

MUSICAT: A COMPUTER MODEL OF  
MUSICAL LISTENING AND ANALOGY-MAKING

Eric Paul Nichols

Submitted to the faculty of the University Graduate School  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree  
Doctor of Philosophy  
in the Departments of Computer Science and Cognitive Science,  
Indiana University  
December 2012



Accepted by the Graduate Faculty, Indiana University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy.

Doctoral Committee:

---

Dr. Douglas R. Hofstadter  
(Principal Adviser)

---

Dr. Eric Isaacson

---

Dr. Donald Byrd

---

Dr. Michael Gasser

December 7, 2012



Copyright © 2012

Eric Paul Nichols



For Helga and Steve





## Acknowledgements

So many people have been friends and colleagues, providing emotional and academic support over my eight years in Bloomington, it seems difficult to list them all. Please accept my apologies for any omissions.

First, I would like to thank my immediate family for a lifetime of support: my parents Ann and Clay and my three little sisters Jenni, Sara, and Julie. I'm lucky to have fairly frequent communication with everyone thanks to email and cell phones; in a way I feel closer to my family in Bloomington, thanks to technology, than when I was an undergraduate at Montana State in Bozeman. A side note: my mom used to run a cat-breeding business, and we gave musical names to all the cats. The business was named "Mewsicats Cattery", an amusing source of inspiration for the name of my project (Musicat).

Second, I owe a debt of gratitude to a host of my professors at Indiana University. My first class in Bloomington was an excellent artificial intelligence course taught by David Leake that got me off to a great start. Soon after I started at IU, Chris Raphael joined the faculty, and after auditing some of his courses, he and I had some very successful collaborations on various music informatics projects. I consider him an unofficial member of my thesis committee, and I'm happy about the hours of mathematical and musical discussions we've had over the years. My official committee has also been extremely helpful. Eric Isaacson taught a seminar on Music Cognition during my first semester, which, in combination with Dr. Leake's course, was a perfect way to start my grad school career; it gave me a great introduction to the field. Mike Gasser's courses on biologically-inspired computing and natural language processing were also extremely insightful. Don Byrd was a great musical presence in Music Informatics group meetings and at ISMIR conferences, and always has given me great feedback on this project. Finally, it goes without saying that my

main advisor, Doug Hofstadter, has been a tremendous influence — not only during my eight years at IU, but indeed ever since I was 18 and started reading *Gödel, Escher, Bach*. I'm especially grateful that he made it possible for me to tag along to Paris in 2010 — *il m'a emmené dans ses valises*, as they say — when he spent a semester there on sabbatical. I expected to learn about artificial intelligence when I came to Bloomington, but Doug actually taught me about cognitive science, communication, writing, and even French pronunciation, among many other things. It's truly been an honor and a privilege!

Third, thanks to my many grad student compatriots from Bloomington: current and past students including Mike Brady, Trista Chan, Annet Czeglédi, Yupeng Gu, Yushen Han, Chris Harshaw, Chris Honey, Andrew Kalafut, Ian Knopke, Olga Rass, and Toshi Uchino; fellow FARGonauts Dave Bender, Harry Foundalis, Ben Kovitz, Francisco Lara-Dammer, Abhijit Mahabal, Damien Sullivan, and Will York; and cyclists extraordinaires George Kachergis and Richard Veale. While in Paris, although I was only there for a semester, I was fortunate to make four great friends: Cinthia Altieri, Tatiana Catanzaro, Rim Roudies, and Junie Terrier. Special thanks to my FARGonaut friends and housemates Matthew Hurley and Alexandre Linhares, both of whom were extremely influential in both my academic and personal life — many great discussions, fun times, crazy projects, and general hilarity!

Fourth, I would like to thank my other close friends in Bloomington (and elsewhere), who formed a sort of surrogate extended family. Alia Alkasimi quickly became my best friend and we've remained like family even after she moved out of town — *merci pour tous, liwliw*. She has also been one of the best sources of moral support helping me succeed with this dissertation, not to mention life in general. Other dear friends include Annika Wallendahl, Lisa Cooper, Zach Saul, Jing Pan, Claire Houck and her dog Jonie, the musically gifted, wonderful Welsh girl Sara Angharad, the incomparable human Lindsay “Z” Arcurio, my “alien twin” Quynh Neutron, my extreme-waltz partner Katherine Wiley, and, of course, the

amazing and artistic musician Priscilla Borges — *obrigado por todos as cores!* Thanks to you all for all the support, friendship, and love.

