performance is different in shur from that of chahârgâh and mâhur.

Returning now to the radif, our primary focus of orientation, we find that our study of shur supports many of the findings of the studies of dastgâh-e mâhur and dastgâh-e chahârgâh, Chapters 3 and 4. But at the same time, we have pointed out differences that suggest that all dastgâhs are not organized and do not behave in precisely the same ways. Despite their important similarities, the dastgâhs of shur, chahârgâh and mâhur have some rather curious differences: Radifs of shur, the longer and by most accounts more important dastgâh, agree less on their contents, that is, common gushes, but more on the overall organization of gushes. In the radifs of mâhur and to a somewhat smaller degree, chahârgâh (generally somewhat shorter dastgâhs), the situation is reversed—more agreement in contents, less in organization. And of course, the dastgâhs play different roles in radif and performance; shur predominates in the radif, while an informal census of live and recorded performances shows both chahârgâh and mâhur to have been more commonly played and recorded in the period of 1968-72. This study, like the others here, show the dastgâhs to be in some ways analogous constituent parts of the radif and of the classical music system. In other respects, they constitute units that are more readily comparable, in Western music, to forms and genres.

CHAPTER VI

SOME COMPARATIVE REMARKS:
CHAHÂRGÂH, MÂHUR, SHUR

What can one learn about the nature of the radif from these close looks at individual dastgâhs and their performances? The complexity of the system and the degree to which a dastgâh is much more than a mode in the traditional European sense have been repeatedly pointed out. Within the framework of this statement, a number of points are worth making.

The radif as a whole consists of units of various sizes—dastgâhs, gushes, motifs and melodic particles, all of which behave rather similarly. The distribution of dastgâhs in the radif as a whole shows regularities of order balanced by diversity; and the same is true of gushes in the dastgâh, motifs within the gushe. At each level there is a contrast between basic and in some ways secondary material—in the radif, the dastgâh of shur and its relatives; in the dastgâh, the darâmad and its variants; in the gushe, the principal motif and its forms. In other ways as well, microcosm reflects and duplicates macrocosm.

The radifs of different musicians are very much alike, more so in musical content than in terminology. The vagaries of oral transmission have had more of an effect in theory, that is, in the designations, than in the content of the musical material. Within the opus of an individual master, the radif changes very little over a period of years; but here too, designations change more readily than melodic entities.

Having studied, in different ways, the radifs of three dastgâhs, we turn briefly to a comparison. First, some of the similarities. The observation that the musical content of a gushe can have an existence independent of its name applies to some of the gushes of shur as well as mâhur. Thus, the same musical content may take different names, and gushes with similar names may differ in their musical contents. In shur, as in mâhur and chahârgâh, this is especially true of the opening gushes, the "darâmad group." Shur also exhibits some of the basic organizational principles observed in chahârgâh and mâhur. For example, gushes are commonly paired with one another rather consistently in different radifs.

In some respects there also appears to have been more diversity among older radifs of both shur and mâhur that has diminished with the recent standardization of the radif and institutional sanction of a few "official" versions. Nazir's and Hedayat's versions of Mirza Abdollah's radif for example, generally agree on the order of gushes, but not about the identity of shur itself. What Hedayat considered one radif, Nazir listed as two separate radifs, only the first of which he call "shur" without qualification. The older radifs of shur contain the names of many gushes that are either no longer in use or which are now known by only one standardized name as opposed to many different names. As in mâhur, standardization in names is particularly apparent in the opening gushes of shur. Chahârgâh, by contrast, appears to have a more consistent and stable history and distribution throughout its versions.

This comparison of the radifs of shur suggests that the relationship between multiple versions or performances of a single teacher's radif is the same regardless of the dastgâh. In Boroumand's radif, for example, his two recorded performances of shur, separated by many years, show as much consistency as do his performances of mâhur. But we also found that in shur, at least, this may not be true of all teachers. The degree of "completeness" of a performance of the radif can vary depending on purpose and context. And the non-central gushes chosen for the performance may also differ. One striking difference among the three, mâhur, chahârgâh, and shur, involves the question of lengths. Our study of mâhur listed approximately 30 gushes; the list of gushes of shur numbers 50. And yet, only one-fifth of the total list of the gushes of shur are common to the modern radifs, while two-thirds of those of mâhur (from a somewhat more restricted sample, to be sure) are shared. For chahârgâh we find a long list of materials included here and there, but a very short list of gushes common to all or most radifs.

Although all three dastgâhs share similar patterns of internal organization at some levels—the pairing of gushes, for example—at a broader level, they have less in common. Within shur we can observe not only pairs of gushes, but also more or less indivisible blocks of gushes. In mâhur, the four radifs are in agreement as to the ordering of gushes mainly at the beginning and end of each radif; the middle gushes are ordered differently. Among these same four radifs, there is much more consistency and patterning in the organization of gushes of shur. In each of the 18 radifs of shur examined, blocks of gushes are organized in only one of two ways. All the versions of shur using the same pattern are in as much agreement about the middle of the dastgâh as the beginning and end. In mâhur and chahârgâh, gushes seem to operate more independently, something evident also in the performances of âvâz. A section of an âvâz of chahârgâh and mâhur (and also, for that matter, segâh) seems clearly derived from a particular gushe in the radif, while in shur, gushes seem tied to each other and overlapping in content in a way that obscures identification of sources.

The study of mâhur observed significant differences in the way instrumental and vocal radifs deal with rhythm. Although we did not specifically investigate this aspect of the music for shur, we did find the instrumental-vocal distinction to be a factor in some areas but not in others. Vocal radifs tend to be shorter than the instrumental and to differ somewhat in their selection of gushes. But in the organization of the gushes within the dastgâh, the distinction between instrumental and vocal, and also between old and modern, does not appear to be a significant factor. Here, shur agrees with mâhur and chahârgâh.

Of special interest are certain types of interrelationships within the radif, the pairing of dastgâhs and gushes, the role of octave duplication, the sharing of gushes, and the hierarchy of materials especially as related to types of rhythmic structure. The higher status of the rhythmically and melodically general, and the lower ranking of the specific and predictable, are important to note as correlates of the relationship between improvised and composed, spoken and sung, audible and danced. The dramatic importance of certain modulatory gushes such as hesâr, delkash, shekaste adds to the variegated structure of the dastgâh. And so, further, does the immense variety of nomenclature, coming from several fields of thought, places in the Middle East, and association with music theory.

Some Comparative Remarks: Chahârgâh, Mâhur, Shur

The dastgâhs differ in melodic content and status, in degree of independence and derivation, in general character sometimes expressed in non-musical terms. But they differ also in ways more fundamental and difficult to define. If one were to distinguish shur from chahârgâh, one would begin with scale, motifs, rhythms, relationship among gushes, but would eventually come to the fact that performances of shur differ from those of chahârgâh in other ways too. The distinction between motifs and general episodic material is clear in chahârgâh and more obscured in shur. There is more of a tendency in chahârgâh to move from non-metric to metric materials gradually, while in shur, performers are more likely to separate the metric inserts in an âvâz from the rest with definite breaks. In chahârgâh, one moves from gushe to gushe, and each has its typical character; in shur, the gushes are less distinctive and musicians mix them more readily in performance. In chahârgâh, one constantly refers to the basic tonic with emphasis; in shur, this procedure is less common. In chahârgâh, the radif is consistently presented in an order in which gushes proceed to higher pitch levels and, simultaneously, to lower degrees of importance; in shur, the order is less stable, and important materials typically appear near the end of the radif of the dastgâh. The general tendencies mentioned here for the radif also apply to performances of âvâz.

These points, and related ones, have been made earlier; they are restated here in order to introduce a more general conclusion, which is, that there are really two kinds of dastgâhs. Although we do not have equally detailed data for all dastgâhs, a cursory examination shows that the satellites of shur, navâ, and also homâyun along with its satellite, bayât-e esfahân, behave rather like shur in the ways that have just been described; and that segâh, mâhur, and râst-panjgâh behave more like chahârgâh. The behavior of the shur group corresponds more to that of the maqams of Arabic taqsims, while that of the chahârgâh group somehow corresponds more to larger forms, and may have been influenced by the Iraqi practice of maqam performance (Tsuge 1972), or by Western music. Their easier association with composed forms, as shown in Chapter 8, suggests influence from that direction. The difference between the two groups of dastgâhs is hardly very specific, and the roots given here certainly speculative; but it may help further to illuminate the variety in the system.

Persian classical music is composed of short bits of sound—we call them motifs, gestures, particles—which are manipulated, alternated, repeated, developed, expanded, reduced. It is this group of procedures that make it possible for the radif to consist of so many units, and yet to be so unified. They also make the radif difficult to memorize, but at the same time, an ideal teaching device for the improvisor. It is well known that the structure of the radif itself and of âvâz based upon it are not radically different in structure. Our examination of performances shows that the structural and functional characteristics of the radif are reflected in the âvâz, but in expanded form. The ways in which the four darâmads of chahârgâh differ from each other in Boroumand's radif are also the ways, somewhat broadened, in which these gushes differ from each other among the various radifs we have examined; and the same kinds of differences, somewhat magnified, describe the relationship among the sections of âvâz based on darâmad by dozens of performers. Similarly, just as the dastgâh of chahârgâh is long in Ma'roufi's radif, a bit shorter in Boroumand, reduced much further in Saba, and so on, performances of âvâz of chahârgâh differ very greatly in length and inclusiveness. Just as some radifs treat the gushes more or less alike while others make grand distinctions between important and secondary, some performances devote two minutes to each gushe while others emphasize one or two and merely allude to the rest.

But again, differences among dastgâhs are major factors in the system. The performances of shur varied greatly, while those of mâhur were much more alike, those of chahârgâh yet more so, while the highest degree of uniformity was found in the small available sample of segâh.

One of the areas of greatest interest is intonation, considering its role in Western and Arabic-Persian works of theory attempting to explain Middle Eastern music. The performances of the radifs available on recordings maintained relatively constant values for half-tones and whole tones, and even (though less) for three-quarter and five-quarter tones. The performances of âvâz departed from these values much more, especially in the case of three-quarter and five-quarter tones, and particularly, of course, in the renditions by voice and unfretted instruments. The departures from standardized intonation were remarkably fewer in shur than in chahârgâh, in certain spots perhaps most pronounced in mâhur. This fact supports the validity of the theory proposing a "bifurcation of dastgâhs," suggested above, but it also leads to the speculation about the role of modulatory gushes. Most dastgâhs have them, it seems, but they are of different sorts and have different roles. In shur, except for consistent use of the raised (sori) fifth, modulation involves use of tetrachord. In chahârgâh, it is more a matter of changing tonic as well as introducing accidentals. In mâhur, the tendency to use two variants of one tone in different spots within one gushe is also pronounced, as for example the flatted seventh in the higher octave of darâmad. The different uses of these pitches in may relate to the variety of intonational consistency.

Many aspects of the radif and of âvâz remain to be investigated: more dastgâhs should be examined in detail, the rhythmic structure and the wandering of the motifs should be charted, intonation ought to be measured. But clearly, the internal structure of the radif, the relationship of its various versions, past and present, and its relationship to improvisation and composition show us a rich and yet unified musical system balancing authority and freedom. It is a system not unlike the grand designs of Persian carpets, their motifs recurring in repetition and variation, their colors blending gradually or set off from each other with sharp borders, abstract designs alternating with vestiges of natural forms, the dominant motifs in large medallions, the ornamental tones in the tiny designs. And not unlike the magnificent miniatures of Iran, appearing insignificant from a distance, comprehended only through detailed and repeated scrutiny.

Third Part: The Radif in Iranian Culture

CHAPTER VII

ATTITUDES, JUDGMENTS, TAXONOMIES—TEHRAN IN 1969

I. Introduction

The importance of the radif as the generating force of Persian classical music in the twentieth century is clear. But beyond this, although the classical music system itself has not necessarily been the repertory of greatest consequence in the musical life of Iran, the radif itself plays a significant role in the musical culture as a whole. It is instructive therefore to examine the attitudes held by people in Iran, to look at the relationship between the radif and musics outside the realm of classical music, and to assess, as well, its relationship to non-musical aspects of Iranian culture. In order to study the radif as a cultural phenomenon, the four chapters in this unit make forays in several directions so as to touch upon different facets of the relationship.

First, in Chapter 7, the attitudes and ideas of Iranians who are musicians and—more important—of people who are not in music, about their classical music system and about the radif in particular are examined on the basis of a survey of opinions made in 1968-69. Included are ideas about the nature of classical music in its relationship to other musics, about the components of the radif, and about types of musicianship. The role of the radif in popular music and in composed genres of classical music, and its relationship to folk and regional musics is examined in Chapter 8.

Having in Chapters 3-6 viewed the radif in a variety of musical contexts, we move in Chapter 9 to a group of cultural contexts in which it is operative. Although more elaborate publications on this subject exist elsewhere, it would be unrealistic in a study of the radif in Iranian culture to avoid touching upon the question of Western influences and of the development of Persian classical music in an atmosphere of Westernization. The role of the radif in Iranian culture is further illustrated by the biography of one prominent Iranian master of classical music, and a brief look at the fate of the radif among Iranian immigrant musicians, professional and amateur, in Israel. Finally, Chapter 10, an essay in ethnomusicological study of symbols looks at the way in which major social values of Persian culture are reflected in the radif and in the system of classical music as a whole. All together, these forays may provide some basis for understanding the way in which the complex of materials that have been combined into the radif, and the music to which the radif leads, function in and reflect the central themes of the culture of which they are a part. Whereas the studies of musical technicalities in the radif that have taken up the earlier chapters of this volume have to some extent been diachronic, what follows here is the result largely of studies carried out in the period between 1966 and 1974. The following chapters thus make little effort at historical reconstruction. More important (despite frequent use of the present tense), they do not reflect the musical culture in the form it took after 1978.

We have discussed at considerable length certain aspects of the structure of the radif and of performance based upon it.

What has been said has naturally been based on teaching, analyses, and criteria provided by professional musicians and masters. We wish now to inquire into the role that classical music played in the thinking of the Iranian population at large, or to put it more specifically, in the thinking of people in Tehran around 1970. In 1969, when this survey was carried out, the Tehrani was surrounded by a large variety of musics. On the radio, on television, in concert halls, music halls, discotheques, on the streets, at private gatherings and weddings, and on records, one was exposed to a universe of sound. One could hear Western music ranging from Beethoven, Vivaldi, and electronic music on the one hand through popular music of the 1950s and 1960s on the other, including American rock, Latin American dances, and European chansons. One might listen to Persian classical music, most likely in a style developed, in many of its essentials, in the twentieth century, as well as folk and popular music from various regions of Iran, in field recordings as well as in arrangements fashioned by Tehran tune-smiths. Popular music in which traditional Persian and Western elements were mixed dominated. And in various situations, Iranians could make available to themselves the music of India and Pakistan, of Arabic countries, Turkey, and adjoining regions of the Soviet Union. One heard the traditional musical shouts of street vendors and the tunes of blind or maimed street musicians. Potentially, a person's total musical experience reflected the character of this city, which seemed then to be a rather mad mixture of traditional and modern, of old Middle Eastern and recent American, of conservative Islam and atheistic avant-garde.

The attitudes towards all music, and especially towards traditional classical Persian music, were hardly unified. The mentioned survey of 1968-69 was a cursory (and not very systematic) study of these attitudes on the part of a cross-section of Tehran society. The data was gathered by asking questions of a number of different types of persons (in 112 interviews), including musician practitioners of various styles of music, university teachers in fields outside music, record and instrument salesmen, students, taxi drivers, domestic servants, and members of a miscellany of other occupations. Most of the respondents were relatively Westernized in attitude and lifestyle, or acquainted with the Westernized sector of Tehran culture. Additional data that sheds light on attitudes was gathered by observing musical events, studying radio programming, and informal conversations about music. Interviews included discussion of the degree of knowledge of various types of music, musical preferences, questions of what should or might happen to Persian music in the future, and most important, the kinds of music the individual interviewed regarded as existing in his culture—that is, his or her taxonomy of music.

