On the 'A' that links the 'M's of Maths, Music and Maps

('Da capo')

J.N. Oliveira

Dept. Informática, Universidade do Minho Braga, Portugal

10 December 2014 Lab. de l&D de Computação Sonora e Musical Dept. de Informática FEUP, Porto

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ ○○ ○○

hors

Chiasmus

Algebraicity

The Unanswered Question

Epilogue

Prelude

(dedicated to Raul Vidal)

phors

Chiasmus

Algebraicit

Epilogue

Back to 1978/79

JUVEMINHO 79 — takes place in Braga in 1979 (Parque de Exposições).

U.Minho's **Electronics Laboratory** — recently created by Raul Vidal prepares some demos for the exhibition.

Among these a multi-part **score interpreter** encoded in assembly code runs on an Intel SDK85, one of three bought by the Lab for the classroom.



・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・

taphors

Chiasmus

Algebraicit

Epilogue

Back to 1978/79

Extra 2Kb memory extension has to be bought for the code to fit in.

No **assembler** available — code written directly in **hexadecimal** notation.

Program + 'scores' are saved in **punched tapes**.



Tapes are loaded from a **teletype** offered by CTT with no **documentation**, no **drivers** — that for SDK85 was built by trial-and-error on a breadboard.



▲ロト ▲帰 ト ▲ヨト ▲ヨト - ヨ - の々ぐ

etaphors

Chiasmus

Algebraicit

Epilogue

Back to 1978/79

Written completely from scratch, the "synthesizer" sampled a 256 byte **sine wave** on a $\sqrt[12]{2}$ basis (everything calculated by the **Wang** machine in the D. Pedro V block, for SDK85 had no reals).

Part samples were produced in real-time, added together and sent to a **DA converter**, itself connected to an amplifier + speakers.



・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・

'Scores' included a few two part INVENTIONS (e.g. BWV 779) by J.S. Bach as well as the four-part Air of the SUITE BWV 1068.

Back to 1978/79

The code would need a little fix while at the exhibition, for notes of the same frequency in different parts (very) occasionally cancel each-other...

This was observed e.g. in the *Air* of BWV 1068, the superstar of the demo:



Horror — no E's in the 1st and 2nd violins at one particular demo!

Fix thereafter ensured no two parts in phase opposition with each other.

phors

Chiasmus

Algebraicity

The Unanswered Question

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 三臣 - のへぐ

Epilogue

Fugue

(35 years later...)

Someone has observed that "those who like maths also enjoy music and maps" 1 :

What commonalities can be found between such a language system (Maths), an art (music) and a science (cartography)?

 $^{^1}$ Comment by a student of David Naumann, Stevens Institute, New Jersey_ \sim

MAPS

Maths is an *abstract* language (**A**) Music is perhaps the most *abstract* (**A**) of all arts Maps are geographical *abstractions* (**A**)

MUSIC

phors

Chiasmus

Algebraicity

Epilogue

Abstraction

Quoting Jeff Kramer²:

"Abstraction is widely used in other disciplines such as art and music. For instance (...) Henri Matisse manages to clearly represent the essence of his subject, a naked woman, using only simple lines or cutouts. His representation removes all detail yet conveys much."

² Is Abstraction the Key to Computing?, Commun. ACM, 50:4, pages 37–42, April 2007.

taphors

Chiasmus

Algebraicit

Epilogue

Abstraction

The famous "abstract" map of the London Underground (1939)

BASE PRINCIPLE: "Eliminate characteristics of the mapped object that are **not relevant** to the map's **purpose**"

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ ◆□▶

aphors

Chiasmus

Abstraction

Opus 118, no.2, by Johannes Brahms (1833-97):

Questions:

What does this piece **mean**? Does it **describe** anything? Does it **imitate** or recreate reality?

Answer:

It means **nothing** — it is **abstract**!

Leonard Bernstein (1st Young People's Concerts, 18-Jan-1958):

"Music is never about anything: music just 'is'!"

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ ─臣 ─ のへで

Albert Camus (1913-60):

Music is the **perfect expression** of an **ideal world** which is communicated to us through harmony. This world exists. Not at a level higher or lower than the real world, but parallel to it.