Finally, on a more somber note, thanks are due to both Helga Keller and Steve Larson, but unfortunately they both passed away in 2011 — a double blow to the CRCC family. Every dissertation like this one from FARG mentions Helga's support and contribution to the Center and her great impact on the lives of the graduate students at FARG. Helga was instrumental in my decision to come to Indiana University, not only by putting me in touch with Doug Hofstadter via phone but also by sending me a surprisingly large collection of CRCC technical reports, which made me very excited to move to Bloomington. Throughout my Ph.D., she was a tremendous help with administrative matters, including lots of extra work on an NSF grant application, but more importantly I enjoyed dinner parties she hosted, a campus tour she gave to my parents, random conversations on quiet days at the office, and a spontaneous road trip to southern Indiana with her and Howard. Helga's presence at CRCC, and in Bloomington, is deeply missed.

Steve Larson, like Helga, directly influenced my decision to come to IU. We met online when he responded to a discussion group post in which I asked where I should apply to grad school. He recommended that I read *Fluid Concepts and Creative Analogies* and encouraged me to apply to IU in Bloomington. We met in person in Eugene, Oregon and discussed his Seek Well project, which led to this dissertation. My meetings in person and via phone with Steve over the years were extremely valuable and his ideas will continue to influence those of us in music cognition for years to come. Thanks, and so long, Steve.

In addition to all the social support mentioned above, I would also like to acknowledge several sources of financial support for this work. I was generously supported by fellowships from CRCC and from the Music Informatics program at IU, as well as by NSF Grant IIS-0738384, awarded by the NSF's CreativeIT program.



Musicat: A Computer Model of Musical Listening and Analogy-Making

What happens when people listen to music? What sorts of mental structures are formed? How do we make sense of a melody as its notes fly by in rapid succession? Can we model the experience of listening to music in real time?

This dissertation describes the computer program Musicat, which was designed to explore these questions. Musicat is a model of real-time melody perception by people. The program “listens” to monophonic Western tonal melodies one note at a time (presented not as audio recordings, but rather in a symbolic form much like sheet music) and generates an internal representation of the musical structures it “hears”. These structures include groups of adjacent notes, meta-groups comprised of smaller groups, expectations for upcoming structures, and, most importantly, analogies between groups (and meta-groups) of various sizes. In the model, listening is not a passive process; instead, it is an active, dynamic process of creating mental structures. Thus when Musicat listens to a melody, I consider such an act to be creative, and I call it a “listening performance”.

Musicat follows in the tradition of previous computer models of the Fluid Analogies Research Group: it is based on the architectures of Copycat, Tabletop, and related programs, with modifications made to accommodate music’s temporal nature. In addition to giving a technical discussion of Musicat’s architecture, this dissertation includes copious examples of the program’s listening performances on a variety of melodies ranging from simple children’s songs to more complex popular-song forms. A discussion of the results suggests that Musicat captures several previously unmodeled aspects of musical listening, such as analogy-making and hierarchical grouping in real time, but that much more work is needed to achieve humanlike listening performances on even the simplest of melodies.



# Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	ix
Table of Contents.....	xv
List of Figures.....	xxiii
List of Tables .....	xxxii
<b>CHAPTER ONE</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
Whence Musicat? .....	1
What is Musicat? .....	2
Wherefore Musicat?.....	4
Music-listening as Performance .....	5
Music-listening is Dynamic.....	5
Music-listening is a Creative Process.....	8
Music-listening is Not a Universal Talent .....	12
Overview of this Dissertation .....	14
Whither Musicat?.....	15
<b>CHAPTER TWO</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>WORK THAT HAS INFLUENCED THIS PROJECT</b>	<b>17</b>
Models of Melodic Expectation and Cognition .....	17
Leonard Meyer .....	17
Eugene Narmour.....	22
Adam Ockelford.....	30

Olivier Lartillot .....	31
Fred Lerdahl and Ray Jackendoff.....	33
Fred Lerdahl.....	37
Diana Deutsch and John Feroe.....	39
David Temperley .....	40
Elizabeth Margulis.....	42
David Huron.....	46
Bob Snyder.....	50
Steve Larson .....	58
Musical Rhythm.....	67
Dirk-Jan Povel and Peter Essens .....	68
Emilios Cambouropoulos.....	69
William Rothstein .....	70
FARG.....	75
Copycat (Melanie Mitchell).....	76
Metacat (James Marshall) .....	81
Numbo (Daniel Defays) .....	81
Tabletop (Robert French) .....	83
Letter Spirit (Gary McGraw and John Rehling).....	86
Phaeaco (Harry Foundalis) .....	87
Seek-Whence (Marsha Meredith) and Seqsee (Abhijit Mahabal) .....	87
Seek Well (Steve Larson) .....	89
Capyblanca (Alexandre Linhares) .....	91