II. Taxonomies

The manner in which Tehranians classified their various musics was an important index to musical conceptualization. In all groups, musical and non-musical, the most important distinction was made between Persian and foreign music. Among educated individuals, the foreign music was, of course, usually labeled as Western, European, or international, but in any event, national origin was almost always cited as the main distinguishing feature of a music. Within Western music, national distinctions also played a role; people talked about American, German, Russian, Italian music much more than about the music of various historical or social groups.

Within Iranian music, distinctions were most frequently made between instrumental and vocal music (despite the fact that musically the difference between the two idioms plays a less prominent role than in Western music). The distinction between art, classical, or court music on the one hand, and folk, popular or tribal music on the other was made by those persons who had a special interest in the classical music, but the same distinction was hardly recognized by others. Contrary to the typical Western attitude, age or time of origin was not a factor in Tehran discussions of music. Although a certain amount about Iranian history was known even to practicing musicians, the order of events in this history does not appear very important even to the typical well-informed individuals. There is a kind of telescoped view of history. A was person likely to describe events of 1890 as well as 700 A.D. as "very ancient." In discussions, the "beginnings" of musical history extended from the Achimenean Empire to the childhood of today's old men. But if one asked about the past of music, one discovered that relevant music history really begins with the memories of the elderly masters.

Within Persian classical music, the primary distinctions are made among the various dastgâhs. Informed individuals make them with assurance, but others also prefer them as the main distinctive features. In folk music, distinctions among regions seem to occupy an important place in musical thinking. But in most respects, Persians do not readily talk about their music in terms of classes or categories. They classify much less, for example, than do South Indian musicians, whose close categorization of ragas and types of pieces appears to dominate musical thinking. One exception is worth noting, however: Individuals who are well or moderately informed about art music were readily willing to rank performers in terms of excellence. Each person has a favorite, second, third, and so on, and although only professional musicians agree even moderately about the ranking, even non-musicians were likely to insist upon the expertise of their judgment.

Moving more specifically to ideas about Persian classical music, it seems appropriate first to try to identify the people who have something to do with it, who like it and participate in it. Certain individuals from all walks of life said that they appreciated and listened to art music. But there was a tendency for educational, religious, and generally cultural attitudes to correlate with degrees of appreciation. (The term "appreciation" is used here to indicate a combination of liking, habitual listening, and having a bit of technical as well as non-technical knowledge.) People with a secular higher education were more likely to appreciate it. In the sample of interviews, individuals with university education were more likely to be in the group of "appreciators" than those without, or, for that matter, than those with a distinctly religious education. Illiterate individuals usually could or did not distinguish between classical and popular music, but they seemed to like best the Persian popular and folk, and the Western popular styles. But to be sure, not all educated individuals by far could claim to appreciate Persian classical music. Some of them maintained that they had no interest in any music, and others admitted to liking only Western classical music. None of the people with higher education identified Persian folk or popular music as the repertory of greatest musical allegiance. Very generally speaking, older educated persons indicated an interest in Persian classical music, while younger ones specified preference for Western music. There were several young people, besides those who were themselves music students, who showed a great interest in the Persian art music, as age is by no means a principal criterion for separating those who identified themselves most with Western music from the lovers of the indigenous classical.

Some devout Muslims were opposed to participation in music, but others maintained that the Koran does not really prohibit music, and that those who maintain otherwise are simply wrong. Since 1978, religious attitudes have played an enormous role in the decline of musical life. But among the members of the Muslim majority with whom I had contact, the lovers of Persian art music—actually a minority—seemed to constitute a kind of middle ground. The most devout rejected music (at least as they themselves defined it). The individuals who were least interested in religion, rejecting Islam as a symbol of old-fashioned underdeveloped society, also tended to reject Persian music, espousing instead the European or European-derived music. Those who appreciated Persian music were, on the whole, people who observed religious practice at least to some extent, but they were not especially devout. Among the musicians themselves, however, some highly devout individuals could nevertheless be found. In this context, it is worth reminding ourselves that Sufism played a considerable role in musical life and thought (Zonis 1973:8). Some musicians designated themselves as Sufis, and several told me that understanding Sufism was essential to an understanding of classical music.

III. The Quintessentials of Persian Music

In the interviews inquiring into the attitudes towards music, one question that I asked was, "what is Persian music like," or "what is the most important thing about Persian music?" Needless to say, answers varied enormously, and many individuals seemed unable to respond adequately, but still, there appeared a considerable difference between the answers of individuals who participated in or made a point of hearing Persian music, and those of others. "Appreciators" tended to respond in terms of praise and glorification. Some of them claimed that it was the world's best and also oldest music, that all other musics came from it. They maintained that this music has inherent in it all that can be expressed musically, that it has a vast range of moods and ideas. I heard that the most important feature of Persian music was its close relationship to Persian poetry, that one could not understand it without having an understanding of poetry.

The importantly improvisational nature of Persian classical music played a role in the answers. The concept of improvisation as such was rarely mentioned, used only by individuals conversant with musicological concepts and literature. I did hear, however, statements suggesting that "Persian music comes more from the heart" than does Western music, and that for this reason, each individual musician has his own style of performance and music. The importance of individual variation was certainly recognized, and it was interesting to find that three musicians posited a connection between constant variation—within a performance and among individual musicians—and the singing of the nightingale.

The twelve dastgâhs were frequently brought up by the informed individuals interviewed, and they considered knowing the dastgâhs, that is, being able to identify them when hearing music, one of the most important indicators of understanding something about Persian music. Repeatedly it was pointed out to me that while Persian music had twelve dastgâhs, Western music had only two equivalent units.

The fact that the dastgâhs have their individual moods has often been brought up in musicological literature, and some authors, e.g. Caron and Safvate (1966:62, 66, 67 etc.) and Barkechli (1963:39-54), assign specific character to each. Asking individuals in Tehran about these moods produced interesting results.

Unlettered and relatively conservative individuals were usually not able to respond well and in some cases did not know what the question meant. Those who were somewhat acquainted with Western music (in the cases of informants without higher education, this was almost always just the popular music) usually felt that the mood of Persian music is sad, and that all of the various dastgâhs have essentially the same mood. This musical sadness was basis for complaint and criticism among some respondents.

Among educated informants who maintained little interest in Persian music as well, sadness was considered a major feature of the repertory and likewise cause for complaint. They compared Persian to Western music and found it wanting in variety of character and mood. One of the criticisms most vehemently made by several non-musical academic persons was of the unwarranted sadness of traditional music in a country in which hope and optimism were essential accompanying features to industrial and social development. These people thought that the unified mood of Persian music did not fit into modern society, and several among them stated without qualification that the purpose of music was to make the listener happy and relaxed.

The attitudes seemed quite different among those who understood a good deal of Persian music. Within this group, non-musicians were much more concerned with matters of mood and the character of the dastgâhs than were musicians, who always seemed to be much more interested in talking about technical details. In my experience in South India, incidentally, musicians exhibited the same kind of interests compared to Indian non-musicians, and perhaps impressionistically one may also say that the same sort of emphasis is found among musicians in Western culture, where informed laymen are also apt to lay more stress, in interest and discussion, on such matters as mood or general character of works and composers.

But on the general nature of Persian music, the reactions of the educated aficionados and of the musicians themselves were quite different. The musicians first maintained that there are a great variety of moods, indeed, that the universe of musical expression resides in Persian music, while other musics have a smaller range of expression. When asked about the matter of sadness, however, some felt compelled to admit that a great deal of Persian music is indeed sad, giving three main reasons: Persian music reflects the sad and tragic history of the Persian people. Sadness is the noblest of emotions, and it is appropriate in a great musical repertory for the majority of pieces to be sad. (Didn't Brahms worry about writing a significant symphony in a major key?) And also, music is closely related to Persian poetry, most of which has a sad undertone or tragic content.

When asked about the specific character of individual dastgâhs, the musicians interviewed were less explicit than some of the musicological literature. Several stated that each dastgâh has its own character, but they could or would not verbally identify it, telling me instead (though to be sure with some prompting) that the difference was strictly musical, translatable into feelings but not words. For certain dastgâhs, I was given specific characterizations. Shur was said by one musician to be in essence sad and to reflect the thoughts of an old man who has suffered much and was telling about his tragic life. Chahârgâh was considered heroic, mâhur, as reflecting majesty, and dashti, happy and lighthearted. This set of opinions differs somewhat from the statements of Caron and Safvate (1966).

One may justly inquire whether these characterizations are not simply derived, because the interviewer insists on asking, from extra-musical associations such as the texts of poems commonly sung with them. When asked why dashti was light-hearted, one musician replied that it is so because some of the basic material of which it consists is derived from folk music. Chahârgâh was considered by the same musician to be heroic because in some contexts, materials from Ferdowsi's Shâhnâme, Iran's national epic, are sung in that mode.

When confronted with the relationship of Persian music to Arabic and Indian music, Iranian musicians usually suggested that the relationship is not very strong and the similarity not very great. The generally not very charitable attitude towards Arabs held (then) by many Iranians was reflected in musical opinion. Among the aficionados of Persian music and other educated individuals, the first reaction to the question was one of disavowing similarity, or at best, as admission that, indeed, the Arabs had learned much of their music from the Persians. Much of this is, historically speaking, true; and the reverse, also true, is readily conceded by Iranian scholars who know the history of music of the Middle East. But non-scholars believed that the influence moved essentially in one direction. When referring to quality, however, most educated Persians in Tehran to whom I spoke about the matter indicated a coolness towards Arabic music, saying, for example, that instead of having twelve dastgâhs it had the technical equivalent of only one. A number of unlettered individuals did admit a liking for the music accompanying belly-dancing, which was considered to be quintessentially Arabic in style.

In comparing Persian with Indian music, the importance of modern national distinctions again emerges, for the Indian was referred to most frequently as "Pakistani" music. Indian music was rather widely available to listeners, both the classical tradition and the songs from Indian films, which were being widely shown at Tehran theaters. The cognoscenti considered Persian music to be more varied than Indian, which, in turn, was thought relatively monotonous and unified, but also exotic. In the 1970s, however, Indian music was becoming better known and to have risen in the esteem of interested Iranians.

IV. Judging the Musicians

One of the most important aspects of musical thought studied through interviews and other sources was the range of opinion held by Tehranians about various individual musicians or types of musicians. A major point distinguishes musicians from both educated and unlettered laymen: the musicians widely considered instrumental music as the norm, and instrumentalists as the most typical and highest type of musician, while for others, vocal music and singers filled these roles. People were quite willing to indicate their choices of best musician, but rather than reproducing these judgments, it seems preferable to identify types of choices and the bases on which they seemed to be made. All types of individuals interviewed tended to be willing to rank musicians, that is, to say that a particular one is definitely "the best," another second, and so on. Beyond that, however, the distinction between educated and less educated is again substantial.

Educated individuals tended to use, as a main criterion, the degree to which a musician preserved older practices and refrained from innovation, and some of them preferred older, sometimes deceased, and in any case conservative musicians. Among the unlettered, the musicians most respected were those who performed most frequently on radio and records, and in this group, those who performed in a mixed, modern style were said to be at least as good as the traditional ones. Knowledge of the traditional material, essential to the educated, was not an important criterion to the rest, but technical skill, particularly on the santur, and the ability to perform the melismatic tahrir vocally (and sometimes on the violin) was most admired. The instruments most loved by the educated were some of those of long standing in Iran—setâr, santur, târ, kamânche; the unlettered preferred instruments capable of virtuosity such as santur and violin.

V. Reactions to Change

As described above, the resident of Tehran of ca. 1970 faced a bewildering variety of Persian classical music, traditional and modernized, and could hear it in a large number of cultural contexts. The variety was in large measure the result of recent and current, and certainly rapid, change. In 1970, one could hear very traditional performances by soloists, at small social gatherings; or performances on radio by individuals who performed in a traditional manner, but whose performance was framed within and occasionally interrupted by homophonic orchestral interludes with melodies in part derived from the styles of Western and Persian popular music. One could go to a concert hall and hear a piece of Persian music entirely composed and read from printed music, performed by an orchestra playing in unison, with occasional tonic and dominant harmonies, all this alternating with occasional brief improvised solos. Traditional Persian instruments played the classical music in a style going back at least to the late nineteenth century, but these same instruments might also play Western-style music with the use of notation imitating in their techniques those of Western instruments such as the piano. On the other hand, one heard Western instruments such as piano, organ, accordion, and clarinet playing Persian music and imitating the tone colors and peculiar techniques of the indigenous instruments. There were surely also pockets of relatively unchanged

Persian classical music, but even there, while the sound of the music might be (relatively) unchanged, the cultural context would have changed sufficiently so that it was bound in time to affect the sound. The Persian music was taught with the use of notation, in Western-style music schools and university departments, with Western terminology (derived from French), and performed for large audiences instead of the small traditional groups. Whereas in the past, the listener had known that he would never again hear precisely the same thing that had just been performed, he now had the opportunity of rehearing these improvisations in recorded and broadcast form. And there were many other changes in the cultural milieu of music. The one thing that tied all of these kinds of music, performances, social contexts, and genres together was their common dependence on the radif; we have presented the radif on these pages as central to Persian classical music, and is understood to be so by Iranians. The radif plays various symbolic roles that show this centrality.

What now was the Tehranis' attitude towards all of this change in their musical environment? One reaction, typical of older, educated, and informed individuals, considered the classical Persian music as great art and lamented any change now being made in it. They conceded that Western music—particularly its greatest creations, by which they meant nineteenth century music—appeared then to be in Iran to stay. It had made, or was capable of making, important cultural and aesthetic contributions to the country, even though, despite its intrinsic merit, it might simply not be compatible with the culture. But they wanted the Persian classical music to remain intact alongside the Western and objected to mixing forms. Some, for example, stated that Persian music should not be performed in concert halls, or by orchestras, or used as background for poetry readings, or played by Western instruments (except for the violin, which had been thoroughly adapted). They wished to bring back to popularity those instruments, such as the kamânche, which they thought were being forgotten; but conversely, they also objected to the kind of artificial revival which had caused the eight-string gheichak, used largely by folk and tribal groups in Eastern Iran, to be fitted with only four strings tuned like those of the violin and used for Persian art music. In general, these individuals wished to see Persian classical music continue as it did before Western civilization and its music began to predominate. They expected Western music to become widely known and used in Iran, but they also wanted to see Persian music continue alongside the Western, undisturbed and isolated. When I pointed out that such an idyllic situation had never come about in recent Third-World history, they reacted with expressions of pessimism about the fate of Iran and of the world.

Musicians in the Iranian classical tradition, of course, have a complex set of attitudes and opinions about the changes of recent past. Take notation and the professionalization of music. Western notation and Western-style musical terminology are widely accepted. The majority of musicians interviewed—and this includes some older individuals—were of the opinion that notation was extremely useful, that its introduction was one of the best things that had happened to Persian music in many centuries, and that indeed the survival of Persian music depended on it. Most believed that Persian music could be written without much difficulty in Western notation and were anxious to see the belief put into practice, presumably in order to assure the place of their music in modern life. Only a small number of musicians—generally those most conservative in lifestyle as well as musical practice—believed that the use of notation violated the fundamental values of variability and personal interpretation that are the basis of the repertory.

Most musicians considered themselves as professionals in essentially the Western sense, teaching students for fees, performing on radio and stage for honoraria, or receiving salaries from government agencies in return for regular or ad hoc performances. A few older musicians indicated to me that this was a new attitude for musicians involved in art music. Thinking of one's self as a professional meant adopting a self-view similar to that of musicians in cafes and at weddings. It was a view inappropriate and detrimental to a true classical tradition. One musicians related this viewpoint to the importance of improvisation: "One can really only perform well if one plays whatever one wishes, when one feels like it, whatever is appropriate to one's mood." The idea of freedom was important, and even being obliged to play a particular dastgâh or at a particular time might interfere. It was a bit baffling to find that the same older, conservative musicians who extolled freedom and improvisation were also the ones who objected to certain kinds of innovation on the part of the younger generation, but the point is that despite the value of freedom, they judged each other most by the degree to which they controlled the traditional radif and avoided inventing things. This is an issue for our discussion of musical and cultural values in Chapter 10.