World of ideas? *Maybe. Or else* **world of numbers**, *as communicated to us by Harmony.*"

▲ロト ▲帰 ト ▲ヨト ▲ヨト - ヨ - の々ぐ

(Essay on Music, 1932)

Mathematics is the universal language of science. Why?

- The abstract language par excellence
- Safe (unambiguous) means to pass knowledge between generations
- Mathematical **proof** the ideal way to provide verifiable **evidence**.

Abstraction: what is it, after all?

Our answer will be based on a concept of mathematics itself — that of a **function**.

・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・

Number of letters (*nr*) and stress vowel (*sv*)

$$V \stackrel{sv}{\longleftarrow} W \stackrel{nr}{\longrightarrow} N$$

'e'
$$\stackrel{\text{"Einstein"}}{\longrightarrow} 8$$

'i'
$$\stackrel{\text{"picnic"}}{\longrightarrow} 6$$

'a'
$$\stackrel{\text{"almond"}}{\longrightarrow} 6$$

Notation (Leibniz): 6 = nr("almond"), 'a' = sv("almond"), etc In general:

< □ > < 同 > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

y = f(x)

letaphors

Chiasmus

Algebraicity

Functional abstraction

Given some function $A \xrightarrow{f} B$ such that, for all *b* in *B*, there is some *a* from *A* such that b = f(a), for example

 $W \xrightarrow{sv} V$ "almond" \longrightarrow 'a' (etc)
"Einstein" \longrightarrow 'e' (etc)
"picnic" \longrightarrow 'i' (etc)
"poll" \longrightarrow 'o' (etc)
"future" \longrightarrow 'u' (etc)

we say that domain B is **more abstract** than A and that f is a **witness** of such an abstraction.

In the example: **one** stress V owel abstracts **many** W ords.

We see that by losing textual information, the text acquires a **metaphorical** dimension — e.g. nickname 'Hare', and so on.

"A la Chomsky": functions f and g transform **deep** structure (a) into surface structure (c).

where f and g are the **witnesses** of the metaphor.

In the example there are two juxtaposed metaphors:

smart

Metaphors in music

Listen to the music excerpt

which includes two simple metaphors, one **melodic** and the other **rhythmic**:

Metaphors

Chiasmus

Algebraicity

Metaphors as maths objects

A **metaphor** can be regarded as a "cospan" (aside) in which

- T (tenor) is the subject
- V is the vehicle
- A is the shared attribute.

(Cf. Richards' *Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 1936).

Summing up, a metaphor is a binary relationship

 $T(f^{\circ} \cdot g)V \tag{1}$

in which the attribute (A) is hidden.

< □ > < 同 > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Metaphors as maths objects

Brief explanation of the formula in the previous slide:

 R° denotes R in passive voice: b R a thus means the same as b R° a. Example:
 Albert watches the hare

versus

the hare is watched by Albert

• Composition: $(f \cdot g)x = f(g x)$, for instance

f p = the number of letters of pg p = the stressed syllable of p

Thus:

 $(f \cdot g)p =$ the number of letters of the stressed syllable of p

Putting the **vehicle** in motion

'No jobs for the boys' in metaphorical form, quoting Eça de Queirós (1845-1900):³

"Os políticos e as fraldas devem trocar-se frequentemente e pela mesma razão"

Metaphor:

"Politicians and diapers should be changed often and for the same reason"

Axiom: s(t x) = False inducing *change* t' in P, etc etc.

³Abbreviations: P = politician (tenor); F = nappy (vehicle); c = corrupted; s = dirty; t = change.

In the presence of more than one shared attribute, e.g.

attribute omission leads to ambiguity.

Either **context** suggests the attribute or the text becomes **open** and may acquire a **poetic** dimension.

Metaphors often "close" inter-textually — see next slide.

A well-known anecdote (Vienna, 1820s):

Vaterländischer Künstlerverein (by 51 composers) on a waltz by Anton Diabelli (1781-1858).

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

Metaphors

Chiasmus

Algebraicity

Epilogue

Var.XXII of contribution 51

◆□ > ◆□ > ◆豆 > ◆豆 > 「豆 」のへで

Metaphors in music

Funeral march by Gustav Mahler (1860-1911): metaphor with **tenor**

whose vehicle is the popular:

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ = 三 のくで

(More abstract) metaphors in music

3rd mov. of Brahms (1833-97) 1st symphony:

Sentence alone is metaphoric by itself, why?