<b>CHAPTER THREE</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>MUSICAT’S DOMAIN</b>	<b>95</b>
Introduction.....	95
A Note on the Universality of Musicat’s Domain.....	96
Microdomain Specifics .....	97
Melody Characteristics .....	97
Extra Information Included with Melodies.....	98
Two Examples .....	98
Example Melodies and Human Listening Performances .....	100
Mystery Melody .....	100
Sur le pont d’Avignon .....	108
On the Street Where You Live.....	115
A Sneak Preview of Musicat.....	124
<b>CHAPTER FOUR</b>	<b>125</b>
<b>MUSIC AND ANALOGY</b>	<b>125</b>
Analogies All the Way Down.....	125
Ascending Through the Levels.....	126
Sound Waves.....	127
Timbre .....	129
Pitch .....	130
Rhythm.....	132
Motif.....	134
Phrases .....	138
Large-scale Form .....	139
Raindrops Keep Falling... ..	140

Analogy as the Core of Music Cognition .....	142
Analogy as the Core of Musicat .....	143
The Importance of Analogy in Models of Music Cognition .....	143
<b>CHAPTER FIVE</b>	<b>147</b>
<b>MUSICAT LISTENS TO BAD MELODIES</b>	<b>147</b>
Understanding Musicat’s Listening Performances .....	149
Some Simplified Notation .....	153
A Note on the Pronouns “I” and “We” .....	154
First Example: Twinkle, Twinkle, Little Star .....	155
Bad Melodies .....	173
Bad Melody #1 .....	174
Bad Melody #2 .....	179
Bad Melody #3 .....	184
Bad Melody #4 .....	187
Bad Melody #5 .....	193
Summary .....	195
<b>CHAPTER SIX</b>	<b>197</b>
<b>MUSICAT LISTENS TO SIMPLE MELODIES</b>	<b>197</b>
Twinkle, Twinkle, Little Star (run 2) .....	198
Row, Row, Row Your Boat .....	208
Sur le pont d’Avignon .....	221
Frère Jacques .....	230
Sicilienne (Fauré) .....	237

<b>CHAPTER SEVEN</b>	<b>247</b>
<b>MUSICAT LISTENS TO COMPLEX MELODIES</b>	<b>247</b>
Younger than Springtime (Rodgers and Hammerstein).....	247
On the Street Where You Live (Lerner and Loewe).....	263
Tennessee Waltz (Stewart and King) .....	284
Good People All (Hofstadter) .....	303
Sun and Moon (Boublil and Schönberg) .....	312
<b>CHAPTER EIGHT</b>	<b>331</b>
<b>THE ARCHITECTURE OF MUSICAT</b>	<b>331</b>
Overview: Mental Processes to Model .....	332
Major Components .....	334
User Interface .....	334
Program Initialization and Assumptions .....	338
Main Program Loop .....	340
Workspace.....	342
Coderack.....	343
Codelets .....	346
Temperature .....	351
Sliding Time Window of Perception.....	353
Objects in the Workspace.....	355
Notes .....	355
Measures .....	356
Rhythm-Based Measure Links .....	356
Relationships.....	357
Bar Lines .....	358
Alphabets .....	359

Groups and Meta-groups.....	359
Analogies.....	363
Expectations.....	365
Calculating Structure Strengths .....	366
Scoring Rhythmic Measure Links.....	369
Scoring Relationships .....	370
Scoring Groups .....	374
Scoring Sequences .....	378
Scoring Analogies.....	379
Scoring Expectations .....	381
Creating Structures with Codelets .....	382
Rhythm-based Measure Links .....	382
Relationships.....	383
Bar Lines.....	385
Groups and Meta-groups.....	386
Analogies.....	388
Expectations.....	391
<b>CHAPTER NINE</b>	<b>393</b>
<b>THE EVOLUTION OF MUSICAT</b>	<b>393</b>
A Brief History of Musicat .....	394
Versions of Musicat .....	396
Two-note Model (Key and Meter Induction).....	396
Musicat with Hierarchy (MusicatH).....	397
Musicat Without Hierarchy (MusicatW).....	416
BinaryCat.....	445
RhythmCat .....	447

