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Abstract

This article reveals the origins of the famous 12 maqams and 24 shu’beh in the treatises of: unknown author “Siratu asrori il-ilahiya”, Kawkabi, Husayni and Jami. The theoretical views of these authors are compared.

Purpose: In addition to studying the science of music that developed in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries through the example of the treatise “Siratu asrori il-ilahiya”, it consists in identifying the theoretical works that contributed to the development of the art of music.

Method: Such methods of research and analysis as classification, comparative-historical method were used to cover the topic.

Result: By comparing the scientific heritage of medieval scholars, a number of theoretical views of Eastern musicology are clarified;

Scientific novelty: The manuscript “Siratu asrori il-ilahiyya” and the treatises of Qawkabi, Jami and Husayni were compared for the first time.
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Introduction

Musicological sources and rare manuscripts directly or indirectly related to them occupy a special place in the world scientific heritage. These works take various forms (a separate chapter may be devoted to musicology) or as an independent treatise (from the 7th to the 20th century) in Persian, Arabic and Turkic languages. Scholar A. Djumaev “In the evolution of maqamat in the Middle Ages, three main historical periods can be distinguished: the VI–VII centuries, from the XIII to the XVI centuries, and from the XVI to the beginning of the XX century. The system of maqamat is relatively stable at all times” (Dzhumadeev A., 1987).

The text of the manuscript does not give any information about the time of its writing and the name of the author. However, at the beginning of the treatise the author says that it was written from the mouth of the teacher Darvesh Fazlullahi Noya “(date of birth unknown, died in Samarkand, 1511, Herat). So, if approximately, it corresponds to the end of the 15th – beginning of the 16th centuries (it should be noted that the author of the manuscript may have been a contemporary of Qawkabi (147x-1533)). The text of the manuscript has survived in relatively good
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condition. The text of the treatise shows that the author not only limits himself to theoretical knowledge, but also expresses his practical views in the manuscript.

The Main part

But know that the teachers consulted among themselves from each maqom and took two shu’ba (divisions) from each maqom. One was from the top and the other from the bottom. And they are as follows: The first is Dugah, the second is Segah, the third is Chargah, the fifth is Buzruk, the sixth is Isfahan, the seventh is Haft, the eighth is Humayun, the ninth is Sakiy, the tenth is Ajam, and the eleventh Ashiro is also read as Ashuro. The twelfth is Muhayyir, the thirteenth is Raqb, the fourteenth is Ruyi Iraq, the fifteenth is Burqa, the sixteenth is Mohur, the seventeenth is Makorak, the eighteenth is Maglub, the nineteenth is Awj, the twenty is Zawil, the twenty-one Navruzi. Khora, twenty-two Navruzi Arab, twenty-three Navruzi Sabo, the twenty-fourth is Nishapurak” (Author unknown, No. 8739/III: The title of the treatise is also unknown. Manuscript, F. A. Abu Rayhan Beruni Institute of Oriental Studies No. 8739/III).

The author of the manuscript provides information that qualified masters consulted among themselves and received two shu’ba from each maqom (i.e. from 12 maqoms), one from the upper fret and one from the lower fret. If we turn to other sources of this theory, D. Rashidova states that “Kawkabi as well as Jami shows that the division of each maqom into upper and lower harmonies resulted in 24 shu’bae” (Dilbar Rashidova, 1981). In Changi’s treatise “In general, each maqom consists of two subdivisions (shu’bae); one consists of the lower harmonies of the maqom and the other of the upper harmonies” (Semenov’s A.A., 1946) – the above opinion is also confirmed.

Hussaini in his treatise wrote: “Know that practising musicologists call some sound harmonies (jam’), intervals and tones shu’beh. The total number of shu’beh is twenty-four and they are as follows: Dugah, Segah, Chorgah, Panjgah, Ashira, Nowruz-i Arab, Mohur, Nowruz-i Hora, Nowruz-i Bayati, Hisar, Nuhuft, Razal, Auj, Niriz (Nairiz), Mubarka, Rakb, Saba, Humayun, Zawula, Isfahanak-i, Rui Iraq, Bastanigor, Nihovand, Khuzi (Muhayyir)” (Semenov’s A.A., 1946) think of shu`ba as a sound harmony and interval. They approach the maqams from a mathematical point of view, they describe them as derived from lower or higher maqams, as in the manuscript. Each is described by schematic drawings with tones and intervals. Before direct interpretation, we felt it necessary to show the letter schematic structure of the oud and how it was shown in Husseini’s letter system. This musical instrument was used by medieval musicologists to describe the structure of the famous twelve maqams.

Scholars used this method to record the maqams because it was not possible to record maqam melodies and songs more conveniently, so the authors of the treatise were only able to show the justified fret of the maqams. The scholars drew the strings and fret of the oud on paper and labelled the maqams with the letters used to define them.

In Kawkabi the first is Zavuli, the following are Avj, Navruz Horo and Mokhur. In the manuscript the name of the fifth shu’ba is Buzruk. If we look at the sixth number, here comes Isfahanak, and in Jami and Husayni Navruz Arab, in Kawkabi Navruz Sabo, then comes Haft, which, it should be noted, also does not appear in the above treatises. Humayun goes number eight, Navruz Horo in Jami and Husayni, Royi Iraq in Kawkabi. In the treatise the next number is Sakiyyah, in Jami and Husayni’s Navruz Bayat, in Kawkabi’s Nayriz. Ajam is tenth in the manuscript, Hisar in Jami and Husayni, Nishoburak in Kawkabi.