- Too obvious: two halves share the same rythm
- Less obvious: 2nd half (tenor) is an inversion of 1st half (vehicle).

Music can be very 'metaphoric' in this (rather formal) sense.

The sequence $A B \neg B \neg A$ of terms that cross each other in the *parallel* or *double antithesis* of a **chiasmus** becomes **parallel de facto** in music, thanks to **polyphony**:

Antithesis by **retrograde** motion (cf. *algebraic* sequence inversion) exhibiting properties such as e.g.

 $\neg \neg A = A$ $\neg (A B) = (\neg B) (\neg A)$

▲ロト ▲帰 ト ▲ヨト ▲ヨト - ヨ - の々ぐ

Chiasmus in music

Abundant device in e.g. Baroque music, cf. *Canon a 2 super thema regium* from BVW 1079 by J.S. Bach (1685-1750):

▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ▲匡▶ ▲匡▶ ― 匡 … のへ⊙

etaphors

Chiasmus

Algebraicity

Musical Offering BWV 1079

Canon a 2 (nr.1 of Canones diversi super thema regium, BWV 1079)

J.S. Bach (1685-1750)

◆□ > ◆□ > ◆豆 > ◆豆 > ・豆 = のへ⊙

letaphors

Chiasmus

Algebraicity

The Unanswered Questi

▲ロト ▲帰 ト ▲ヨト ▲ヨト - ヨ - の々ぐ

Epilogue

Still about "chiasmus"

The stamp of J.S. Bach (1685-1750) in which the initials 'J', 'S', 'B' overlap each other once "mirrored" (ie. inverted), cf.

ors

Chiasmus

Algebraicity

Apparently a requirement "wilfully" claimed by Saussure in his writings (ELG, p. 236): $^{\rm 4}$

"l'expression simple sera algébrique ou ne sera pas"

In what measure can universal algebra help?

Music particularly interesting in this respect, for its inherent **algebraicity**:

- Music event level forms a very simple **algebra**: that of **sequences** of pairs (*pitch*, *duration*).
- Transformations across musical metaphor witnesses easy to express and reason about (many can be regarded as **linear transforms**).

⁴S. Bouquet, *Ontologie et Épistemologie de la Linguistique dans les Textes Originaux de Ferdinand de Saussure*, U. Paris X, 2008, vol. XVIII, no.3.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ □□ - のへぐ

Algebraicity

Take augmentation, for instance:

$$k * [] = [] \\ k * [(p,d)] = [(p, k d)] \\ k * (m n) = (k * m) (k * n)$$

Transposition:

$$[] + i = [] [(p, d)] + i = [(p + i, d)] (m n) + i = (m + i) (m + i)$$

Retrograde:

$$\neg [] = []$$

$$\neg [(p,d)] = [(p,d)]$$

$$\neg (m n) = (\neg n) (\neg m)$$

< □ > < 同 > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Algebraicity

In general, can one "measure" algebraically the **expressive** richness of a metaphor $f^{\circ} \cdot g$?

Algebra of functions: $f \leq g$ measuring loss of information — f abstracts more than g ($\equiv f$ is less **injective** than g).

Distance between tenor and vehicle of metaphor $f^{\circ} \cdot g$ measurable by **complements** $\neg f$ and $\neg g$ (\equiv what is **not** common), where $\neg f$ satisfies the universal property

 $id \leqslant f \land k \equiv \neg f \leqslant k$

where *id* is the identity and $(f \land g) x = (f x, g x)$.

For example, small complements will correspond to *poor* metaphors, etc.

etaphors

Chiasr

Algebrai

Epilogue

The Unanswered Question (Bernstein at Harvard)

"He immersed himself in Chomskyan linguistics (...) so that he could then apply the principles of linguistics to music — thereby creating a brand new field of study.

Ambitious? Oh, yes! Was he in over his head? Completely!" (Jamie Bernstein).

(日) (雪) (日) (日) (日)

The Unanswered Question (Bernstein at Harvard)

For Leonard Bernstein (1919-90), music is

- inherently transformational
- the most metaphorical of all means of artistic expression.