<b>CHAPTER TEN</b>	<b>455</b>
<b>CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK</b>	<b>455</b>
Aims of the project.....	455
What Musicat Does Well.....	456
Musicat Behaves Differently on “Bad” Melodies.....	456
Musicat Generates Hierarchical Grouping Structures .....	457
Musicat Listens in Real Time with Limited Working Memory .....	458
Musicat Notices Different Things on Different Runs.....	460
Musicat Forms Analogies.....	461
What Musicat Does Badly.....	462
Musicat Forms Groups at Measure Boundaries Only.....	463
Musicat Misses Too Many Simple Things .....	463
Musicat Makes Errors in Grouping and Bar-line Thicknesses .....	464
Musicat Makes Too Many Analogies .....	465
Musicat Makes Too Few Analogies .....	466
Musicat Ignores Many Crucial Aspects of Pitch.....	466
Musicat Doesn’t Generate Note-level Expectations .....	467
Musicat Flails .....	468
Musicat Destroys Large Structures.....	470
Musicat Gets Confused by Long Melodies .....	471
Contributions of Musicat .....	472
Lessons Learned .....	472
Architectural Contributions .....	475
Contributions to the Modeling of Music Cognition.....	477
Future Work.....	482
Next Steps.....	482

A Hypothesis for Future Testing.....	483
Whither Musicat? (Questions and Speculations about the Future).....	485
Could Musicat be Extended to Listen to Polyphonic Music? .....	485
Will Musicat Ever Listen to Audio Recordings?.....	485
Will Musicat Ever Hear Music in the Same Way as a Human Does?.....	486
Will Musicat Ever Become a Composer? .....	486
<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>489</b>
<b>PILOT STUDY</b>	<b>493</b>
<b>PRELIMINARY QUANTITATIVE RESULTS</b>	<b>501</b>

## List of Figures

Figure 1.1: Opening motif of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony. ....	2
Figure 1.2: Opening motif, including the next four notes. ....	3
Figure 1.3: Previous figure with groups and an analogy. ....	4
Figure 1.4: Opening of “Ants Marching” . ....	6
Figure 1.5: Opening melodic motif in “Ants Marching” . ....	6
Figure 1.6: Rhythmic reinterpretation of Figure 1.5: drum on beats 2 and 4, not 1 and 3. ...	7
Figure 2.1: Melody described using pitch alphabets. ....	39
Figure 2.2: Auditory memory processes, adapted from (Snyder 2000). ....	51
Figure 2.3: Beginnings of typical Seek Well melodies. ....	59
Figure 2.4: Three musical forces. ....	60
Figure 2.5: Ascending octave. ....	60
Figure 2.6: Alternate melodic continuations after C-D. ....	63
Figure 2.7: A simple melody (below) and an implied background level (above). ....	65
Figure 2.8: Prediction at a higher level. ....	66
Figure 2.9: Surface-level prediction. ....	66
Figure 2.10: No boundaries. ....	69
Figure 2.11: Two boundaries. ....	69
Figure 3.1: “Sur le pont d’Avignon”, a typical melody in Musicat’s domain. ....	99
Figure 3.2: “On the Street Where You Live”, a more complicated melody in the domain. ..	99
Figure 3.3: Mystery Melody, Note 1. ....	101
Figure 3.4: Mystery Melody, Notes 1–2. ....	101
Figure 3.5: Mystery Melody, Notes 1–3. ....	102
Figure 3.6: Mystery Melody, Notes 1–4. ....	103
Figure 3.7: Mystery Melody, Notes 1–5. ....	103
Figure 3.8: Mystery Melody, Notes 1–6. ....	104
Figure 3.9: Mystery Melody, Notes 1–5, heard in 4/4. ....	105
Figure 3.10: Mystery Melody, Notes 1–5, heard in 3/4. ....	105
Figure 3.11: Mystery Melody, Notes 1–7. ....	106
Figure 3.12: Mystery Melody, Notes 1–8. ....	106
Figure 3.13: Mystery Melody, Notes 1–9. ....	106
Figure 3.14: Mystery Melody, Notes 1–9, heard in 3/4. ....	106
Figure 3.15: An unrealistic expectation for the next three notes. ....	107
Figure 3.16: Mystery Melody, Notes 1–10 (complete). ....	107
Figure 3.17: Opening theme of Bach’s Organ Prelude in C major, BWV 547. ....	108
Figure 3.18: “Sur le pont d’Avignon”, measure 1. ....	109