Another group of educated persons, younger on the average and on the whole less informed about Persian music (though having some concern for the preservation of Persian civilization), looked with more favor upon mixed forms that combine Persian and Western elements in the classical tradition. One of them made a point of saying that it would ideally be best if the Western elements could be avoided, but compromise was essential if there was to be survival at all, and further development. In contrast to the first group, this segment of the population believed that Persian music is alive and must be changed and developed, in the way things in Iran were generally changing.

There have developed several kinds of performance incorporating harmony, the idea of large ensembles, fixed compositions, virtuosity, and other elements from Western music or compatible with it—yet all based in some way on the radif. These are presented as traditional to concert-going audiences. Audience reaction to such genres of music in my experience was not always favorable, but it was usually concerned and excited. While criticizing the habit of costuming musicians and the changed and possibly "contaminated" forms of Persian music thus presented, some of the informed persons who attended concerts told me that such performance is essential if the classical music is to survive, and that the kind of experimentation that results in these kinds of concerts itself has artistic merit and may produce works of genuinely high caliber, quite aside from its preservative role. The typical reaction of audiences is excited, talkative, and conscious of movement. By contrast, at truly traditional performances audience reaction was quiet, relaxed, and satisfied. The two types of audience symbolize the two attitudes: conservatism and acceptance of a static way of life and art, as against attempting to preserve the old by compromising with the new and external.

The less educated individuals who were interviewed for this project accepted the condition of change very readily and appeared to take it for granted, more so perhaps than their educated counterparts. One of the interesting pieces of evidence for this widespread acceptance of musical change was found in the arrangement of certain popular programs of Radio Iran, a government-based kind of cultural politics to be sure, in which Western, Persian, popular, folk, and semi-classical were mixed with ease. A second was the programming in the many music halls in the entertainment district of central Tehran. Here non-stop live entertainment continued for five or six hours per evening, for an audience of between fifty and three hundred men. A large part of the program consisted of dancing: genuine folk dances, non-authentic presentations of dances from neighboring countries—some of it clearly regarded as lascivious by the audience—and belly dancing. Each was accompanied by its own type of music, which might be performed by anything from an ensemble of traditional Middle Eastern instruments to a 1940's-type jazz combo, but mixed groups (e.g. violin, clarinet, santur, zarb) predominating.

Another large part of the program was performance by female singers rendering several genres of vocal music: Persian folk songs (in rural costume), more or less purely Middle Eastern popular music derived in part from Persian classical music (sung in evening dress), and popular music using Middle Eastern and Western elements (in miniskirt). The correlation of dress with musical style—a widespread feature of modernized concert life in many nations—indicated clearly that the various kinds of music were seen as distinct by artists and audiences, and yet the overall combination of styles was applauded. Occasionally, Persian art music itself appeared on such a program. In the interviews and in life, the distinction between art, popular, and folk music was not important to the unlettered, who seemed to show little concern with the survival of traditions, but who did appear to perceive as important the difference between Western and what they considered as indigenous.

This brief study of attitudes is of course no more than an introduction, which should point the way towards more comprehensive and scientifically rigorous research. It is a kind of research that could probably not be carried out after 1978 or that would show the attitudes to have radically changed since the revolution. In Tehran of 1966-72, the views towards traditional art music were complex, correlated to some extent with degrees and kinds of education, with wealth, degree of exposure to Western culture, and religion. They were moreover inextricably tied to ideas of modernization or Westernization in economic and social life, and to preservation of the national identity in the face of cultural change.

CHAPTER VIII

THE RADIF OUTSIDE THE ÂVÂZ: COMPOSED AND NON-CLASSICAL FORMS

The radif is principally associated with classical music, and in particular, with the improvised âvâz. Its roots, as has been suggested earlier, seem to be in the typical combinations and successions of maqams, principal and modulatory, found in improvised genres of Middle Eastern music, and its particular character seems to be driven by the importance of a musician's ability to modulate from main to secondary maqams in the course of performance. This was and continues to be one of the main features of classical music in the Arabic and Turkish world; and the importance of moving about among maqams evidently brought about the recognition of typical patterns of succession and their codification in memorized series of melodies. These were realized and combined in the classical âvâz of Persian music.

While we have spoken of the classical system as if it were easily separated, musically and socially, from the rest of musical culture, it is worth noting that the separation of elite and mass cultures was a phenomenon that evidently came into its own only in the twentieth century, and indeed, was to a degree the doing of the Pahlavi dynasty (Keddie 1981:183). The creation of the radif may have been a function of this separation, but the radif's close association with musics other than the classical âvâz harks back to earlier times in history. During the twentieth century, the association of the radif with a variety of other genres or repertories—classical but composed, popular, and folk—had become an important sidestream of its history. The aspect of the radif most evident in these instances is indeed the importance of principal motifs, the succession of gushes, their ranges and tonalities, and particularly, modulatory gushes.

I. Classical Composition

A work of non-improvised classical music, a composition such as pishdarâmad, tasnif, and chahâr mezrâb may simply be cast in individual dastgâhs. A tasnif performed alone, or a chahâr mezrâb, may be cast, for example, in segâh or mâhur. In a full-blown performance of a dastgâh, where there is an âvâz plus accompanying metric materials, the composed pieces are in the main dastgâh of the performance. If such a composition is cast in a particular dastgâh, it may follow the radif very generally, to the extent that the principal scale of the dastgâh is used, along perhaps with allusions to the main motif. Or, there may be a much closer relationship, with individual sections of the composition based on various gushes. And of course there are intermediate forms. Iranian musicians tend to group tasnifs by their relative degrees of "classicalness." Khoshzamir (1975:46-47) proposes three types of tasnif, classical, popular classical, and popular, the first adhering closely to the radif, the second slightly, the third substantially Westernized. Caton (1983) has a similar grouping.

The line among these types of tasnifs is difficult to draw, and it seems more appropriate to follow those musicians who talk about "very classical," "less classical," and so on.

The most "classical" of these compositions are divided into series of musical (and in the case of the tasnif, also textual) lines, or pairs of lines. Each line or pair is devoted to one gushe, and at its end, the main motif of the dastgâh itself may appear. The total number of gushes to which allusion is made is relatively small, and the tendency is for those gushes to be selected that raise the average pitch level of the melody, as well as modulatory gushes. Furthermore, whether by design or coincidence, the tendency is to compose these "classical" tasnifs and pishdarâmads in the dastgâhs in which modulatory gushes play a prominent role or at least appear, and also in those in which major gushes are melodically and tonally distinct. And further, such compositions are often cast in those dastgâhs in which, both in radif and in typical âvâz performance, there is a tendency to present the material of the individual gushes separately. These criteria lead, rather automatically, to mâhur, chahârgâh, and segâh.

The following may thus happen in a tasnif with five lines in chahârgâh: The first line is cast in darâmad; the second, in zâbol (centering on the third degree), third, in mokhâlef (on the sixth), fourth, in maghlub (on the octave, reminding of darâmad), and fifth line, darâmad again. Again, the system is described in much more detail by Caton (1983:143 and *passim*).

Pishdarâmads are similar to tasnifs in this respect. The pishdarâmad in the performance of mâhur on a well-known Ocora recording, *Musique persane* (OCR 57), edited by Hormoz Farhat, moves from darâmad to dâd, shekaste, delkash, and back to darâmad; and this same sequence of gushes is used in the âvâz that follows. The tendency for pishdarâmads to be divided into lines and to follow a rigorous periodic structure provides an opportunity for a structure similar to that of classical tasnifs. The use of the same kind of structure in chahâr mezrâbs is a bit less common, given the fact that this genre may be both composed or improvised, and that it commonly appears either as an independent genre in performance, or as a section in a full-blown performance preceding the âvâz, or again as material inserted at various points within the âvâz. Its periodic structure is ordinarily not as regular. Nevertheless, there are chahâr mezrâbs that to some extent follow the radif in its details. And again, they seem to have been most commonly cast in chahârgâh, segâh, and mâhur.

The tendency for pishdarâmads and chahâr mezrâbs to use rondo-like form is also related to their use of the radif as basic material. The line that corresponds to the main theme of the rondo is based on darâmad, while the episodic lines are derived from various other gushes. The structure parallels the appearance of the main theme of darâmad, or at least the range surrounding the tonic, at the ending of many gushes in radif and in performances of âvâz.

Of course, a large number of tasnifs, pishdarâmads, and chahâr mezrâbs are based on a dastgâh in a much more general sense. In the case of the tasnifs, the "popular -classical" group in Khoshzamir’s classification is based on the basic scale and tonality of a dastgâh, actually, that is, of the darâmad of the dastgâh; and frequently, the main thematic content of darâmad is quoted or paraphrased. Pishdarâmads and chahâr mezrâbs ordinarily remain somewhat within the scope of classical music, retaining the basic character of the Persian music sound; but tasnifs are often cast in the framework of popular music, were widely disseminated through popular media such as 45-rpm records, and used Western instruments and harmony. Nevertheless, they often exhibit aspects of the structure of the radif. So-called classical tasnifs, which follow through a series of gushes line by line, may nevertheless be accompanied by piano, electric organ, etc., and make some use of harmony.

The increasing prominence of composed pieces in the classical music sector is partly at least the result of Westernization, in the form of influence from the general principles of composed music in Western culture; and so we are led to a few brief comments on Iranian music that is actually part of the Western sector, but that exhibits some effects of the radif.

While there are a number of Iranian composers of Western-style music, most of them seem to have kept the Iranian traditions entirely outside the purview of their work, or to have been content to introduce elements of the general sound. Nevertheless, the classical music system in its specifics including the radif have played a role here and there. One of the composers who combined Western techniques and the radif is Alireza Mashayekhi, who studied in Germany and Netherlands and then, after some years residence in Iran, moved to North America. In 1966, he produced what is probably the first piece of Iranian electronic music at the electronic music studio in Utrecht. It is entitled "Shur" and, while a typical electronic piece of its time, it includes some segments in which the lower tetrachord of the dastgâh, and the main motif of darâmad, are clearly audible. The point to be made is that Mashayekhi was operating to some extent with the values of the traditional Iranian musician, beginning the history of Iranian electronic music appropriately with the radif, and using, for this first work, the dastgâh regarded first in order and significance. Later, various other works of his appeared, using elements of the radif as a musical and symbolic basis: "Mahur" I, II, and III for an ensemble (consisting of any instruments); "Ost-West II," op. 80 (electronic), "Iranian Aesthetic," op. 77; and "Saba," op. 75 (named after Abol-hassan Saba). (See Retro Records AM18O and AM280, Hartsdale, N.Y., 1980; and Ahang-e Ruz SARLP 513, ca. 1977.)

Another Iranian composer using traditional classical material in a modern Western context is Dariush Dolatshahi, who studied Persian music with Boroumand and later turned to composition, taking up residence in the New York area and, more recently, Portland, Oregon. A characteristic piece of Dolatshahi's is "Sufi" for târ and electronic music. Of course, Persian traditions have played a role in the works of non-Iranians as well, as for example the famous "Persian Set" by Henry Cowell. So we can see that the radif, the basis primarily of improvisation, has, as it were, reached out not only to play a major role in the composed pieces of Persian classical music, but also in the Western or "international" music by Iranians and even by others. In some such instances it is a symbol of the quintessence of Persian music.

II. Popular Music

The overall structure of a dastgâh, at least in allusion, is also widely used in popular music. But the distinction between classical and popular music in the framework of Persian musical culture is not always easy to grasp. The concept of classical music is there, it is called "musiqi-ye sonati" (traditional music),"musiqi-ye asil" ("original" or "basic" music), "musiqi-ye kelasik" (classical music, using the French word), or just plain "music of the dastgâhs", "dastgâh music," or "the radif." That there is a sharp line between classical and other traditions is insisted upon by musicians involved in classical music, and the most conservative musicians, those who maintained the greatest interest in the authenticity and purity of the radif, also insisted most strenuously on its sharpness. But actually, from a somewhat more objective outsider's viewpoint, the line is ambiguously drawn and indistinct. Although the term "musiqi-ye âmiyâne" ("vulgar," "illiterate," or "popular" music) sometimes appears for designating popular music, it seemed to me to be used mainly by musicians of the classical tradition in order to denigrate the rest. In any event, popular music was not as clearly marked a category as the classical tradition, which could virtually be defined as the music that uses the radif.

The vagueness of the line between classical and popular music is evidenced by the forms that appear in both parts of the system—tasnif, chahâr mezrâb, for example. Then, there are the folk taxonomies of music as "classical," "classical-popular," and so on. And there are classical performances that appear importantly in the venues generally reserved for popular music—in ca. 1970, the lower middle class music halls and the 45-rpm record. If there is a repertory that can be properly regarded as the "popular music" in Tehran of that period, certain forms of classical music and music derived from the classical tradition must be considered to be part of it.

Outside Tehran, the relationship between classical and popular seemed to be even closer. In Meshhad and Bojnurd, for example, classical forms were performed in nightclubs, but there seemed to be no strong classical tradition with an independent life, no venues for performance devoted only to classical music. (Note their absence in the thorough ethnographies of Blum, 1972 and 1978.) Musicians of classical music did not seem to have the prestige and middle-class lifestyle of their Tehran counterparts, and they participated in popular music performances and performed background music at parties and weddings.

In Tehran, the radif was used in a variety of venues closely associated with popular music. We have already described the traditional music halls. Somewhat similarly, Westernized nightclubs with a preponderance of Western popular music might have offered some traditional Persian music, mainly classical perhaps, or in a mixed classical-popular style. Indeed, while it is possible to show that the repertory of Iranian popular music included material derived from the classical, one can also look at the universe of classical performance as containing a "popular" component. This includes music performed at the mentioned traditional and Western establishments; part of it is the music that was widely used to accompany poetry readings, with harmonized compositions at least theoretically based on the radif on Radio Iran in the late 1960s and early 1970s; and it also included music performed on 45-rpm records.

It was possible, around 1970, to distinguish the artistic and economic tastes of the Tehran musical public by their use of recordings. Record stores had separate sections for Iranian and Western music, a separation correlating style of music, language, and origin of performers. In the case of Iranian music, one could distinguish LP records, which were very expensive by Western standards, and which contained lengthy performances of classical music approximating somewhat the live versions, concentrating on solo performance more than was the case at public concerts. This group of recordings was separated from the 45-rpm records, which were very low-priced by Western standards (ca. $.35 U.S. in 1968), and among which one could find a large variety of popular materials. In this group one would find materials that were based on the radif, but not referred to as "classical." It contained principally three kinds of music that can be regarded sub-types of classical performance.

Most important was the tasnif. Discussed at length in works by Caton (1983) and Khoshzamir (1975), it is one of the most significant music genres in twentieth-century Iran, one which cuts across the strata of classical, popular, and folk (Caton 1983:33). The role of the radif in the classical tasnif has already been mentioned, but in general parlance, a great many popular songs in various musical style but with musically lyrical character were known as "tasnifs," The popular repertory of ca. 1970, the body of tasnifs was comprised principally of songs sung by soloists and accompanied by orchestras consisting largely of Western instruments to which were added some traditional Middle Eastern ones. The style of these songs often involved an arc-shaped melodic contour, a type of shape extremely common in much Middle Eastern and European folk and art music.

The general characteristics of the radif may be found in many of these songs. The arc-shaped contour parallels the tendency for gushes to ascend in pitch, but it is also the contour of many individual gushes. There is also the tendency also for modulatory materials to appear in the upper part of the range. And of course, the popular songs often share in the general character of the scales, including their widespread use of three-quarter and five-quarter tones. Only a few of these songs—which are generally called "tasnif", although they vary greatly in textual content and musical style—follow the radif of a dastgâh rather specifically. Indeed, as Caton (1983:22-23, 121) and Khoshzamir (1975:48) suggest, the practice of composing a tasnif by following through the principal gushes of a dastgâh is a twentieth-century practice, and Caton, in analyzing sixteen principal tasnifs as a sample of the classical tasnif tradition, includes only two in this category, designating them "dastgâhi." Similarly, only a few of the known classical tasnifs presented by Khoshzamir follow precisely the procedure of the radif; indeed, the use of the radif within the context of arc-shaped melodies with a tendency to modulate or to introduce accidentals in the higher part of the range seems to be a syncretic procedure.

