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ABSTRACT

Computer-assisted musical analysis is now well over thirty decades old. Many projects undertaken in that time have centred on clearly-defined areas of research: transcription from late or sacred tablature, music printing, identification of vocal borrowing, harmonic analysis, codification of musical grammar, etc. One other significant area of computer-assisted research that has received its popularity throughout this period is that of quantitative analysis. Since a musical composition can be broken down to yield a considerable quantity of statistical data it is not surprising that music has been widely subjected to such analysis. This is especially so in view of the speed and accuracy with which computers can process such work. Most quantitative analyses have focused upon Medieval and Renaissance music, where the transmitted musical text is additionally accidented (thus simplifying encoding and ensuring past accuracy and potentially irrelevant information is excluded from the analysis).

Most statistical analyses are concerned with stylistics, and seek to discern merely between composers’ styles. To identify geographical provenance, or to correlate through. Such projects pose formidable problems of methodology, and their value has not yet adequately been demonstrated. Since in many such projects appear or have advanced ineluctably there would seem to be only two possible conclusions: either the wrong questions were asked of the computer, or, alternatively, unsuitable information was supplied as input for the computer to answer the right questions. But is it reasonable to expect clear-cut answers in this type of analytical work? This paper examines the extent to which computer-assisted stylistic analysis as conventionally practised is a valid and meaningful exercise.

Credible stylistic analysis demands that the authorship of the musical output under analysis has been established beyond doubt. In the case of Medieval and Renaissance music this is, on the one hand, not as traditionally assumed, and on the other requires the musical text (now more commonly transmitted through prints assembled under the composer’s supervision) to be reconstructed in a process more profound than the stylistic differences between contemporary composers working within a given context. But even a composer’s biography does not automatically reflect the composer’s true intentions. There is, for instance, the usual process of musical theft! (Of what reliable criteria can we choose between respecting the privilege that the composer apparently intended and preferring those holistic interpretations which he may well have entertained? Such “secondary” readings within a musical text may be illuminating in the context of Sondheim or Bizet analysis, such matter as the interpretation of music itself may well affect a qualitative analysis significantly.

This paper is primarily concerned with polyphony written before 1600, although the arguments can be extrapolated to cover later music. Musical polyphony presents one major analytical problem in that it comprises compound parts, but often containing individual voice parts. Since the musical characteristics of, say, a compound part differ from those of a homophonic part it is clearly invalid to aggregate the statistical information concerning each voice part and regard the results as representative of the piece as a whole.

On an even more insurmountable problem is that of determining which features of a composition are to be attractive for analysis. An initial mandate must be taken on to bow for the original attribution to remain valid and meaningful. It is inappropriate, for instance, to include the information about to pronunciation, since this might alter the view of an individual writer in a particular corpus. On this basis no account should be taken of such factors. Furthermore, the only copying and printers often followed copy-closely
is such states, and the presence of lightness within the context of artistic night will be a clue to
date of copying or to authorship.

So what features of a composition are to be
included? It seems reasonable to suspect that
different composers working within a limited
growth might create spatial materials in terms of
different thematic patches, and that it might be
profitable to ascertain the "average step length"
of a composition, but how is a musical "phrase"
so defined? It might be proposed that rests define a
phrase, and that a phrase may therefore be defined as
the maximal statement found between successive rests. For our spatial
intuition (and even a fuzzy knowledge of the
"hocket" principle in Medieval music) possibly
informs us that such a definition is unusual, although a better one exists.

Similar problems of interpretation concern
"contrapuntals." Valuable insight into musical style
might appear to be available from a study of the
ways in which a composer manipulates and
justifies intervals, extending intervals clearly from fundamentals in descending
ones, and so on. intervals must be broken into
two categories - ascending and descending - for
the phenomenon of "patches" is a distinguishing between ascending and descending
intervals. Willig's "contrapuntal sonata" in his "Studien zur Musikgeschichte"
(1933), if we were to distribute between ascending and
descending intervals the first and second level parts, would be statistically identical to
intervals. Although the ratios are altered, the
same are not. But at the same point one or
two provocative questions in an ascending fifth
climbing to a descending fourth that it to a
descent of a fifth. If the harmonic feature
between a motion not use sufficiently strong that these two intervals would be deemed
to be the same.