Figure 3.19: “Sur le pont d’Avignon”, measures 1–2. ....	109
Figure 3.20: “Sur le pont d’Avignon”, measures 1–3. ....	110
Figure 3.21: “Sur le pont d’Avignon”, measures 1–4. ....	111
Figure 3.22: “Sur le pont d’Avignon”, measures 5–7. ....	113
Figure 3.23: “Sur le pont d’Avignon”, complete. ....	114
Figure 3.24: “On the Street Where You Live”, first 5 notes. ....	115
Figure 3.25: “On the Street Where You Live”, first phrase. ....	116
Figure 3.26: “On the Street Where You Live”, second phrase. ....	118
Figure 3.27: “On the Street Where You Live”, third phrase. ....	121
Figure 3.28: “On the Street Where You Live”, fourth phrase. ....	122
Figure 3.29: “On the Street Where You Live”, phrases 1–4. ....	123
Figure 3.30: One of Musicat’s listening performances for “Sur le pont d’Avignon”. ....	124
Figure 4.1: A pure tone at 440 Hz. ....	127
Figure 4.2: A composition of two sine waves at 440 and 880 Hz. ....	128
Figure 4.3: A small portion of the waveform of the note A played on a piano. ....	129
Figure 4.4: The beginning of Chopin’s “Raindrop” prelude. ....	130
Figure 4.5: The key change to C# Minor between measures 28 and 29. ....	131
Figure 4.6: G# becomes B in measure 41. ....	132
Figure 4.7: Measure 23 (analogous to measure 4). ....	133
Figure 4.8: Measure 85 (analogous to measure 23). ....	134
Figure 4.9: Ab becomes F. ....	135
Figure 4.10: Another variant of the repetition motif. ....	136
Figure 4.11: Rhythmic motif. ....	136
Figure 4.12: Rhythmic motif appearing in another form. ....	136
Figure 4.13: Another appearance of the motif. ....	137
Figure 4.14: Measures 8-11: High-descending-notes motif. ....	137
Figure 4.15: Return of the high descent motif: a ray of sunlight or “a star in the jaws of the clouds”. ....	138
Figure 5.1: A sample screenshot demonstrating Musicat’s notation. ....	150
Figure 5.2: Twinkle, Twinkle, Little Star. ....	155
Figure 5.3: Twinkle, Twinkle, with lyrics. ....	156
Figure 5.4: Twinkle, Twinkle, measure 1. ....	157
Figure 5.5: Twinkle, Twinkle, measure 2. ....	158
Figure 5.6: Twinkle, Twinkle, measure 3. ....	159
Figure 5.7: Twinkle, Twinkle, measure 4. ....	160
Figure 5.8: Twinkle, Twinkle, measure 5. ....	161
Figure 5.9: Twinkle, Twinkle, measure 6. ....	161
Figure 5.10: Twinkle, Twinkle, measure 7. ....	162



Figure 5.11: Twinkle, Twinkle, measure 8.....	163
Figure 5.12: Twinkle, Twinkle, measure 9.....	164
Figure 5.13: Twinkle, Twinkle, measure 10.....	165
Figure 5.14: Twinkle, Twinkle, measure 11.....	166
Figure 5.15: Twinkle, Twinkle, measure 12 (end of song). ....	167
Figure 5.16: Twinkle, Twinkle, processing. ....	169
Figure 5.17: Twinkle, Twinkle, processing. ....	170
Figure 5.18: Twinkle, Twinkle, final state, low detail level (strongest structures only).....	171
Figure 5.19: Another run on "Twinkle, Twinkle".....	173
Figure 5.20: Bad Melody #1 (random rhythms and notes). ....	174
Figure 5.21: Bad Melody #1, measure 4. ....	175
Figure 5.22: Bad Melody #1, measure 5. ....	175
Figure 5.23: Bad Melody #1, end of processing. ....	176
Figure 5.24: Bad Melody #1, low detail level. ....	177
Figure 5.25: Bad Melody #1, medium level of detail. ....	178
Figure 5.26: Bad Melody #2 (constrained rhythms).....	179
Figure 5.27: Bad Melody #2 (run 1), end of processing. ....	181
Figure 5.28: Bad Melody #2 (run 1), low level of detail.....	182
Figure 5.29: Bad Melody #2 (run 2), low level of detail.....	182
Figure 5.30: Bad Melody #2 (run 3), low level of detail.....	183
Figure 5.31: Bad Melody #3 (constrained rhythm).....	184
Figure 5.32: Bad Melody #3 (run 1).....	185
Figure 5.33: Bad Melody #3 (run 1), low detail.....	186
Figure 5.34: Bad Melody 3 (run 2), low detail.....	186
Figure 5.35: Bad Melody #4 (odd-length phrases). ....	187
Figure 5.36: Bad Melody #4, measure 5. ....	188
Figure 5.37: Bad Melody #4, measure 6. ....	189
Figure 5.38: Bad Melody #4, measure 7. ....	190
Figure 5.39: Bad Melody #4, end of processing. ....	191
Figure 5.40: Bad Melody #5.....	193
Figure 5.41: Bad Melody #5 (run 1).....	194
Figure 5.42: Bad Melody #5 (run 2).....	195
Figure 6.1: Twinkle Twinkle (run 2), measure 4.....	198
Figure 6.2: Twinkle, Twinkle (run 2), measure 9.....	199
Figure 6.3: Twinkle, Twinkle (run 2), measure 12.....	201
Figure 6.4: Twinkle, Twinkle (run 2), measure 12 (+3 measures of extra time).....	202
Figure 6.5: Twinkle, Twinkle (run 2), measure 12(+4). ....	203
Figure 6.6: Twinkle, Twinkle (run 2), end of run.....	204