A much smaller proportion of the popular music repertory of ca. 1970, as represented on 45-rpm records, is comprised of performances of âvâz. In some cases, these recordings occupied two sides of a record, thus requiring ten minutes for playing; but ordinarily, a single side of five minutes had to suffice for an entire âvâz. In length, but also in other respects, these performances tended to differ from those of the classical contexts such as LP records, radio broadcasts, public and private concerts. Most of the âvâz's were preceded by chahâr mezrâbs performed by santur or violin, and a few were followed by tasnifs. The âvâz's themselves were almost exclusively vocal, and accompanied by one of the mentioned instruments. What distinguished the âvâz's on the popular recordings was the emphasis on virtuosic singing—particularly, use of the tahrir—and a relatively restricted excursion into the radif. The âvâz would typically be devoted entirely to darâmad, or perhaps a second, higher gushe would additionally be used. Among the dastgâhs selected, segâh and the satellites of shur and homâyun predominated, in contrast to the popular (but radif-related) tasnifs, in which one might find segâh, mâhur, and chahârgâh, but much less of shur and its relatives.

A third type of composition found in the popular repertory (as well as the classical) and sometimes derived from the radif is the chahâr mezrâb. Here, in contrast to the brief renditions typical of classical performances, the tendency is to perform relatively long pieces. The instruments most used were the santur and the violin, ordinarily accompanied by percussion. As in the case of the âvâz's, the tendency here is to emphasize virtuosity, and the mentioned length may be related to the role of exhibiting technical virtuosity. Actually, the chahâr mezrâbs appearing on the popular 45-rpm records were sometimes taken from the classical tradition. They may move through a small number of gushes, but not in the line-by-line structure characteristic of the tasnifs; and their tendency to use, very broadly speaking, an arc-shaped contour relates them to the melodic structure of tasnifs. Their close association with the radif is underscored by the fact that on the record labels they are ordinarily labeled by dastgâh, something rarely if ever the case among the popular tasnifs, and not even always true of the recordings of âvâz, as these may sometimes be named in accordance with their poetic texts.

We should conclude, then, that the radif and the music most directly derived from it plays—or played—a role in popular music life of Tehran around 1970. The names of dastgâhs appear, the forms of classical music have their popular counterparts or manifestations, and there are some ways in which the specific characteristics of the radif fit readily, and perhaps even syncretically, into the conceptual and structural framework of the modern culture of the urban Middle East.

III. Folk Music

The popular music of the second half of the twentieth century is related to the radif by the fact that some of its repertory is derived from the radif, or from classical material that is based on the radif. The relationship of the radif to folk music is quite different. It is certainly possible that rural music has here and there been influenced by the dastgâhs and the radif, and—considering that folk music is usually performed by specialists—there are probably a few rural or folk musicians who have studied classical music in larger cities. But the influence has probably largely moved in the other direction. Before moving to this consideration, however, it seems useful to look at the overlapping of the concepts of art music and folk music in smaller cities of Iran (see e.g. Blum 1972).

Just as the relationship of popular and art music is closer in Iran than in Europe or, for instance, India (and may have been closer yet before 1920), with fewer specialized venues for art music performance, the stylistic distance and differences in practice between folk musicians and those who perform art music is shorter. Folk musicians include individuals who sing or chant religious narratives on the street, or heroic narratives in tea houses, or the morsheds who chant and drum in the zurkhânes, the ceremonial gymnasia. But they also include individuals whose main musical role is performing at special festivities such as weddings and picnics (Blum 1978:40-41). At these latter sorts of performances, one may occasionally hear tasnifs that follow the radif to some degree, or chahâr mezrâbs in specific dastgâhs, or simple âvâz's. These musicians, motrebs and bakhshis, did not use much of the terminology used by classical musicians in Tehran. Thus, the concept of dastgâh, with a main tonality and subsidiary units—darâmad and other gushes—was not developed. The names of modal concepts were sometimes used, however, pieces sometimes referred to as being in "segâh," or "râst." Some pieces might be labeled with the name of a gushe, and others, with the name of dastgâh. The nomenclature and conceptualization is reminiscent of Arabic music (particularly in Syria and Lebanon), where there is no difference in principle between main and secondary maqams, and where a maqam may function as primary in one performance and secondary in others.

But, as indicated above, the influence is largely from folk music upon classical music rather than the reverse. There are various musical and terminological relationships; we only touch upon a few. Of great interest is the matter of nomenclature of gushes, already discussed elsewhere in this study. There are of course no gushes that are specifically named or labeled "folk music," but one can infer rural and bucolic background here and there. Thus, dashtestâni ("of the countryside" or possibly "from the rural [desert] region of Dashtestan") might have come from folk sources, and so may the material labeled with the names of small towns or regions—tusi, zâbol, neyshâburak—or those labeled with the names of tribal or regional peoples—bayât-e kord, bayât-e tork, afshâri. The diminutive titles of a few gushes may also possibly imply a simple and folk-like tune type—esfahânak, and again neyshâburâk. It is widely believed that the dastgâh of dashti and to a smaller extent bayât-e tork contain folk music materials (Farhat 1966:80-81; Caton 1972:150-56). Caton in particular points to the prevalence of materials in dashti in the music of the region of Gilân, and to the presence of Gilaki songs in the radif, such as chupâni and deleymân, both in dashti. She further (1972:152) suggests that Abolhassan Saba's radif contains more gilaki melodies than other radifs, and that this may result from Saba's three-year residence in Gilân (where in 1929 he incidentally founded, in Rasht, a branch of the Tehran Conservatory of National Music).

At the same time, it has not been possible to discern specific content of a folkish nature in the melodies of these gushes. A few musicians of classical music told me that rural folk music had an influence, and Nour-Ali Boroumand maintained that he "loved the sweet, simple tunes of the folk" and was happy to find them here and there in the radif.

It seems likely that some types of folk poems and the associated melody types seem to have found their way into classical music, and to have become gushes. One of the most important of these secondary gushes (Farhat's tekke) is dobeyti, found in six of the dastgâhs in Ma'roufi's radif. The name translates as distich, or couplet, but it may also refer to a melody type. To be sure, the various tunes in the radif that are covered by this name differ substantially, but they do share some traits, such as a generally sequentially descending melody. We can possibly shed some light on the background and role of dobeyti by examining the term and concept of chahârbeyti. While not actually present in any of the examined radifs, it is found occasionally in performances of âvâz, where it is treated like a gushe. The name means, literally, "four lines," or more precisely, "of four lines," but is associated with a kind of quatrain (see Blum 1974:86-98) that is widely used in many parts of Iran, particularly in the northeastern region of Khorasan. There is a vast number of chahârbeytis that are covered by the term; but it turns out that in Khorasan, at least, they are ordinarily sung to tunes conforming to a particular melodic type. People of Khorasan recognize this in their folk taxonomy, referring to it by its particular name, âhang-e sarhaddi, or simply as the "chahârbeyti tune" (Blum 1974:90).

The introduction of this tune type to the radif by way of performance may suggest something significant about the genesis of the classical system, and of the radif. One can reasonably speculate (but indeed only *speculate*) that the following may have happened in the case of certain gushes: There developed, in the countryside, a tune type that was sung to a particular kind of poem; it may occasionally have been rendered instrumentally, or in any event found its way into an occasional performance in which a group of materials (maqams and popular songs) were combined in succession. So far, this parallels what evidently took place in the case of chahârbeyti. Then—extrapolating now from what may the have happened in the case of dobeyti—the characteristics of the gushe were abstracted into the radif as one of the gushes. This is of course suggestive reconstruction, and may apply to no real instance, or to one or two. But it could also have been the process that moved what could at one time have been merely regional or local tune types or styles, or individual tunes that became more widespread as types, such as zâbol, neyshâburâk, or esfahânak, into the classical tradition and the radif.

There are other interesting aspects of the tunes type as characteristic of both classical and folk music in Iran, and perhaps in the Middle East generally. In contrast to the musical systems of many cultures, music of the Middle East appears to consist of a relatively small number of tunes, each of which is manifested in a number—a vast number, to be sure—of versions. It is a situation not unlike that of Western European folk tune families, at least if one follows the thinking of Samuel P. Bayard (1953), who suggested that Anglo-American folk music consisted largely of some 40 tune families. The Middle Eastern situation is more extreme, as there may be fewer tune families each of which may be further distributed. In at least parts of the Middle East a tune (e.g., a tune type such as chahârbeyti, or even a maqam or gushe) together with all of its variants is recognized by the society as a unit. It is particularly interesting that the tune type phenomenon exists in various strata of music, including rural folk song and the classical art. The concept of a dastgâh, in the radif, as something that is manifested in a vast number of performances is clearly related to the idea of a tune type, as it has its own name, but can be sung by many persons, each with his own version. An individual may sing it in a slightly different version in each performance, or even differently in each stanza of a performance. The concept of variation and elaboration is present at both (and at intermediate) levels.

The radif may therefore be interpreted as a kind of major elaboration of practices found in folk music, and the folk tunes can be viewed as a kind of microcosm of art music. The microcosmic concept may also be helpful in commenting on the relationship between art and folk music in the areas of scale and melodic contour. The intervals, generally speaking, which are found in the folk traditions are also those of the radif. The characteristic 3/4 tone of classical music is present in folk music. The gushes of the radif tend to concentrate upon tetrachords, although their total ambits may be larger, and similarly, each of the tune types of folk music tends to use, principally, a tetrachord or perhaps a pentachord. Two kinds of melodic contour seem to predominate in the folk music repertories, the arc-shaped and the descending diatonic sequence. Both are common in the individual gushes of the radif, the descending sequence perhaps most in foruds, and the arc, in melodies of a relatively fixed nature. The arc-shaped contour is also reflected in the overall structure of the typical dastgâh. The developmental composition techniques of the radif—sequence, elaboration, diminution, extension of motifs, repetition, and various combinations of these—are all found in the folk melodies, although, as the latter are almost always rather short, in briefer and less frequently compound versions.

It is clear that there are general principles of mode and structure common to the musical culture of the area. The traditions of liturgical music in Iranian culture also exhibit modal and melodic elements that are related to the classical traditions. (For comments, see al-Faruqi 1981:57-68; During 1984b:20-22; Zonis 1973:8-9; Caron 1975:10; Nelson 1985:66.) Thus, while Iranian musicians of the classical tradition liked to distinguish sharply between it and the radif on the one hand and the other Iranian repertories on the other, there are certain respects in which the Persian system of music can be seen as a single system of which the radif is a central, highly complex, abstracted and distilled manifestation.

CHAPTER IX

CULTURAL CONTEXTS: A GROUP OF EXCURSIONS

with the participation of
Amnon Shiloah and Craig Macrae

We now turn to several cultural contexts in order to show a variety of ways in which the radif interacts with its culture. Beginning with the radif in the modern musical life of Tehran (compared, further on, with the life of Carnatic music in Madras), we then examine its role in the biography of a prominent twentieth-century master of Persian music, and finally, its fate in the course of immigration of Iranian Jewish musicians to Israel. The combination of these three approaches will provide, hopefully, a sense of the variety of ways in which the radif impinges on musical life of Iranians.

I. Modernized and Westernized Music in Tehran

It may seem paradoxical to present the radif as emblematic of the grand tradition of Iranian classical music, and at the same time to suggest that it is closely associated with the rapid modernization and Westernization of the traditional culture since the late 19th century. I should like to argue, however, that the radif was created in part as a response to the encroachments of Western musical culture, and in part as a device for the absorption of these influences. It seems doubtful to me that musicians set out explicitly and purposely to carry out such an aim; and yet the establishment of the radif, the effects it had on other musics, and the various ways it could be manifested in sound and as symbol, seem to me to have been ideal for carrying out the stated purpose. The fact that there is for earlier times little evidence of a radif, in the form in which it is now found, is indicative. It fits interestingly into the Western conception of musicianship in a number of ways and there are some respects in which it is not very compatible with some of the general tendencies of Middle Eastern music.

One of the important features of the radif is that it provides, for the entire world of Iranian classical music, a single system of theory. Equivalent in some ways to the course of theory study in European music schools, it is, as it were, a curriculum equally applicable to all instruments and voice (though is principally directed to instrumental music) and which is generally agreed upon by a large number of musicians who are associated with each other. The concept of a body of theory applicable to a universe of music is characteristic of Western musical thought. The notion of music as a “universal language” was probably put into the awareness of Iranian musicians in the 19th century, and presumably not in the sense of "universals" that modern ethnomusicologists tend to deny, but in a way that refers to Western music alone. Western music, with its all-Western though Italian-derived terminology, its notations system, and its theoretical concept was presented as a phenomenon of universal validity. The radif may have been the Iranian musician's answer. The emphasis placed on its completeness, its universality in the Iranian context, and its ability to produce a universe of moods and ideas, all point in that direction. So also does the fact that the radif draws on all aspects of Iranian culture, as shown by the nomenclature of its parts—regions, towns, ethnic groups, folk musics. It can arguably be interpreted as the Iranian counterpart of the comprehensive Western theoretical system.

The parallel is also evident in the relationship between theory and practice. As far as we can tell, older Middle Eastern musical culture definitely separated the two. Theorists who wrote treatises seem not to have been writing for young music students, and what they wrote did not directly provide teaching material and exercises. Teachers presumably did give such materials to their students, but their orientation was probably much more practical than theoretical. Western musical culture, has for some time had a body of material that provides a middle ground—theory textbooks for example, or special exercises for learning theory and showing its relationship to music itself, and music whose purpose is primarily pedagogical.

The importance of Western instruments in modern Persian classical music, particularly the violin but also the piano and flute, has been widely noted and discussed (Nettl 1978:164-68; Whiting 1985). So also has the difference between the use of the violin in Iran, where it has introduced the sound of Western violin music into the indigenous tradition, and in India, where it has become thoroughly integrated into the tradition soundscape (Nettl, 1985:47-51). But the role of indigenous instruments in Persian music too has changed. The relationship of instruments to the radif involves the basically instrumental nature of the radif, and the emblematic significance of instruments in Western music. Thus, while the traditional conception of âvâz is vocal—as the word ("voice," "song") implies—the majority of classical performances in the period around 1970 were instrumental. It seems likely, however, that classical music in the period before 1900 was prevailingly vocal. In any event, the importance of Persian poetry and of ideas from the world of Islamic mysticism along with the opprobrium sometimes heaped on instrumental music by theoreticians and theologians suggests that the best kind of classical music once used to be the vocal. Thus, the essentially instrumental nature of Western music had substantial impact in the late 19th century. The main masters of the early radif were instrumentalists, and when Iranian concert life and modernized musical pedagogy developed, they did so principally around an instrumental base.

Accompanying this development, a fundamental distinction between instrumental and vocal radifs seems to have been made. Instrumental radifs were collected and published, and when the "official" radif of the Ministry of Fine Arts was produced by Ma'roufi's committee (Zonis 1973:62), it was instrumental though presented as "the radif," without any special designation. The vocal radif of Karimi, published in 1978, followed several instrumental ones, and contrasts with them in several ways. In basic structure, it is similar (Chapter 2). But to review the differences, it has fewer sections, and the structure of gushes is relatively uniform, ordinarily comprised of the darâmad (which is sung to vocables), the she'r (poem), and the tahrir section with its melismatic passages.

At least two important characteristics of the instrumental radifs are not present in the vocal. One, the concept of options that is provided by the presentation of several darâmads, or "versions" of darâmad, is absent in the vocal. And second, so also is the large quantity of material exhibiting techniques that may be used in improvisation—sequences, extensions, contractions, development of motifs—that plays such an important role in the instrumental radifs. The things that make the radif the authoritative model, a point of departure for improvisation and composition, are much more developed in the instrumental radifs; and this, I suggest, is related to the importance of instrumental music in the Western classical tradition. In contrast to the popular traditions of Iran, the classical music had by the 1970s become essentially an instrumental repertory. And in contrast to the music of South India, in which the system is first learned by virtually everyone through vocal means, Iranian musicians seem to learn instrumental music first, somewhat as do Western musicians.