Ashiran is the next shu’bah, Raqb at Kawkabi and Nuhuft at Nayriz, Jami and Husayni. The twelfth shu’beh is Muhayyar, Ghazzal in Jami, Razal in Husayni, and Nishoburak in Qawkabi. The next shu’beh in the manuscript is Rakb, the same number is found in Kawkabi, Awj in Jami and Husayni. The fourteenth number is Royi Iraq, Nuhuft in Kawkabi, Nayriz in Jami and Husayni.

The next in the treatise are Burka’, Mubaraka’ in Jami and Husayni (Mubarki’ is given in Boldyrev’s translation), Chorgoh in Kawkabi. Mokhur is sixteenth in order, Uzzol in Kawkabi, Navruz Horo in Jami and Husayni. The next shu’beh in the manuscript is Makorak, Sabo in Jami and Husaysini, Nowruz Arab
in Qawkabi. In the eighteenth issue, the author cites the shu'beh of Maghlub, Ajam in Kawkabi, Humayun in Jami and Husayni.

The next number in the treatise is Avj, in Jami and Husayni Zovuli, in Kawkabi Dugoh. In the twentieth shu'bah of the manuscript, Zawul, in Qawkabi Ajam, in Jami and Husayni the next is Isfahanak or Royi Iraq, in Qawkabi Muhayyar. The next shu'beh by number is Navruz Horo, Segoh in Kawkabi, Bastai Nigor in Jami and Husayni.

The twenty-second number is Navruz Arab, in Jami and Husaini Nihovand, Kawkabi Hisar. Next in the manuscript is Navrozi Sabo, in Jami’s Jawzii, in Husaini Semenov’s translation goes Husii, there may be suppositions that it could be Jawzii, Araban, and in Kawkabi Segoh. The last twenty-fourth number is Nishapurak, Jami’s Muhayyar and Husayni and Khisar in Kawkabi.

“But Khoja Kamoliddin Abdulqadir Hawzi is known among many teachers and mentioned him for his unity. And others have recited the messages of Ruyi Iraq in different places, particularly (minbaram), Dugohi Rost and Nigori Yaq. And its melody (mood) is such that the voice of Roeya Iraq should sound higher than the voice of Iraq on the instrument of dutar. And some people call “Zovil” “Garramon.” And this is because “Zovil” is between “Ushshak” and “Nawo”. So it is correct to call it “Garramon”. They say “Nowruz Arab” as “Garramon” (Author unknown, No. 8739/III: The title of the treatise is also unknown. Manuscript, F.A. Abu Rayhan Beruni Institute of Oriental Studies No. 8739/III).

Discussion

If we directly analyse the practical and theoretical views given in Husayni’s and Jami’s treatises on the twenty-four shu’ba, it becomes clear that the scholars lived and worked almost at the same time (Jami 1414–1492, Husayni 1463–1519) and Jami’s treatise was written directly at the request of Alisher Navoi, “Navoi himself in his book “Khamsatu-l-mutaҳayyiriin” says that Kulmuhammad during his apprenticeship was very talented, that he learnt everything and played the instrument well, and that four musical treatises were written for him, four great teachers, but these treatises did not satisfy him and then he asked Mulla Jami to write a fifth treatise” (Fitrat A., 1993).

In a short preface to his treatise “Kanun” (i.e. Guidelines) Husseini wrote: “This treatise contains both the practical part and the musical theory (Hussaini wrote: “This treatise contains both the practical part and the musical theory. I have compiled this work at the request of some of my friends and I present this treatise to that sage by whose grace the world received a sweet melody (Navoi) (the author alludes to the poetic pseudonym of Alisher Navoi, and then the author gives a poem glorifying Navoi)” (Zainulabidin ibn Muhammad bin Mahmud ul-Husseini.1a).

Both treatises are directly or indirectly related to Alisher Navoi. It is evident from the above that the capital moved from Samarkand to Herat, and people of art moved towards this centre, and several treatises were created under Navoi’s patronage.

In the treatise “Kitab al-Adwar” by Safiuddin al-Urmawi there are a lot of similarities regarding the terms 24 shu’ba listed by Jami and Husayni, and his predecessor and one of the main sources of that time, the author of the treatise “Jome ul-alhan” and “Maqsid ul-alhan” by Abdul Qadir Marogi also met these terms.

Conclusion

In comparing Husayni’s and Jami’s treatises, similarities in their general orientation have been observed, but their partial differences in some theoretical or practical views are also found. The creation of these treatises is a clear example of the fact that the demand for music theory was extremely high during the period when scholars lived and worked. In addition to music theory, scholars have also scrutinised practical knowledge. It can be said that there are opinions of scholars that deny each other and the difference that arose in the elucidation of this theory. It should be recognised that both treatises were written in the time of Alisher Navoi, directly or indirectly, with his support and patronage or dedicated to him.
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