Figure 6.7: Twinkle, Twinkle (run 2), outer group ( <i>very</i> low level of detail).....	205
Figure 6.8: Twinkle, Twinkle (run 2), big analogy (low level of detail). ....	205
Figure 6.9: Twinkle, Twinkle (run 2), medium detail level. ....	206
Figure 6.10: Twinkle, Twinkle (run 2), medium detail level. Analogy in blue singled-out. ....	207
Figure 6.11: Row, Row, Row Your Boat.....	208
Figure 6.12: Row, Row, Row Your Boat (run 1).....	209
Figure 6.13: Row, Row, Row Your Boat (run 2).....	211
Figure 6.14: Row, Row, Row Your Boat (run 3).....	213
Figure 6.15: Row, Row, Row Your Boat (run 4).....	215
Figure 6.16: Row, Row, Row Your Boat (run 5).....	218
Figure 6.17: Row, Row, Row Your Boat (run 5), low detail level. ....	219
Figure 6.18: Row, Row, Row Your Boat (run 5), medium detail level. ....	220
Figure 6.19: Sur le pont d’Avignon.....	221
Figure 6.20: Sur le pont d’Avignon (run 1), just after hearing the final measure. ....	222
Figure 6.21: Sur le pont d’Avignon (run 1), low detail level.....	223
Figure 6.22: Sur le pont d’Avignon (run 1), medium detail level. ....	223
Figure 6.23: Sur le pont d’Avignon (run 1), high detail level. ....	225
Figure 6.24: Sur le pont d’Avignon (run 2), just after hearing the final measure. ....	226
Figure 6.25: Sur le pont d’Avignon (run 2), final state. ....	227
Figure 6.26: Sur le pont d’Avignon (run 2), low detail level.....	228
Figure 6.27: Sur le pont d’Avignon (run 2), medium detail level. ....	228
Figure 6.28: Frère Jacques.....	230
Figure 6.29: Frère Jacques d’Avignon.....	230
Figure 6.30: Frère Jacques (run 1).....	231
Figure 6.31: Frère Jacques (run 2).....	232
Figure 6.32: Frère Jacques (run 2), strongest structures. ....	233
Figure 6.33: Frère Jacques (run 3).....	234
Figure 6.34: Frère Jacques (run 3), low detail.....	235
Figure 6.35: Frère Jacques (run 3), medium detail. ....	236
Figure 6.36: Fauré’s Sicilienne for cello and piano, op. 78.....	237
Figure 6.37: Sicilienne (run 1).....	238
Figure 6.38: Sicilienne (run 2), final state. ....	240
Figure 6.39: Sicilienne (run 2), measure 8(+1).....	241
Figure 6.40: Sicilienne (run 2), measure 8(+2).....	241
Figure 6.41: Sicilienne (run 2), measure 8(+5).....	242
Figure 6.42: Sicilienne (run 2), final state, medium detail.....	242
Figure 6.43: Sicilienne (run 3).....	244