The Western traditions of music teaching seem also to have played a role in the contemporary form of Persian music, and to have been in part responsible for the existence of the radif in its peculiar form. The concept of materials produced specifically for teaching, the teaching of techniques which later will be used by the performer in playing something else, is characteristic of Western classical music culture. The radif fits this conception. It is something one learns, practices, but does not itself perform, but it is rather something upon which one later bases real performances. In this respect it is like the Western exercise or etude, but it is also related to what appears to be the way in which much

Arabic music is taught (and Persian music may once have been taught), that is, the concept of learning certain pieces from a teacher and then performing these in one's own version. I should like to suggest, therefore, that the radif is a combination, perhaps created syncretically, of the traditional Middle Eastern technique of teaching one's version and expecting the student to create his own from that on the one hand, and on the other, the Western concept of etudes and teaching pieces.

Related to this as well is the concept of notation. That notation, with the implied control on the part of composer and performer that it provides, is a major emblem of Western musical culture can be shown in many ways. The idea that the radif, if it is to have value and to survive, must be notated was a major issue in twentieth century Iranian musical thought. Major figures such as Vaziri, Saba, Ma'roufi, Barkechli, and Darvish Khan (see e.g. Khoshzamir 1979, esp. p.144-46) were concerned with the pros and cons of notating the radif, but they generally concluded that notation was essential. The notation of composed pieces such as pishdarâmads and tasnifs was not an issue to the same degree, and notated versions of such works appeared from the beginning of the century. (See Khatschi 1962:133-43 for a list of individual works published in mid-century; or, as a sample of an anthology, a collection of pishdarâmads for violin by famous and less famous masters—Musa Ma'roufi, H. Yahaqqi, Ruhollah Khaleqi, Abolhassan Saba, and others, published under the general title, 18 Qat'e Pishdarâmad barâye violon az Agâyan-e Ostadân-e Musiqi (n.d., ca. 1950-60.) What some of the musicians who were in favor of notated publication wished to accomplish, it seems to me, was to prove that the radif was significant within the Iranian musical culture by fitting it with the major emblem of Western musical dignity, notation. In my experience in the 1960s and 1970s, not many musicians used the notated forms that were available. When they did, it was more to serve as mnemonic device than as a way of approaching and learning music. And certainly some of the more conservative teachers made clear their skepticism about the possibility of using notation to keep the tradition alive. But the symbolic value of notation was maintained.

The question then surely arises about the degree to which the notated radifs really tell us something about musical practice. After all, if the notations by Saba and Ma'roufi were not really indicative of teaching practice, if their published forms were largely of symbolic value, it is relevant to ask whether it is proper to study the radif as a factor in Iranian musical culture from such versions. There is circumstantial evidence that the notated radifs may actually be close to traditional practice. Take for example Karimi's published radif (Massoudieh 1978). Recorded and notated in the 1970s (though not so much for practical study as for scholarship), but it is virtually identical, at least in many of its parts, with the versions recorded years earlier explicitly for teaching rather than preservation. Boroumand's radif, performed in several versions a few years apart and never published in transcription, conforms closely to Ma'roufi's notation; but Boroumand, a blind man, had no access to these notations. The radifs of Davami, Shahnâzi, and Ney Dâvoud, at least in some of their sections and in the complement and order of their gushes, conform closely to the versions and general structuring of the published radifs. We must conclude that either the published radifs were reasonably representative of the practice of oral tradition, or they had such a strong effect on the practice that their characteristics became in the course of the twentieth century part of the oral tradition.

The role of concerts in the development of mid-twentieth century Iranian musical culture has been discussed (see Nettl 1978:151-53), but it seems appropriate here to note the specific relationship of the radif to modern concert culture and its manifestations in the mass media. One thing that struck me in Tehran about 1970 was the importance, to musicians and aficionados, of designating the music being performed. A listener's knowledge was tested by his ability to identify the dastgâhs and gushes he heard. In formal concerts, either by printed program or oral announcement, music was designated by dastgâh. Records bore the names of dastgâhs, as did published forms of composed pieces. It was interesting to see that modernized venues of performance provided these designations, whereas the more traditional ones did so much less frequently. Thus, private concerts or performances at majles took place without announcements of dastgâhs. It is difficult to draw conclusions, but it might be a reasonable guess that the importance of designating keys and modes in Western classical music had an effect on Iranian traditional practice.

The custom of recording concerts or of repeating concerts in broadcasts no doubt affected performance practice, and the relationship of radif and performance. The concept of far-flung imaginative improvisation must have been inhibited in an atmosphere of repetition, and by the likelihood of being criticized by musicians who could hear the same performance repeatedly. The notion that there was a right way to perform, and that the radif must be followed religiously, was surely reinforced by the concert culture and by the existence of printed authorities. Thus, it seems to me, public concert performances and recordings probably produced greater uniformity than had been present in a musical culture of largely private performances. Musicians therefore tended to memorize their "improvisations," greater standardization in the use of particular gushes and the omission of others was attained, and certain practices, such as full presentation of certain gushes and mere allusion to others, became established.

The development of the radif as a distinctive body of material peculiar to the Iranian classical music system may also be tied to the rising Iranian nationalism of the twentieth century. While the Persian music system is clearly a close relative of Arabic and Turkish music, with dastgâhs and gushes sharing names with maqams and (Turkish) makams, it was important, in the 1960s, to Iranian musicians to point out repeatedly the distinctive and particularly the national nature of their classical music. Pejorative comparisons to Arabic and Turkish music were made and the fact that the radif represented music from all of Iran was sometimes brought up in conversation.

The concept of a body of material that could be regarded as a unit had been important to Iranian nationalists as early as Vaziri and continued to be stressed in the articulation of my teacher Boroumand. Thus the large, comprehensive, unified yet complex radif was in a way a symbol of Iran. But more of these considerations later. For the moment, let me try to clarify the role of classical music in modern Tehran by viewing it in a broader context of Third-World musical life by digressing to a comparison of the role of Persian classical music in the twentieth century to that of South Indian classical music in the somewhat similar community of Madras.

II. A Tale of Two Cities

At the times of my observation (1966-1974 for Tehran, 1981-82 for Madras), the two cities were in some respects alike.

Each had a population of ca. four million, and each was the economic and cultural center of a large unit—Tehran, the national capital but also the center of Persian culture, and Madras, the commercial, intellectual, and artistic center of the culturally distinct region of South India. Both cities became the cultural centers that they are in recent times, since the late 19th century. At that time, industrial and economic growth had caused the establishment of modern institutions such as the government-sponsored conservatories, ministries of the arts, and radio corporations; there had also been established a middle class which attracted artists and musicians from smaller cities and courts. Accordingly, the great establishments of Carnatic music in Mysore, Tanjore, and small towns such as Palghat in India declined, as did the aristocratic centers of Persian music such as Shiraz and Isfahan, while Tehran and Madras became the major focal points. By the 1970s, both cities had undergone what the L'Armands (1978:115; 1983:433) describe as secondary urbanization (see also Redfield and Singer 1954). They had become not only urban centers of their own traditions but citadels of a multicultural mosaic, made up of elements from within the nation-states Iran and India, with an admixture of Western-derived international culture.

In order to discuss the differences in classical music culture in these cities, it seems appropriate to comment first on the cultural value of music in the two societies. The general evaluation of music in Iran was surely lower than in South Asia. The reasons for this and the implications of its religious basis have been widely discussed and argued, but there is no doubt that in Shi'ite Islam, there is a kind of ambivalence about music not found in Hindu South India. Much of the character of musical life in Iran can be traced, I believe, to the general value of the concept of music.

Take the population of musicians in the two cities. Although there is little hard evidence, I see no reason to believe that the number of professional musicians was significantly smaller in Tehran than in Madras. But those of Tehran tended less to identify themselves as musicians, and the types of music with which they associated themselves differed. In Tehran, the majority of musicians were involved with popular music, comprised of a mixture of indigenous and Western styles. Another large group was devoted to Western music, and only a few to music that could in most respects be regarded as traditional (as indicated by a count in *Iran Who's Who*). Those involved with traditional music sometimes maintained activity in Westernized popular and Western music as well. Most musicians in Tehran did not come from the higher social classes, with the exception of a few involved in Western classical music as a result of study abroad, and some who identified themselves (to me) as sufis. A good many, on the other hand, were members of minorities. All together, perhaps no more than 150 could have been considered professionals in the field of Persian classical music.

In Madras, in the accounting of the L'Armands (1978:121), there were almost a thousand musicians in the Carnatic classical field who gave public concerts or broadcasts, and surely many more who were in some way professionally competent and active. On the other hand, there were probably no more than a mere handful of individuals primarily involved with Western classical music, a relatively small group working in Indian film music, and a few performers of rock and related forms. Perhaps half of those active in Carnatic music came from Brahmin castes. Thus, the actual number of musicians in the two cities differed less than did their demography, stylistic allegiance, and social origins and status.

Where was music performed? Again, briefly: In Tehran, Western and a bit of Persian classical music were performed at public concerts (the two repertories rigidly separate). But Persian classical music was mainly heard in homes and on radio. In Madras, the musical venues were distinctly larger and distinguished by their much greater public accessibility. There were simply far more public concerts, and even those that were officially "private" could be attended by almost anyone. Both cities had substantial radio services that concentrated on traditional classical music, indigenous popular styles, and a certain amount of contrived experimentation with Westernization of the traditional material. In terms of teaching institutions, the two cities were not radically different. Conservatories, university music departments, government support, instrument-making establishments, and record stores were all there.

Institutions for the sponsorship of performance, however, did differ. In Tehran, the dowreh, the small, intensely private club which met periodically for a purpose such as Koran-reading, poetry-reading, or performance of music continued in force, while a large, public Club Musicale, founded by the great modernizer Vaziri in the 1920s, never became a widely-used model (Khoshzamir 1979:94-97). In Madras, contrastively, such large organizations are central, and have become the major source for sponsorship and organization of concert life. These clubs, "sabhas," have an illustrious history in the twentieth century, and in 1981, some 35 of them were involved in the sponsorship of music in Madras.

It is important to state that in the folk taxonomies of both cities, music was perceived as belonging to several discrete systems (or musics), as determined in some measure by style but even more by social and broadly cultural criteria. Without having carried out a thorough study, and as a kind of working hypothesis, I would like to suggest that a kind of pyramid-shaped consensus emerges from a variety of sources. In Tehran, the most prestigious music was the Western classical, below which, paired, were Persian classical and Western popular—in the latter case, not so much rock music as French and Italian song and Latin American dances. Middle Eastern (including Iranian) popular music seemed a step lower, along with Persian folksong. During my time in Iran, the Persian classical music, based on the radif, was higher on the prestige scale of the typical member of an audience if it appeared in forms somehow related to Western music—with large ensemble, in elaborate composed forms, and harmonized.

In Madras, the most valued music was clearly the Carnatic, with vocal music ranked above instrumental. Various kinds of non-classical but specifically South Indian music (such as the devotional tirrupugazh) seemed also to be high in general esteem, perhaps followed by Hindustani classical music and by Western classics. Indian film music was also moderately high in prestige, but Western popular music, lower. The point is that in Madras, Indian musics were generally more esteemed than Western; but the opposite was the case in Tehran.

The most intriguing difference between the two cities was the quantity and prestige of Carnatic music that was performed and heard in Madras as compared with the small amount of Persian music, and its relatively low esteem, in Tehran. Surely, as suggested, this has something to do with the view of music held by the respective religions, Shi'ism and Hinduism. But further, while both Tehran and Madras were undergoing secondary urbanization and becoming in many ways Western-like cities, classical music played different symbolic roles. In Madras, it seemed to me, Carnatic music was held in high esteem precisely because it could function as a major symbol of traditional Indian culture. In other respects, the citizens of Madras might be westernizing their lives, but they felt able to avoid this in their music. In Tehran, curiously perhaps, Persian classical music was actually gaining a certain degree of ascendancy as part of the processes of urbanization and westernization. To be sure, Western classical music was also rising in prestige and attention; and the emphasis on Persian music as a "classical" system may, as suggested earlier, be of recent vintage. Carnatic music may thus be interpreted as a symbol of the old cultural tradition, while Persian classical music in 1970 symbolized nationalism along with a certain kind of identification with the West, a culture which itself prizes adherence to its own classical system.

In the two cities, we find interesting and contrastive views of Western music on the part of members of the respective classical music establishments. In Madras, Western classical music was not really well known, but it was regarded as a kind of sister-system to the Carnatic and described in complementary (and complimentary) terms. Carnatic music is melodic, and the Western, harmonic; Carnatic has ornamentation, but Western does not; Carnatic music is mainly vocal, but Western, instrumental—so go the opinions. In some other ways, the two are also thought to be alike, in contrast to the rest of the musical world: Each has its trinity of great composers, each has long, composed pieces, seven-tone scales with solmization, and emphasis on tonic and fifth. These opinions of course ignore similarities elsewhere in the world, but they tell us some interesting things about the view of the musical world held in Madras.

In Tehran, Western music played a grander role. Often called "international music" to symbolize its universal scope but also to point up Iran's place in the international cultural system, it was (in conversational usage) also the repertory most readily labeled simply as "music" without qualification. Iranian music, by contrast, was especially so designated. The superiority of the "international music" was widely taken for granted. Stylistically imitated in certain ways by Iranians in their traditional music, it was also assimilated symbolically, as in the claim that the santur is "the Iranian piano." There is, then, a substantial difference in attitude towards Western music in the two cities.

It is probably fair to say that the sound of Western music has had a greater impact on classical music of Iran than on the Carnatic. One might well expect the opposite, as Carnatic music would lend itself more readily to syncretic combination with Western music than would the Iranian; intervals, emphasis on tonic and dominant, major composed forms, complex principles of accompaniment are all closer to Western music than is the case for Iran. Nevertheless, the sounds of Carnatic music, if we are to believe older musicians, have not changed very much in a Westerly direction. To be sure, there is the violin, and there are other Western instruments recently introduced (clarinet, saxophone, guitar, mandolin), but they have been integrated into the Carnatic soundscape much more than is the case in Iranian violin and piano music. It is true that today there may be more emphasis on the foursquare adi tala than was once the case in India, one hears special ensembles that experiment with Western overtones, and some Carnatic singers have learned from Western vocal techniques. But on the whole, what is essential about the sound of Western music has barely penetrated Carnatic music.

It is somewhat different in Iran. Several large ensembles, sometimes using harmony though mainly heterophonic, were prominent around 1970. There was Western harmony, dominant in some pieces, less pervasive in others, harmonic touches appearing in key places such as junctures of sections and cadences. Traditional intonation, including 3/4 and 5/4 tones, has frequently been changed to the closest Western equivalent. The Western violin has been introduced and, unlike in India, used to introduce the sound of nineteenth-century Western violin music into the Iranian classical tradition. In India, Western instruments have been integrated into the extant system; in Iran, they have been accepted along with their sonic and cultural context, which has in turn affected the Iranian tradition. Thus, the sarinda-like ghe-ichak has been brought from its rural environment in Eastern Iran to Tehran and modified in number and function of strings and the structure of the bow in order to look and sound more like a violin.

If Carnatic music in Madras does not sound Western, its social context has over the course of the twentieth century become relatively Western. A virtually opposite trend was found in Tehran in 1970. For example, the most common venue for Carnatic performances in Madras is the concert, a Western-style affair with tickets, chairs for the audience, printed programs, a typical sequential structure of pieces, and little attention to the earlier seasonal or other temporal associations of ragas. The audience is middle-class and substantially Brahmin. While different from its European or American counterparts in several respects, it is also in many ways a typical Western event and it is certainly quite contrastive to the small private majles.

Like teaching institutions, teaching methods of the two cities did not differ markedly. In the conservatories of both, notation was used—the Western system in Iran, a more traditionally based one in Madras. In teaching, there had emerged a distinction between performance, theory, and history. In both cities, the older teaching tradition had been replaced to a considerable degree. But the replacement was probably greater and more whole-hearted in Madras than in Tehran, where the entire questionof schools was, by 1970, still somewhat controversial. The establishment of the radif as a major teaching device may be interpreted as an attempt to find a way of teaching that was parallel to the Western and yet compatible with the older tradition; or as a mechanism for enabling syncretism to take place.