But what is an "interval" anyway? Is it the
distance between two consecutive notes not
separated by rests? If yes, then most notes be
considered as "intermediate" intervals.

Surely the relationship between alleluia notes
is as meaningful to us as that between
consecutive notes. This is completely true.
This is a fundamental question of a composition
whether the segments loosely connected
create something that holds the greatest clue to medical
rhythm. One may even wonder whether
"diminishing" be possible? Should we also be
measuring 3rd-outer intervals, or 15th-order intervals?
If we were to decide to include up to
growth in the 15-chord intervals (of course, quite arbitrary), how are we to treat
donate nothing but the elements of fewer than a
tone? Are they to be excluded from our analysis?

Thirly, how should compositions in which
separate or separated notes are treated
Schenkerian analysis would ignore "phrases" but
then Schenkerian method is a composite practice
out." A musical composition is incomplete
without the expansions intended by the composer.
(There are often fully written out or printed,
sometimes in order to accommodate a different
extends or simplification). Yet it might be argued that an "incomplete" expands to the same wide
set of elements of a composition. This is the
to making of the difficulties involved in defining
what constitutes a "contrapuntal sonata" to be so
exact ingenuity. How substantial must the repeated
phrase be? how to be treated a passage where one
voice part has an exact repeat but another voice
part does not?

Fourthly, there is the problem of pitch. However,
setting it might move to embrace absolute (i.e.
measuring pitch in the analysis, to do so would
be far too many questions in this field-reduction
area of performance practice. Now ignoring absolute measuring pitch, however, pitch problem should
"patches" may be often mentioned through
such texts of Beethoven and Schubert, consti-
tuting them as "patches." It is true that much
will see that certain chief combinations in early
music implied concatenation. This transcription theory for certain chief
combinations has been chief by writers from the
lado-century onwards, and has been brought
up sharp. But, this century through the writings of
Arthur Mendel and others. The chief
combination leaving document transcription are
commonly described as different
"patches." There are considerable
disagreements among early writers to precisely
which chief combination through document
transcription. Whatever the exact details of
transcription as to be kept, it is clear that for such early music the
treatment pitch in such a notation was the
value of the pitches, to make a guess: editorial balances would certainly
be influenced by the documentation of data and might result in the
destruction of valuable information.

Finally, there is the problem of note-values. It
would surely be inadvisable to regard some
unrelated with a defect of inexact music
parameters as equivalent to those in an
important one and, of course, many "contrapuntal"
and "patches" compositions enjoy more than one
notation. An early musical practice will
help many pieces, and it is well known that
many composers, and important ones, write the same
notation sign to convey something rather than that
notation. The problem of notation in such a piece
which contains many different notations, further
resulting in different notations. Further temporal difficulties are
raised by pieces which are written in...
area. This is a questions we ask which a
composer notes his music in a lower level of
note-values than would normally be the case, i.e.
with the 'full' quarter-note, rather than the
'small' half-note, as the basic unit of movement.
Although the notions for note-value notation are
not yet fully understood in a generally likely that
the composer intended to influence the visual
appearance of the music rather than the usual
effect. In order, therefore, to bring pieces in
note-value notation into the same form of
reference as other extant score values need logically to be doubled, yet such
modulations present a serious procedural
predicament, since to transform one values in
this way is arguably to falsify the data and to
conceal a particularly significant feature of the
composition.

In such Renaissance polyphony (e.g. Masses of
note-values) the music falls structurally into
movements or sections. Now are such sectional
units to be treated? Clearly all sections must
question be taken into account, yet not so simply
as aggregate the styleics for all the sections
This average conception of the piece. To do
would be to destroy the identity of the
individual sections themselves. It will also make a mockery of the structure, since the
order of the various sections would be
irrelevant. Indeed, 'apportion' analysis of
this type is open to serious criticism in that it
takes no account of how a composition develops,
and thus ignores 'process'.