In fact:

- musical processing functions are easy to identify (cf. algebra of sequences);
- metaphors in music are **inherently abstract** they close up literally on the musical text alone.

Expressive efficacy proportional to the **'metaphorical engineering'** of the composer — have a look at our last example (next slides).

The example leads us back to Chomsky's (hidden) **deep structures** (prosaic, vulgar) as opposed to the (visible, audible) **surface structures** (poetic, beautiful).

In a sense, isn't this **deep-to-surface** transformation an essential part of the **creative** process itself?

Sketch books of L. van Beethoven (1770-1827) - 7000 manuscript folia (many on the internet⁵) ready for this kind of study.

Deep structure starting point⁶: a vulgar, 'Mannheim-like'' theme (see next slide).

⁵See *Beethoven sketches in the Digital Archives* available from http://www.beethoven-haus-bonn.de.

⁶Cf. B. Cooper, *Beethoven and the Creative Process*, Clarendon Press, 1990. 🕤 🤉 🔿

Algebraicity

(日)、

ъ

Creative process

Deep structure

From this, sonata opus 31-no.2 eventually emerged:

Sketches unveil the metaphor

"Mannheim rocket" theme in the sketches is the hidden (common) attribute of the whole movement's metaphor.

NB: see chap. 12 of *Cooper, op.cit*, for a detailed study of the sketches of this movement of the sonata.

letaphors

Chiasmus

・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・

"Metaphors We Live By"

In their classic textbook, George Lakoff and Mark Johnson show how metaphorical "normal language" is in everyday life, eg.:

- ARGUMENT IS WAR (read: Argument
 ^{f°⋅g}
 War for some witnessing f, g)
- TIME IS MONEY (read: Time < Money for some other witnesses f, g)

My question is:

Since our brain structures concepts and knowledge around so many "down-to-earth" metaphors, how do such metaphors acquire the **æstetical** drive which lifts us to Camus' (parallel) **ideal world**?

Such is the magic of a creative mind.

Towards the Semantics of Music

Mihailo Antovic⁷ (Univ. Nis, Serbia):

Music is an **abstraction**, and the only way to approach it is to **metaphorise** — *i.e.* map the **concrete** onto the **abstract**, be it through waterfalls, bamboos or dots on a vertical line.

(...) conceptual metaphor theory, in its search of the conceptualization of music, provides the most solid grounds for a true 'musico-semantics'.

⁷Antovic, M. (2009). Towards a Semantics of Music - the 20th Century, Language and History, 52(1): 119-129.

Afterthought

Two flavours in (applied) linguistics,

- generative (grammars, parsing)
- cognitive ("metaphors we live by"...)

Parallel in software science:

• "Hylomorphisms" with pattern $f \cdot g^{\circ}$, eg. contex-free compilers: $compiler = code_generator \cdot pretty_printer^{\circ}$

 $sort = is_ordered \cdot (bagify^{\circ} \cdot bagify)$

• "Metaphorisms" with pattern $f^{\circ} \cdot g$, eg. sorting:

Epilogue

Humanities versus Science

- The Big Divide: "Art" or "Science" ... a historical error.
- Nefarious disjunction since the era of specialization.
- Man of Hellenism and of the Renaissance lost.
- Some counter-examples in Portugal: João de Freitas Branco (1922-89), Jorge de Sena (1919-78), Rómulo de Carvalho (1906-97) ...
- Sociology of mathematics the real problem?
- Confluence requires change of attitude on both sides, with much work ahead.

Music well positioned to "bridge the gap" ...

• Experience in Computer-aided Musicology course at Minho.

< □ > < 同 > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

I wish a long and fruitful life to the newly reborn

Lab. de l&D de Computação Sonora e Musical @ FEUP

▲ロト ▲帰 ト ▲ヨト ▲ヨト - ヨ - の々ぐ

I thank Rui Penha (Lab. de I&D de Computação Sonora e Musical, FEUP) for the invitation to deliver this talk at the opening ceremony of the lab.

I also thank Álvaro Iriarte Sanromán (CEHUM) for inviting me to give a former version of this talk at the the CEHUM Autumn Colloquium XV.

・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・

I also thank José J. Almeida (mate in the Computer-aided Musicology course at Minho) for his patience and attention whenever I bump into his office.