In both cities, music was regarded as emblematic of the local culture. But in Madras, Western students were accepted and considered part of the system more readily and in greater numbers than in Tehran. Many Carnatic musicians seemed to be trying to say, in effect, that their system was equal to the Western capable of being international, available to the world. In order for such an attitude to be put into practice, it was necessary to adopt a view to the effect that music was not something integral to a particular culture but, rather, an essentially technical phenomenon that could be learned by anyone willing to apply himself. And restrictions of venue, caste, sex, nation, time of year and day for musical performance all might have to be sacrificed. In Tehran, by contrast, I was sometimes told that it was only Iranians who could really learn the music, and that it was not something exportable. Although some Carnatic musicians demurred, participation by Westerners was seen in Madras as proof of the universality of South Indian music. In Tehran, music was seen more as something culture-specific. The nationalistic overtones may be related, as we have seen, to the creation of the Iranian radif as a specifically national phenomenon.

III. Musical Life of a Master

The particular role of the radif in musical education, and its function as a focal point of the musical system, can also be examined through the life of a musician. It played a major role, of course, in the life of the musician who was my principal teacher, Nour-Ali Boroumand, a man who was widely considered as a principal authority on many aspects of Persian classical music especially in the 1960s and early 1970s, but who was not regarded as a major figure in the area of performance despite his excellent technical command of several instruments. Interestingly, he refused to regard himself principally as a musician. But it is indicative of his authority that he was one of a small number of masters whose radif was recorded in the 1960s and 1970s by one of the government agencies concerned with the preservation of the traditional culture and arts of Iran. In this chapter, we present a brief biography of Boroumand, based largely on interviews with himself held in 1969, as well as an interpretation of his view of the radif and of Persian music, based on these same interviews as well as a long period of acquaintance with him.

Although Boroumand was in many respects a unique individual, there are ways in which his biography is characteristic of the experience of many Iranian musicians of the twentieth century. Born in 1905 in Tehran, into the family of a well-to-do jeweler originating in Isfahan, he lived in a household with respect and love for the arts. An uncle was a famous painter, the mother was artistically inclined, and musicians frequently came to the home for social events and to perform. Among them was the famous târ-player Darvish Khân, and from him Boroumand had his first lessons at the age of seven. His father determined that some kind of artistic training was desirable, and he was thus given the choice of studying music or calligraphy. He thus studied music sporadically, but at the age of sixteen went to Germany to secondary school, studying, as well, Western music on the piano. At age 22, graduating from a *Gymnasium* he returned to Tehran for a year, continuing the study of music with Darvish Khân, and beginning serious work on the radif. Then however he returned to Germany for medical study and came close to completion of the doctorate before losing his sight. After lengthy medical treatment proved unsuccessful, he returned to Iran, giving up all interest in Western music and turning to concentrated study of the Iranian tradition.

The next quarter century of Boroumand's life was devoted substantially to musical studies. He worked on the radif with several masters, particularly Habib Somâ'i, Musa Ma'roufi, and Esmâil Qahremâni, and others. Ma'roufi's importance in the history of the radif is well known. The period of Boroumand's study with him preceded the time in which Ma'roufi headed a committee to prepare the official radif (published in Barkechli 1963); indeed, Boroumand, along with Ahmad Ebâdi, Aliakbar Shahnâzi, and Rukneddin Mokhtâri, was a member of that committee. Somâ'i did not remain Boroumand's teacher long, but Qahremâni remained in that role for about thirteen years. Boroumand made a point of stressing to me that proper study of the radif was a matter of years, and his purpose was to study the radifs of several masters in order 1) to be sure that he learned the most authentic version, and 2) to be able to put together, synthetically, an excellent personal version of his own. Much later, when he taught his radif at the University of Tehran, he had four years available for each student, and believed that this was barely adequate time.

In this context, the somewhat different approach to matters of authority in creation of the radif found in the analysis of

During (1984a:126-29) may be mentioned. In a manner derived from practices in Shi'ite theology, the consensus of an elite of masters becomes the official position.

Boroumand's statements comparing earlier and more recent practices in Persian traditional music were revealing. He believed that there was a single, proper, authoritative version of the radif, and that it was his task to discover it; and he believed that the ring of authenticity was in the music itself, that an informed musician could discern it by hearing it, and thus distinguish it from other less authoritative forms or performances. He felt that through its history, the radif gradually increased in the number of its versions and thus grew away from the unitary tradition of Mirza Abdollah. But he also believed that the differences among the versions were not really great, comprising principally matters of order of the gushes. The relationship of the radif to performance did not interest him greatly. He asserted that in earlier times, musicians performed the radif itself in public, deviating very little; and that the notion of improvisation was a more recent development. But on the other hand, he agreed that each person performed the radif in his own way, and that it its structure and character depended on the mood of the occasion. Indeed, there was an interesting contrast between Boroumand's attitude towards the radif (unitary and authentic) and performance (sticking to the radif), on the one hand, and on the other, his attitude towards musicianship, in which he stressed the personal and individual, and extolled freedom of choice on the part of the musician as a central characteristic of the Iranian classical tradition if properly carried out. Boroumand did not, even later, when he had been for some years a professor of music at the University of Tehran, wish to be regarded as a professional musician, and pointed out that among the great musicians of his early years, none were professionals in the sense that they made their living by music. (The only exception, he said, was Darvish Khân, who was respected because of his excellence.) But men who earned their livelihood through music were not highly respected, and Boroumand related this to the matter of freedom of choice in performance.

Boroumand's expertise gradually became widely known, and he began to be sought after for advice and to perform, but he typically declined to cooperate. Because of his blindness, he tended to be distrustful and to suspect the presence of secret recording devices. He did not wish to have his radif recorded, in part because of a traditional Iranian fear of the "evil eye," but also because he treasured his knowledge and did not want to share it with just anyone. And further, as a musician with an attitude of great self-criticism, he was anxious to have only the best of his musicianship known.

It was not until late middle age that Boroumand finally came to the point of sharing his knowledge widely. About 1965, he was persuaded by Mehdi Barkechli to undertake the teaching of the radif at the University of Tehran, whose music department was about to institute a section for Iranian music. He developed a plan whereby he would teach his radif in four years, two or three dastgâhs per year, to a group of students. Between six and twelve students attended his classes. Boroumand's procedure was to play a gushe, or a short part of it, to which the students responded by repeating in unison. Gradually, an entire gushe would thus be learned. Each class session began with the repetition of the entire dastgâh up to the point to which it had been learned, or at least of several gushes preceding what was about to be taught. The students played a number of instruments, producing a heterogeneous sound; but no vocalists were included. (By contrast, in the classes of Mahmoud Karimi, at the Conservatory of National Music, where the procedure was similar, there were only vocalists.) The blind Boroumand was an exacting pedagogue, using his ear to isolate students who "didn't get it right" and asking them to repeat materials solo. When students had questions about the specific turn of a melody or ornamentation, he patiently explained and demonstrated. The entire group played the nonmetric materials in excellent unison.

Boroumand felt that the particular way in which the radif was taught had a major effect on the musical outcome, the performance, and on the nature of Persian musicianship and of Persian music at large. He did not wish to have the radif notated (although he was aware that some of his university students transcribed what he played, for their own use in memorizing). He believed that there was a close relationship between the character of a musical system and the manner in which it was transmitted. Even so, he was willing to be flexible, suiting his teaching methods to the capacities of his pupils. In dealing with his students at the University of Tehran, he was careful to present material in a particular order, and his instruction was entirely done through example by the teacher and repetition by the students. But in dealing with non-Iranians, he found it helpful to provide himself with special techniques. In my own case, he provided simplified versions of gushes, and he suggested that I record my lessons so as to be able to practice more effectively. He was prepared to depart from the basic order of the radif for particular pedagogical purposes. On the occasion of his visit to the University of Illinois, he was interested in showing students the general nature of Iranian music and did so with the use of recordings of nightingales' singing. But throughout his activity as a teacher, he emphasized the central character of the radif to Persian music, and the need to learn it properly.

Boroumand's evaluation of other musicians was, accordingly, made largely on the basis of their knowledge of the radif. He was quite willing to provide a ranked order of such individuals, placing himself first as the person who knew the radif best, giving second place to one person, third to another, and so on. On the whole, his evaluations corresponded to those of other musicians. While he distinguished this criterion—knowledge of the radif—from others and was willing to identify musicians who were technically proficient (sometimes people whom he also accused of ignorance regarding the radif), there was no question that knowledge of the radif was, to him, the most important criterion of Persian classical musicianship. It is important to note that among the distinguished Iranian musicians of the late 1980s and early 1990s are a number of students and disciples of Boroumand's, notably including Dariouche Safvate, Dariush Tala'i, Mohammad Reza Lotfi, and Dariush Dolatshahi.

In Boroumand's rhetoric about Persian music, there was a possibly curious discrepancy between his emphasis on the radif and his insistence that musicians do whatever comes to them, assert their personality and the mood of the moment, and avoid being subject to authority. The true performer must not, he would say, simply play the radif, the order of the gushes should be changed in performance, you should be yourself. But clearly within limits. In his teaching, Boroumand constantly made it clear that Persian classical music swung between authority and freedom, consensus and individuality, the composed and the improvised.

IV. Emigration: The Radif in Israel

by Bruno Nettl and Amnon Shiloah

It has been widely recognized that members of religious and ethnic minorities played a major role in the musical life of Iran in the twentieth century and perhaps even more in earlier times. In the 1960s, instrument makers in Tehran were largely Armenians, and a substantial proportion of performing musicians were Jewish. From the large community of Iranian Jews, about half, over 70,000, immigrated to Israel between 1948 and 1970; and since the middle 1970s, thousands more left Iran for Israel, North America, and Europe (see e.g. *Statistical Abstract of Israel*. vol. 24, 1973, p. 48, Table II/20). It is not surprising, of course, that a good many musicians were found among the immigrants to Israel, and that they played a role in the Persian culture which the immigrants had brought with them. In 1969 and 1976, the two authors of this essay searched for musicians in the Iranian communities of Israel, and to learn about their use of the radif.

In the period of study, Israelis of Iranian origin differed considerably from other immigrant groups. They were a large minority, approaching 100,000, close to 5% of the Jewish population of Israel (*Encyclopedia Judaica*, vol. 8, col. 1441). About one-half of the Jews in Iran had immigrated to Israel after 1948, but in contrast to those of most Arabic nations, they came not in one large wave but rather more gradually. Government statistics indicate a rather even stream of immigration. Moreover, through personal observation and interviews we noted that a good deal of movement in the other direction, extended visits to relatives and some permanent return to Iran, had taken place. Frequent visits of Iranian Jews to relatives in Israel provided contact as well, and a musical counterpart was made possible by the availability of radio listening and the importing of Iranian records. This type of contact seemed to be less significant for Jews from Arabic countries and far less in the case of Eastern Europe. Iranians on the whole had taken up urban residence and white-collar occupations, and while they maintained networks of contact in Israel, these were relatively loose. Attempts to find large numbers of Iranian musicians were frustrated by their residential dispersal, a widespread lack of interest in Iranian music on the part of the Iranian community at large (possibly derived from similar attitudes among urban Iranian Muslims), and the absence of institutions which might stimulate performance of and interest in the classical repertory. Over the years, however, it was possible to find a small number of musicians willing to be interviewed and to make recordings; the total with whom we dealt was only a dozen, but they exhibited a great variety in attitude, musical knowledge, and practice.

If half of the Jews of Iran immigrated to Israel, and if within the Jewish community in Iran there was a disproportionate number of musicians, one is prompted to question the relative dearth of musicians in the Iranian Jewish community of Israel. The question is intensified if we remember the opprobrium that is at least theoretically visited on music and musicians in Shi'ite society. Why didn't the Jewish musicians of Iran simply pack up and leave in large numbers? One likely reason is the importance of musicians, even if despised, in the Iranian culture, especially of non-Muslim musicians, and the related absence of a Muslim audience for this music in Israel (Loeb 1972:8). Jewish musicians were important in Iran, and their audience was largely Muslim. Jewish members of Iranian society at large, in my time at least, seemed to take little interest in traditional Middle Eastern music but, rather, moved into the milieu of Western music, tending also to take up other aspects of Westernized culture such as the study of English. Jewish musicians of Middle Eastern traditions did not perform for them, but rather, for Muslims (with predictable social results; Loeb 1972:8-9). But it is also important to realize that the proportion of Jews among musicians was greater in the realm of popular music, and in the area of truly professional rather than elevated amateur musicianship of Iran.

The life of Yones Dardâshti in the 1960s is illustrative. A Jewish singer of classical and light classical music, he was acclaimed in Tehran. But he made frequent visits to Israel, as members of his family had moved there, and he himself tried several times to establish himself, finding, however, that there was no real audience for his music. He made a partial living by working as a cantor in a synagogue, but in the end, returned several times to Iran, where he could sing radio concerts and make recordings.

No general assessment of the role of Jewish musicians in Iranian culture and its history is available. The cited study of Jewish musicians in the province of Fars by Loeb indicates a substantial impact on the part of Jews, and one may assume that other areas in which Jewish populations were concentrated in the late 19th and 20th centuries—the areas surrounding Isfahan and Hamadan, for example—experienced similar kinds of Jewish-Muslim interaction. Little is known, specifically, about the role of Jews in the musical life of large cities, particularly of Tehran, where Jews are not easily identified by name, behavior, or appearance. In general, however, it appears that in modern Tehran, Jews were quite prominent in traditional popular musical life, performing for weddings and entertaining the urbanized and not devoutly Muslim segments of society, and members of the lower-middle and middle classes.

There were a number of prominent musicians of Jewish background in the Persian classical music system, but they did not come close to predominating and were not, with a few notable exceptions, among those most respected or outstanding. Also, they were not among the highly acclaimed amateur experts such as Boroumand. They appeared not to be highly active in the Western music sector of Tehran culture of ca. 1970, and they played a special role in the selling of musical instruments, though not, as already stated, in their manufacture. It is important to note, therefore, the relatively low profile presented by Jews in the Persian classical music culture, but this must be seen in the context of a Tehran where in recent and perhaps also in earlier times, musicians of all sorts participated in a variety of musics, including popular and classical, traditional, Westernized, and Western. Also, regional forms of the classical tradition once coexisted, and only in the twentieth century did the system of Tehran come to dominate. The point is that in the 1960s, the regional traditions seemed to have become satellites, influenced by Tehran but maintained by musicians with less prestige and skill, while the regionally distinct materials remained in a kind of backwater or simply disappeared. In those secondary cities in which Jews had sizeable communities, they probably participated in the regional traditions and, according to Loeb (1972:6-9) they played a major role in folk music, a type of music which in the Middle East is substantially the province of specialists. Thus we may conclude that in the twentieth century, Jews in Iran played a relatively small role in the classical music of Tehran but possibly a somewhat greater one in that of certain other cities, and that they were more active in non-classical forms of music, sharing particularly in the tendency of Iranian musicians to participate in a variety of styles and strata of music.

Although in recent decades, professional musicians employed by government agencies have dominated the classical music culture, the ideal of amateur musicianship and its association with freedom of choice continued into the 1960s. But the Jewish musicians in Iran probably did not play much of a role in this ideal musical life, rarely being wealthy and hardly feeling free to do as they wished. Possibly their widespread willingness to change to a modernized style of performance when they moved to Israel was as much tied to their exclusion from musical amateurship and the associated leisurely and improvisational lifestyle as the contact they began, in Israel, to experience with other musics of that nation.

A small number of preliminary and tentative findings can be reported on the basis of the modest sampling of Israeli musicians of Iranian origin. It must be borne in mind first, however, that we are concerned mainly with those Iranians who had experience in Persian classical music. Most musicians of Iranian origin in Israel seem to have had some such knowledge and exposure, but only for a few had it been the principal form of musical activity in Iran, and for even fewer was it thus in Israel. We found ourselves dealing with a highly heterogeneous group of individuals, largely urban indeed, many residing in the Tel-Aviv area and in Jerusalem, but diverse in socio-economic status, level of education, maintenance of the Persian language and Iranian forms of behavior, length of residence in Israel and degree of contact with Iran. In our visits to the homes of members of the community we encountered everything from a social milieu almost indistinguishable from a Tehran setting to situations in which the Iranian origins were barely evident. Length of residence in Israel was a normal but not universal correlate of this continuum. Still, a small number of regularities appeared to emerge.