Figure 7.1: Younger than Springtime (from the musical <i>South Pacific</i> ), 32-measure excerpt. .....	247
Figure 7.2: Younger than Springtime, 8 measures. ....	249
Figure 7.3: Younger than Springtime, 8 measures. ....	250
Figure 7.4: Younger than Springtime (16-measure excerpt).....	251
Figure 7.5: Younger than Springtime (16 measures, run 1), after measure 9.....	252
Figure 7.6: Younger than Springtime (16 measures, run 1) after measure 15.....	253
Figure 7.7: Younger than Springtime (16 measures, run 1), end of processing. ....	255
Figure 7.8: Younger than Springtime (16 measures, run 2). ....	257
Figure 7.9: Younger than Springtime (16 measures, run 3). ....	258
Figure 7.10: Younger than Springtime, 8-measure bridge. ....	259
Figure 7.11: Younger than Springtime (middle 8 measures).....	260
Figure 7.12: Younger than Springtime (bridge, run 2). ....	262
Figure 7.13: On the Street Where You Live (from the musical <i>My Fair Lady</i> ). ....	263
Figure 7.14: Metrically-shifted version of “On the Street Where You Live”, illustrating the measure-numbering scheme used in the text.....	264
Figure 7.15: On the Street Where You Live (run 1). ....	266
Figure 7.16: On the Street Where You Live (run 2). ....	269
Figure 7.17: On the Street Where You Live (run 2), low detail. ....	270
Figure 7.18: On the Street Where You Live (run 3). ....	274
Figure 7.19: On the Street Where You Live (run 3), low detail. ....	275
Figure 7.20: On the Street Where You Live (run 3), medium detail.....	276
Figure 7.21: On the Street Where You Live (run 4). ....	277
Figure 7.22: On the Street Where You Live (run 5). ....	278
Figure 7.23: On the Street Where You Live (run 5), low detail. ....	279
Figure 7.24: On the Street Where You Live (run 5), medium detail.....	280
Figure 7.25: On the Street Where You Live (run 6), with a very large analogy! .....	281
Figure 7.26: Tennessee Waltz. ....	284
Figure 7.27: Tennessee Waltz. ....	285
Figure 7.28: Tennessee Waltz, first half. ....	286
Figure 7.29: Tennessee Waltz, first half. ....	287
Figure 7.30: Tennessee Waltz, first half (run 2). ....	289
Figure 7.31: Tennessee Waltz, first half (run 3). ....	291
Figure 7.32: Tennessee Waltz, second half.....	292
Figure 7.33: Tennessee Waltz, second half (run 1). ....	293
Figure 7.34: Measures 5–8 (top staff) and 13–16 (bottom staff). ....	295
Figure 7.35: Tennessee Waltz, second half (run 2), after measure 12. ....	296
Figure 7.36: Tennessee Waltz, second half (run 2), after measure 13. ....	297

Figure 7.37: Tennessee Waltz, second half (run 2), after measure 14. ....	298
Figure 7.38: Tennessee Waltz, second half (run 2), after measure 15. ....	299
Figure 7.39: Tennessee Waltz, second half (run 2), after measure 16(+3). ....	300
Figure 7.40: Tennessee Waltz, second half (run 2), end of processing. ....	301
Figure 7.41: Opening measures of Good People All, from a cantata by Douglas Hofstadter. .....	303
Figure 7.42: Good People All (measures 1–4): starting points of groups indicated by upper voice. ....	304
Figure 7.43: Good People All (measures 1–4): groups represented by their starting notes. ....	304
Figure 7.44: Good People All, recomposed. ....	306
Figure 7.45: Good People All (run 1). ....	307
Figure 7.46: Good People All (run 2). ....	309
Figure 7.47: Good People All (run 3). ....	310
Figure 7.48: Sun and Moon (from the musical <i>Miss Saigon</i> ). ....	312
Figure 7.49: <i>Miss Saigon</i> , opening notes. ....	313
Figure 7.50: <i>Miss Saigon</i> , opening accented notes, rewritten at double tempo. ....	314
Figure 7.51: Sun and Moon, with phrasing implied by the text. ....	315
Figure 7.52: Sun and Moon, with an alternate possible grouping suggested by the chords. ....	315
Figure 7.53: Sun and Moon, first half. ....	316
Figure 7.54: Sun and Moon, first half (run 1). ....	317
Figure 7.55: Sun and Moon, first half (run 1), after measure 6. ....	318
Figure 7.56: Sun and Moon, first half (run 1), after measure 10. ....	319
Figure 7.57: Sun and Moon, measures 1-12. Descending scale shown with large noteheads. .....	320
Figure 7.58: Sun and Moon, first half (run 1), medium detail. ....	321
Figure 7.59: Sun and Moon, first half (run 2) (final processing). ....	322
Figure 7.60: Sun and Moon, first half (run 2), medium detail. ....	323
Figure 7.61: Sun and Moon, second half (measures 13–25, renumbered as 1–13 for simplicity). ....	324
Figure 7.62: Sun and Moon, second half (run 1). ....	325
Figure 7.63: Sun and Moon, second half (run 1), after measure 11. ....	327
Figure 7.64: Sun and Moon, second half (run 2). ....	328
Figure 7.65: Sun and Moon, second half (run 3). ....	330
Figure 8.1: Standard user interface for Musicat. ....	335
Figure 8.2: Development interface. ....	337
Figure 8.3: Hypermetric upbeat in Mozart’s 40th Symphony, First Movement. ....	339
Figure 8.4: Tennessee Waltz melody with pickup beat. ....	340
Figure 8.5: Tennessee Waltz melody with shifted bar lines. ....	340