The Israeli musicians exhibited a wider variety of forms of the radif than seemed current in Iran at the same time, reinforcing the conclusion that a number of once separate traditions had recently been unified in Iran, while the more diverse forms continue to linger at least somewhat longer in the marginal survival of Israeli Persian musicianship. The types or origins of the traditions cannot really be identified in our small sample, and the divergences may in part be due to deterioration, forgetting, and random change in Israel. But to some extent the differences may also reflect earlier regional differences in Iran, where they had largely disappeared. Among our consultants we encountered differences of opinion regarding the identities of sections of the radif, of gushes and motifs. These disagreements were roughly parallel to those distinguishing older musicians in Tehran in the 1960s, and they presented a contrast with the more standardized view presented by younger musicians working in Tehran in the 1970s.

When asked to verbalize about or illustrate their knowledge of the radif, musicians in Israel typically exhibited rather fragmentary knowledge. They could play short sections of a few prominent dastgâhs, largely segâh, dashti, homâyun, mâhur, and chahârgâh, only a few gushes from each, and these in rather brief versions. Considering the fact that traditional Persian music was frequently learned in stages of increasing complexity, one may perhaps assume that these musicians had learned only the simpler versions or, at any rate, only remembered those. Conceivably, then, the more complex versions, often in Iran learned after the simple ones, had been forgotten, while those learned early in the musicians' careers of study were remembered longest.

It was possible to make recordings of portions of the radif itself, but more difficult to record improvisations based upon it;

and indeed, musicians did not easily draw the distinction. Some analysis of recordings indicates that the improvisations were brief and constituted what Safvate and Caron (1966:129) describe as the "lesser" kind of improvisation, consisting of embellished but not substantially altered or developed performances of the radif; the more elaborate extemporizations common in Iran seemed to be absent. The overall impression has to be that there had been, at the time of study, considerable impoverishment of the Persian tradition and particularly of the radif in Israel. The reasons no doubt include lack of occasion for performance, ambiguity of attitude towards the Iranian culture, and lack of a concentrated tradition due to the limited contact among musicians and also with the variety of Iranian traditions from which they had come.

In Iran, some of these musicians were full-fledged professionals, though rarely of great renown, and others had at least a certain degree of professional status and made part of their living in music. In Israel there developed the amateurization of musicianship. Previously professional musicians now made their living in other ways and played only rarely, and perhaps paradoxically, the amateur status that was prized by Muslims in Iran as the road to truly rewarding musicianship had the opposite result in Israel. The condition of Iranian musicianship in Israel around 1970 may possibly have represented a stage similar to the state of Iranian music before the coming of the large-scale urbanization and institutionalization that accompanied and was evidently essential to the development of the radif.

V. Exile: Notes on Iranian Music in the U.S.A.

by Bruno Nettl and Craig Macrae

During the period of 1965-1980, the culture of Persian music in the United States was largely confined to academic institutions, as a small number of departments that taught ethnomusicology sponsored visiting artists and teachers. The relatively small population of Iranian immigrants and Iranian-Americans took at best modest interest in the classical repertory. Beginning in the late 1970s, larger number of immigrants began to appear, and eventually populations in the hundreds of thousands congregated in certain urban centers such as Los Angeles, San Francisco, Houston, and New York. Smaller numbers of exiled Iranians, largely of middle-class and upper-middle class origins, came to live in urban and academic centers of the Midwest, such as Chicago, Indianapolis, Urbana-Champaign (Illinois) and Bloomington (Indiana).

Considering the difficulties experienced by musicians in Iran during the 1980s, it is not surprising that many distinguished musicians exiled themselves to Europe and North America. Hormoz Farhat (1990:121) wrote: “In today’s Persia, public musical life is non-existent, save for the so-called ‘revolutionary’ music which is in the service of the ideology of the state. All traditional musicians who were sustained through employment in radio and television, and as teachers in various schools, are out of work and are suffering intolerable deprivation. The harm that such dismal conditions have done to a musical tradition which does not rely on written symbols, and must be performed in order to live, is incalculable.” Farhat’s words were probably formulated well before the publication of his book and may have been out of date by 1990, by which time a substantial if rigorously controlled revival of musical life had taken place, and according to certain sources, the situation, especially as regards the maintenance of a private concert life, may never have been quite as bleak as he suggests (see also During 1984b). Nevertheless, the sudden change in attitude towards music after 1978, opposing public performance, Westernized (though not necessarily Western) musical styles, instrumental music, and performance by female artists, had an enormous impact in Iran and established a lively musical culture among emigré musicians and, since ca. 1990, through tours of groups of musicians from Iran itself.

At the time of writing, the authors of this sub-chapter are engaged in a study of musical life, and particularly of the role of classical music based upon the radif, in Midwestern communities. The very preliminary conclusions available so far include the following:

Persian classical music plays a much greater role in American communities than it did in middle-class Tehran about 1970. Individuals who took little part in traditional classical music, and whose musical life was more typically centered on Western or popular music, now maintain an interest. Concerts are major events, and Iranians travel great distances to hear them, indicating their respect for the occasion by lavish dressing and surrounding the concert with associated social events. A few Iranian musicians in large cities support themselves in part by teaching Iranian children and adults. Large numbers of recordings, pre-recorded cassettes and a few CDs, mainly from Iran but some produced in the U.S., and a few scholarly or informative publications, support the culture. At academic lectures on Persian music (including those given by non-Iranians), the number of Iranians in the audience has greatly increased since the late 1970s.

In Iranian social life, discussion of music plays a greater part than it did in Tehran of the 1970s.

Establishing an Iranian identity in the place of exile seems to be the principal function of the Persian classical music culture in North America. When asked about the reason for the proliferation of performances and the wide availability of recordings, Midwestern Iranians typically spoke of the need to preserve their identity as Iranians and to maintain the traditional culture, especially as it might be in a state of decline in Iran itself.

The relatively small number of people in Tehran, ca. 1970, involved in classical music tended to be rather well informed, knowing dastgâhs and gushes, recognizing the improvisatory styles of renowned performers, and often having had a bit of instruction. The greater breadth of the population of Iranian-Americans maintaining an interest in classical music suggests—and some interviews support this—that a good many people with little knowledge of the radif and of the niceties of performance practice are nevertheless enthusiastic about the music. Further, the interest in music on the part of Tehranians in 1970 was in some respects part of the movement to Westernization and therefore emphasized instrumental music and what we may call the technicalities of music, a kind of interest parallel to that of the Western-music aficionado in New York. By contrast, Iranians in the U.S., for whom Persian music functions as a reminder of the traditional culture of Iran, have come to increase their emphasis on vocal music, and perhaps on the related spiritual components of the music and its association with Sufism.

The pattern of Iranian musical life in the U.S. differs from that of most European and Asian immigrant groups who came to North America in the period just before and after 1900. These ethnic groups also sustained themselves through the increased practice of music and dance from the home country, but it was largely the music of rural communities, folk and vernacular music. The classical traditions of Spain, Italy, Russia, Scandinavia did not play a role as great as folk music. Moreover, the musical interests of immigrant groups from the Middle East—Syrians, Lebanese, Egyptians, Turks, Armenians, and Kurds—rarely centered on the classical traditions of these cultures, although classical traditions were available if not as readily distinct from vernacular musics. In its considerable interest in classical music, Iranian musical culture in the U.S. may be compared with that of Indians. The common ground may be the existence of a highly developed classical tradition already, in the homeland, kept rigorously separate from folk and popular traditions; and the fact that both Indian and Iranian immigrant groups are comprised of a large percentage of well-educated professionals and intellectuals. In India, these segments of the population tended to support Hindustani and Carnatic music with enthusiasm; but in Iran, the radif was less an object of interest and respect.

It is clear, however, that important differences in the attitudes towards Iranian music between Iranian immigrants to Israel and Iranians residing in North America result from the difference in attitude towards the host country and towards Iran, from the difference between immigration and exile. In ethnomusicology at large, many studies have focused on the role of music in immigrant communities; only few, Reyes-Schramm (1990) and Bohlman (1989) among them, have looked explicitly at the community in exile. In any event, a comprehensive explanation of Iranian musical life in North America must await further study.

CHAPTER X

PERSIAN MUSIC, SYMBOLS AND VALUES

Ethnomusicologists frequently contend that music reflects culture, and that a musical system must thus reflect important features of its particular culture. It is then a reasonable hypothesis based on this assumption that in a given culture, some aspect of music that reflects the central features of the cultural system is also in some ways central to the musical system. Such an approach to the relationship of music to the rest of culture is surely rather specialized and may be more instructive in certain cultures than in others, and inevitably it leads to conclusions that can only be described as broadly interpretive. It nevertheless seems appropriate to conclude this group of essays by examining the ways in which the radif of Persian music reflects important components of the culture of which it is a part.

For this purpose, I should like to lay before the reader what I perceive to be some similarities between certain broadly conceived characteristics of social behavior in urban Iran, as they could be observed around 1970 (but as they were also known to have existed for a long time before that) on the one hand, and on the other, the behavior of musicians in their music-making, and indeed of the music itself. I hope to show that these parallels lead us to the conclusion that the classical music system and the radif can be explained as a particular kind of symbol, or at least reflection, of Iranian society and its values, as they existed at that time. But can one briefly characterize an entire social system? There is actually no single, satisfactory ethnography of Iranians or of the city of Tehran, and so I must largely rely on my own observations. And in order to make my points, it seems most appropriate to be selective and even anecdotal. From a number of random observations, it seems possible to construct the beginning of a generalized statement.

I. Social Values

A sampling of incidents from my first days in Tehran, in 1966: I went to some stores and found in each a photo of the Shah (in 1985 it would instead be the Ayatollah Khomeini). I attended several meetings at the University of Tehran and found that those present were not usually willing to make decisions, wishing in each case to ask a higher figure who was not always present for guidance. These meetings began with ceremonial speeches, while the substance of discussion took place near the end, with people scurrying off. I took some walks and feared for my life because of the utterly unpredictable and, it seemed to me, highly impolite behavior of drivers. But I was struck, too, by the degree of politeness according to me by individuals whom I met, and noted that whenever two or three people entered a door, they paused first in order to determine with elaborate gestures who should go through the door first. I made some business appointments and was usually left to wait, sometimes for hours, for people to appear.

I also went to a party, fashionably late I thought, and found all of the other guests already present. I noticed a man walking on the street, with his wife walking several steps behind him. But I also noted that my hostess's female servant spoke to her with assurance and aggressiveness. I attended several meetings of a small group of university faculty members and found that each began as had the previous one, went on to cover the same ground in a slightly different manner, and ended inconclusively (perhaps a form of meeting not totally unknown in North America).

I attended a rather formal meeting with several deans and administrators; the president was present but spoke last and little. I bought a carpet; the salesman was voluble but looked to his boss, who silently nodded assent. I was brought to the Music Department of the University and surprised by being told that I was to sit on an examining committee on Persian music, a subject about which I then knew next to nothing. I went to a store, tried in my totally elementary Persian to make purchases, succeeded, and as I turned to leave, heard the salesman say, in excellent English, "Have a good day sir, it was a pleasure to meet you." And whenever I departed, goodbye was said many times, in many ways.

These impressions were of course repeated and amplified by further experiences, but they may perhaps serve to outline some of the major characteristics of Persian culture. Among them, I should like to discuss three, which can be abstracted as follows: 1) Social life moves within a rigid hierarchy, with a head who functions as the source of power, authority, and guidance. The nation looks to its head, the university to its president, the family to the father, directly and without much if any intermediate stages. 2) Persian culture is individualistic. Departure from norms of behavior is prized, and exact repetition is not. Constant variation of pattern is expected and accepted. A correlate is the value of surprise and unpredictability. People enjoy surprising each other and do not feel that it is important to know what is coming. 3) What is most important comes first in most ordinary situations, but as formality increases, the important person or act is likely to be preceded by introductory events or persons.

These characteristics are mentioned, at least incidentally, in much of the historical, sociological and political literature on Iran and in some cases on the Middle East in general, but I have not found them abstracted or summarized. Their relationship to political structure, religion, and economic development is of course stated here and there, and they are thought by some authors to be major obstacles to modernization. The extant literature tends to treat them normatively rather than structurally.

Such characteristics may also be regarded as socio-cultural values—a) hierarchy, b) individualism and unpredictability, and c) the framing of prominence. In stating it thus, I follow the basic assumption that there is in any culture a central core of values that are reflected in many domains of culture, including music, and the particular values mentioned here seem to me to be best reflected in the classical music of Iran. Other values—the diversity of the Iranian nation, the ambivalence between tradition and modernity, the increasing role of Western culture before 1978—might be reflected by folk, regional, modernized, popular musics; and in any event, they are not a subject for discussion here. The structure of the radif and of classical performances and the things that are particularly valued in these, reflect some of the important values in social behavior. The fact that classical music is a domain in which a rather small number of persons participates need not be an issue. In the first place, Iranians who did not hear or know the radif knew about it and, on the whole, expressed respect for it. Furthermore, we may take as a point of departure the belief that the great art works of a culture reflect its most fundamental values, something one may say with confidence, fearing only of the most vigorously populist contradiction about Michelangelo, Beethoven, and Shakespeare despite the fact that they are unknown to most persons who partake of Western culture. Whether the Iranian population feels a close connection between classical music and the essence of its culture is not an issue; it is possible in any event to suggest the structural relationships.

I now return to the three mentioned values of Persian society in order to see how, specifically, they are reflected in the musical structure of the radif and in the performances derived from it.

II. Hierarchy

The concept of hierarchy looms large in traditional Persian life (Levy 1965: 53, 68-71; Nasr 1966:166). But it is hierarchy in a special sense. Two conflicting structures strike the observer. First, but less important, is the most generally accepted version of the concept. There is a top echelon, and under it, several strata, each with power and influence over the next (Lambton 1970:74-75). It is a pyramid headed by the national symbol of leadership, the monarch, or, at present, the Faghih or Imam, and below whom there are ranks, beginning with aristocracy or of elevated clergy, down gradually to middle class and peasantry. Iranians in the 1960s thought of themselves as members of classes and had no trouble putting themselves into one of several categories (English 1966a:71). But the idea of strata and of descending levels of status and power also exist elsewhere. In extended families, it is represented by generation and wealth. In villages, concentric circles of an audience mark status groups. In musical life, performers may indeed rank colleagues in terms of quality of their knowledge and performance, grouping them in several categories. The importance of hierarchy in Persian culture, in clerical as well as political traditions—greater than in other Middle Eastern societies—is generally recognized (Nasr 1966:116) and noted.

But this rather traditional conception of hierarchy is overshadowed by a more special one, the concept of a unit or cell that looks to a single part or nucleus as its source of authority, power, and guidance (Jacobs 1966:24, 119, 177). Examples extend from high to low, all-encompassing to microcosmic. During my stay in Iran, citizens generally felt in some sense that they must turn to the shah directly for guidance—or, lacking an acceptable shah, another figure such as Khomeini—even if only vicariously, by seeing him driven by on the street or at a distance, in a crowd of a hundred thousand, the symbolize the immediacy of contact (Jacobs 1966:29, 59; Patai 1969:358, 413). More realistically, the president of a university is the source of power and makes vast numbers of decisions directly, without delegation, far more than his American counterpart. The father of a traditional family, nuclear or extended, is asked for permission to do almost anything. The village headman is concerned with details lofty and ridiculous.

The structure of authority exercised directly, of guidance sought from the ultimate source without intermediate delegation (Patai 1969:413; Lambton 1970:81; Jacobs 1966:259) seems to me to be related to another feature of social interchange, the need for personal appearance. Instead of saying to someone, "get it in writing," one is tempted to say, "get it through eye contact" (see Gallagher 1968:214 for comments on the value of immediacy in exchange in Islamic society). People remember faces better than names.

Direct access to authority is a significant feature of Islam in general (Levy 1965:55); but in Shi'ite Iran it is modified by the presence of an intermediary, the Twelfth Imam. (And indeed, as already suggested, Islam in Iran is more hierarchical than elsewhere.) Even so, all men are equal before God, there are no true priests who mediate, only teachers. The point is that the Iranian, it seems to me, wishes direct access to the source of guidance and thus structures society as a group of units, each with its own authority, these units of many kinds, overlapping, and existing at various levels and in varying sizes. So perhaps the Persian's perception of the social universe can be abstracted thus: 1) All are equal, but this is a theory, and life doesn't really work that way. 2) The real world, overriding this theory, consists of classes defined by wealth, descent, education, symbolized by dress, mode of transportation, location of residence. Indeed, going further, of any two individuals, one is always clearly the superior. 3) This disparity between the ideal and the real is mitigated by the practice of seeking direct contact with the source of authority and the expectation of guidance from it.

The radif musically reflects these three statements and the tensions among them, reflecting as well their relative prominence:

> **a)** All sections of the radif are said to be equally the source of improvisation and composition. Informant-teachers usually say this first, and the ethnomusicological literature reflects this initial impression (Zonis 1973:62; Tsuge 1974:29; Gerson-Kiwi 1963:14; but see also Modir 1986:73 for a different view of the relationship between radif, improvisation, and composition). We have pointed out that the radif is described in most of the literature as a group of units—dastgâhs and gushes—which are equally

capable of becoming true music. This is the basic theory of music, as equality of humans is the basic theory of life. But music, like life, doesn't really work that way.

b) The materials in the radif are readily evaluated by teachers and musicians as having different degrees of importance. The criteria are varied, and I shall refer to some of them later. But as you learn the radif, you quickly find that some parts are stressed, dastgâhs and gushes singled out for special attention and mention (see e.g. Farhat 1965:32, 50; Zonis 1973:83, 85). And parts said to be important by your master turn out also to be more prominent in terms of frequency of appearance, position, and length in improvisations as well. In Figure C-l, the appearance of gushes in improvised performances of the dastgâh of chahârgâh illustrate this trend.

c) Most important, the relationship of authority to derived action is reproduced in the radif at various levels. The radif is composed of—but is also a part of—a system of cells, large and small, in which there is a source of musical authority on which other materials are directly based, the musical authority providing, as it were, immediate guidance to the musician for further action. The following five structures are related somewhat as if they were concentric circles.

> **1)** The entire career of a musician can actually be viewed in this way. He first learns the radif, and when he has completed its study some years hence is he said to be ready to improvise, without further instruction. The

radif itself does the instructing. Throughout your career as a musician, you practice and restudy and contemplate the radif, although you do not play or sing it in public since it is only a source of musical authority, not music itself.

2) Three musicians mentioned to me an ideal way of studying the radif. Three versions should be learned; the first version, which is said to contain the most important materials but is in fact the shortest, can in a sense be seen as the authority for the other, more extended versions.

3) The radif itself contains sections of authority on which other material is based. We have discussed the various orders and here only recapitulate: the most common order of teaching begins with shur, which is followed by the satellites of shur, and near the end of the dastgâh, navâ recapitulates some material from shur. Homâyun appears before its satellite, bayât-e esfahân, and some of its material is recapitulated in rast-panjgâh, always appearing near the end. In the musicians' evaluations of dastgâhs, the derivative materials have lower degrees of significance, and the position of shur, the ubiquity of its melodies, and the large number of associated materials, as well as the explicitly Iranian character as described by some musicians lend to this dastgâh a role of authority over the entire radif.

4) The role of darâmad as authority for material throughout the dastgâh must be noted as well; and its frequent reappearance as well as its recapitulatory function makes it into a microcosmic version of shur.

5) Many gushes exhibit the same structure in microcosm, as we have seen; a kind of mini-darâmad, a short theme or motif, functions as generating force for material that follows.

The system may also be viewed as a series of concentric circles, a form of classification otherwise prominent in Islamic cosmology (Levy 1965:458-98). But more important, the arrangement must be seen in the light of a musical system in which improvisation, based on some kind of musical authority, requires constant guidance. The musicians, like society at large, first pays lip service to the theory of equality among musical units in the radif, then goes on to articulate the class structure or continuum in music, and then works out an elaborate system for reconciling the two by establishing at many levels direct contact between the common musical phenomenon and the source of musical authority from which it is derived.

III. Individualism and Surprise

In many of its aspects, Persian culture is individualistic, reflecting release from the hierarchical social structure and paralleling the principle of direct contact between individual and God in the Islamic egalitarianism (Levy 1965:55). The radif, in its structure, is a curiously closed system, said in fact to be perfect, so that nothing may be added to it. But in a secondary sense, it and the music that it generates reflect individualism. Three illustrations may clarify:

a) Nour-Ali Boroumand, when teaching in the United States, searched for a metaphor from nature to explain the character of this strange material he was about to impart to uncomprehending Americans. The symbol upon which he drew was the singing of the nightingale, as this bird, thought to be particularly common in Iran, is indeed widely used as a symbol of things Persian, Persian in tradition and essence, a symbol of things that are good and beautiful, and particularly of Persian classical music. The reason given for the musical association is the theory that the nightingale, which sings constantly, does not repeat itself. And in Persian music, one must not, so Boroumand said, repeat anything precisely (unless one has the role of accompanist, when precise repetition of the soloist's phrases is required). Thus, in the radif itself, exact repetition is also said to be absent—and is in fact not common at all.

Now, in fact, both nightingales and Persian musicians do repeat themselves. The radif, however, actually contains very little in the way of precise repetition, but it does include a great deal of variation—the same material is presented in several ways, many times, all slightly different. Examples have been provided in the preceding studies—variation of a five-note motif, the use of several versions of a darâmad, the use of variations (such as maghlub or shur-e bâlâ) to divide a dastgâh, derivative and recapitulatory dastgâhs. Even the ways in which an improvisor renders an âvâz of any dastgâh throughout his life can be interpreted as a set of variations upon the radif, which then becomes, in effect, a set of variations. Similarly, social life provides examples of variation carried to unexpected degrees. When Iranians hold series of meetings, they see no harm, but virtue, in covering the same ground many times, in slightly different ways (Jacobs 1966:257). They find a dozen ways of saying goodbye.

But while variation is preferred to precise repetition, the redundancy it provides is a sign of lower status. Thus the derivative dastgâhs of shur are relatively unimportant, and the most redundant—râst-panjgâh and navâ—are rarely used and often subject to defensive statements (Caron and Safvate 1966:74) which underscore their low significance.

b) We have had numerous occasions to discuss the attitude of musicians who say, when they teach the radif, that certain of its parts are more important than others. One criterion of importance appears to be departure from some norm. I am not sure whether we have a chicken-and-egg situation, whether what is important may be permitted to depart from a norm, or whether this departure, arrived at by chance, is later singled out for attention. But among the gushes that are regarded as "important" in a dastgâh, a disproportionate number turn out to depart from an established norm in terms at least of tonality. Viewing the radif diachronically for a moment, exceptional gushes seem to have become independent because of their idiosyncratic character, and thus to gain the significance that gave them status as at least minor dastgâhs.

No doubt, in Iranian society, the identity of the chicken is clear. The person who holds high status is permitted individualistic behavior more readily than another. We might expect this to be a cultural universal, and no doubt it is widespread. But then, we must also take into account contrastive situations such as Hindu society, in which the high castes must obey many rules, their conformity itself a mark of high status, while untouchables may or even must in certain ways transgress, possibly becoming "untouchable" for that very reason. The parallel has limitations and is used only to point out that license need not be a universal appurtenance of high social status. In Iran, the theory that "rank has its privileges" is widely accepted and recognized. Musicians are in the first instance evaluated in large measure in accordance with their knowledge of the radif and their adherence to its rules. But it follows that the higher the status of a musician and the greater his personal authority (which is assumed from his knowledge of the radif), the more likely it is that his departure from the rules in a performance will be tolerated or even welcomed by other musicians.

c) The value of improvisation as compared to the performance of composed pieces plays a role here. There is an interesting contrast between this major musical value of the Middle East, along with the related concept of variation, and its Western counterparts—precise repetition and radical innovation. This major difference between Middle Eastern and Western values reflect patterns in other forms of behavior. Stress on technological innovation, contrasting with precise repetition needed in the production of manufactured goods, goes hand in hand with a musical culture in which a composer is expected to produce a symphony which is really new and different from all that has gone before, but which, once composed, must be performed precisely the same way each time. Traditional Middle Easterners appear to prefer to have life and music both following a middle course, avoiding radical innovation as well as precise repetition. But given that the Middle Eastern musical systems are complex, the value of improvisation is not exhibited simply by its presence (as not all music, of course, is improvised) but rather by the prestige it enjoys when it does appear.

Rather than assuming that radical innovation and standardization were absent in the Iranian tradition because the technology, musical and industrial, was not available to bring them about, I suggest that the preference for improvisation is a matter of values. Persians can compose and can repeat, and they do both. But in the classical performance, the central, most important section is the âvâz, an improvisation surrounded by composed pieces with lower status.

Incidentally, while I am using music and culture as static models for convenience, it is necessary to point out the importance of musical change as a result of and as an index to culture change. It is instructive to note that the âvâz has in the last two decades become less thoroughly improvised but is more likely to be largely memorized. And in the course of this, it has also come to be viewed as less important in relationship to the composed pieces that precede and follow it in performance. Of course, parallels may be found in ordinary behavior as well; personal schedules being tighter, even farewells are reduced. The Western contrast between repetition and innovation is becoming established. Life as a set of variations recedes, and there are hardly any nightingales left in Tehran. And yet: individualism, prized in Iran, is reflected in the centrality of improvisation in the traditional classical music, in the high ranking of the exceptional and the low status of the redundant, and in the theory that repetition is forbidden while reference to authority is rendered through variation of a theme.

All societies have predictable and less predictable behavior, and predictability itself may be a positive or negative value. In Iranian society, unpredictability and surprise seem to me to be positive values. Having given some examples earlier, I wish only to repeat that the traditional Iranian sees little reason to apologize for being late, since the possibility of tardiness is something to be expected, and that he loves to surprise you in any of a number of pleasant, unpleasant, frequently startling ways. In rhetoric as in behavior, sudden departures are usual.

The value of surprise is no doubt related to the correlation of license with high status. Now, most of the kinds of music that one hears in Iran do not particularly reflect this trait. But the classical music system does so in a number of ways, some of which have already been touched upon: the unexpected is good, the surprising note or rhythm in the radif is prized, and the value placed on improvisation, itself a system essentially of surprise, is an obvious correlate. In a dastgâh, unusual gushes are particularly significant and occupy more time than others. Those that are least metric and most prone to far-flung fantasy are rated most highly, while the rhythmic predictability in a gushe suggesting a metric basis, with a recurrent beat, confers lower status than the rhythmically unpredictable non-metric counterpart. In improvising, the musician who surprises most without completely violating the system is praised. Possibly in music as in life, surprise provides relief from the pressure of authority. The classical system balances the two.

IV. The Position of Authority

The third value that I should like to discuss is a bit difficult to articulate in a word, but it involves the framing of significant portions of an event. We want to understand patterns in events in which the handling of time is significant. We want to know, for any culture, where the main course comes in a meal, at what point we have reached the climax in a religious service, where the general marches in a parade, when we can expect to hear the pièce de résistance in a concert. This is an aspect of life hardly discussed in the literature on Iranian culture and society, but it plays a significant role in determining musical structure.

I have already mentioned the importance of relative rank, the countervailing value of individualism and the related one of surprise. We have identified what is important and found some of the criteria. The question now is where the important portions of an event are placed. Here is my approach: I should like to view Persian society as a continuum of relationships, the nuclear, perhaps skeletal, being that of two individuals who are members of a family, going on to larger groups and less closely related people, and further to large, formal ceremonies attended perhaps by thousands. Equality, as I said, is a basic theory of life; but in practice, any two persons have different status, and the frequent visual and auditory representation of this difference is an essential component of behavior. How is it symbolized? The more basic, skeletal, nuclear the relationship, the more it will be articulated by the temporal precedence of the person with higher status. Traditional husband and wife proceed in single file, husband first; father goes through the door before son, with no ceremony. But when two university colleagues come to a door, the situation is a bit more formal and they pretend to urge each other to go first, although it is known from the beginning that the full professor must precede his untenured friend.

Of course, the particular context of the situation may also affect status relationships. An anecdote may illustrate. I was completing a recording session with an elderly kamânche player. Normally, I would have been the person with higher status: a foreigner, a guest, with high income by Iranian standards, a professor, wearing a reasonably new suit, in a position to pay this musician for his services; he, a master of the radif to be sure, but impecunious, living in a poor section of the city, poorly dressed, known to be an opium user, a man with no steady job, member of a low-status profession. Had there been no musical bond, and had we simply been acquaintances shopping in the bâzâr, I would have had to take precedence. But this was a musical context, his “turf,” and I was in a sense his student, so when we left the room together we played the "Alfonse and Gaston" game for a while, and then he slipped through the door before me. New in Tehran, I was not aware of the subtleties, and feel that I was simply lucky; only later was I told that the musician would have been mortified if I had gone before him. It would have been an imposition of outside or non-musical values on a musical relationship, and a denigration of his status as a musical authority.

Between two people, the more important goes first, but as formality increases, the amount of activity introductory to the essence also increases. And not only is introductory activity involved, introductory personnel may also be injected. Thus, in a formal set of negotiations, an agent, go-between, spokesman is likely to be present. One way of exhibiting status is to bring a retinue that speaks for you. A businessman may bring one assistant who, however, is likely to do most of the talking. In large ceremonial situations, the most important person speaks late if at all. Formal lunches begin with endless tea and cookies. In my fieldwork, I found my status enhanced if someone accompanied me and made initial explanations in my behalf, while I began to speak later in the game.

The classical system reflects this set of relationships in a particularly clear way. The radif is skeletal, the nuclear, basic portion of the musical system, and within it, what is important comes first; the radif itself is learned at the beginning of music study. The most important gushe in a dastgâh precedes the others. Status as explained in my discussion of authority and hierarchy is reflected in temporal precedence. And I am not simply inferring importance from position, for this importance is confirmed by informants who use criteria of length, novelty, frequency of use in true performance.

By contrast, when this radif, which one learns in a one-to-one relationship with a teacher and practices alone, is translated into public performance, a more formal situation, it is preceded by improvised material. In a concert, the âvâz, the improvisation based most directly on the radif, is performed after one or two composed pieces. The more formal the concert, the longer, more numerous, and more prominent as well these parts of the musical retinue. The radif itself is the basic skeleton of Persian classical music and thus behaves like the family, the basic skeleton of society. The music of a public concert, in part based on the radif, is structured like other public social events.

V. A Symbol of the Social Core of Culture

Much of what I have said about the ways in which certain social values of Iran are reflected in the structure of Persian classical music applies also to Middle Eastern Muslim society at large. But it applies particularly and sometimes exclusively to Iran. My final question is whether this musical system can itself properly be interpreted as a symbol, beyond being merely a reflection.

While social life may be bound, by its very nature, to obscure the values that underlie it, the Iranian classical music system renders these values clearly and in relatively unobstructed form. To the Iranian who knows the system, it articulates the values of life, and the tensions among these values, more definitively than does the social behavior that he observes. It reflects the central values better than do the many other musics which are known to him. Not many Iranians know the classical music, but we have seen that many have strong opinions about it, positive and negative, and regard it as something belonging especially to Iranian culture, good in the view of the tradition-minded, undesirable in the eyes of those who wish for rapid social change, something to be avoided by the devout Shi'ite, but special to all. Musicians to whom I spoke about the matter insisted on its special Persianness.

Thus, I wish to suggest, first, that this classical music is a symbol that abstractly represents the social core of culture, while other musics and arts may symbolize or reflect other, less central values. And second, that it symbolizes the traditional way of life in an environment that was, in the 1970s, changing daily. The avoidance of social change since 1978 may be significantly related to the absence of a significant role for classical (as well as popular) music. The radif and the classical music system reflects and distills what is socially central and what is traditional. It is a symbol representing an ideal and is for that reason regarded by the most conservative musicians as perfect at least in theory, unalterable, complete, a closed system. The radif and the music derived from it thus functions as the musical sector of the Great Tradition of Iran, an elite tradition which, in its relationships to the "little" folk and regional traditions throughout Iran, served for much of the twentieth century as a force reflecting and integrating the national culture.