Figure 8.6: Codelet-creation graph. Boxes at the top of the graph represent codelets that can generate codelets of the types below, shown by arrows. ....	345
Figure 8.7: A typical sequence of bar line “thicknesses” .....	358
Figure 8.8: A typical sequence. ....	362
Figure 8.9: White (Deep Blue) to move, just before move 37 (Be4). Game 2, Kasparov versus Deep Blue, 1997. ....	368
Figure 8.10: Twinkle, Twinkle. ....	371
Figure 8.11: Measures 1–2. ....	372
Figure 8.12: Measures 3–4. ....	372
Figure 8.13: Sigmoid function. ....	378
Figure 9.1: Opening of “Stückchen”, from Schumann’s <i>Kinderszenen</i> , Op. 15. ....	398
Figure 9.2: MusicatH listening to a modified version of “Stückchen”. ....	399
Figure 9.3: MusicatH’s Slipnet. ....	402
Figure 9.4: Stückchen, run 1. ....	404
Figure 9.5: Stückchen, run 1. ....	404
Figure 9.6: Stückchen, run 2. ....	405
Figure 9.7: Triplet Scale. ....	406
Figure 9.8: Triplet Scale, heard in 3/4 meter. ....	406
Figure 9.9: Triplet Scale, run 1. ....	406
Figure 9.10: Triplet Scale, run 1. ....	407
Figure 9.11: Triplet Scale, run 1 (end of run). ....	407
Figure 9.12: Triplet Scale, run 2. ....	408
Figure 9.13: Triplet Scale, run 3. ....	409
Figure 9.14: Triplet Scale, run 4. ....	409
Figure 9.15: Twinkle, Twinkle, run 1. ....	410
Figure 9.16: Twinkle, Twinkle, run 2. ....	411
Figure 9.17: Twinkle, Twinkle, run 2, a moment later. ....	411
Figure 9.18: Good People All (first two measures). ....	412
Figure 9.19: On the Street Where You Live, run 1. ....	413
Figure 9.20: On the Street Where You Live, run 2. ....	414
Figure 9.21: MusicatW running on “Stückchen”. ....	417
Figure 9.22: MusicatW running on “Stückchen”, note links hidden. ....	418
Figure 9.23: Global temperature. ....	422
Figure 9.24: Codelet urgencies during a run. ....	423
Figure 9.25: Real-time codelet adjustment window. ....	424
Figure 9.26: Bar lines of “thicknesses” following a regular pattern. ....	429
Figure 9.27: Analogy maps in MusicatW. ....	430
Figure 9.28: “Stückchen” .....	432

Figure 9.29: Triplet Scale.....	433
Figure 9.30: “Twinkle, Twinkle” (run 1).....	434
Figure 9.31: “Twinkle, Twinkle” (run 2).....	435
Figure 9.32: “Twinkle, Twinkle” (run 3).....	435
Figure 9.33: “On the Street Where You Live” (run 1).....	436
Figure 9.34: “On the Street Where You Live” (run 2, with analogies), mid-run.....	437
Figure 9.35: “On the Street Where You Live” (run 2, with analogies), end of run.....	438
Figure 9.36: A very simple melody.....	440
Figure 9.37: Very simple melody, during final processing.....	441
Figure 9.38: Very simple melody, end of run.....	442
Figure 9.39: Sur le pont d’Avignon.....	443
Figure 9.40: Sur le pont d’Avignon, result of a run using the latest Musicat (repeated from Chapter 6).....	444
Figure 9.41: Far too many analogies in “Sur le pont d’Avignon” — an embarrassment of riches.....	444
Figure 9.42: “Sur le pont d’Avignon”.....	446
Figure 9.43: “Sur le pont d’Avignon”, rhythm only.....	448
Figure 9.44: A run of an early version of RhythmCat on a simple rhythm.....	449
Figure 9.45: A run of a later version of RhythmCat, whose display resembles that of the latest version of Musicat.....	450
Figure 10.1: Frequency counts of tonal functions for first notes.....	497
Figure 10.2: Krumhansl and Kessler’s key profiles.....	497
Figure 10.3: Comparison of first note data with weighted Krumhansl and Kessler profiles.....	498
Figure 10.4: More comparisons.....	499

## List of Tables

Table 1: Similarities between the two halves of the first phrase of “On the Street Where You Live”. .....	117
Table 2: Contour symbols. ....	371
Table 3: Preliminary results for Musicat, compared with reported results from CBMS. ....	503

