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ABSTRACT

We investigate the use of declarative logic programming in the automated composition of music. We show that it is possible to use Answer Set Programming (ASP) to create *ab initio* short musical pieces that are both melodic and harmonic and have an appropriate rhythmic structure based on Farey series.

Our system, ANTON, named in honour of our favourite composer of the second Viennese School, is presented as both a design and as a practical working system, showing that rule-based declarative systems can be used effectively. We report on our experience in using ASP in this system, and indicate a number of potentially exciting directions in which this system could develop, both musically and computationally.

1. INTRODUCTION

It has been said that deciding what the next note should be is the composer’s fundamental problem! Many methods have been used both formally and informally to generate notes, from traditional techniques like repetition of all kinds, arpeggiation, inversion and the rest, to full algorithmic composition. As a side effect of other research in the use of logic in a range of problems, we started to investigate rules in music. We report here on the second version of our system that incorporates rules for melody, harmony and rhythm. Earlier versions of the system have been reported in the logic programming literature [6, 7, 8], but here we report for the first time the incorporation of rules in music. We exploit this semantics to produce different musical pieces that do not break rules of the style.

2. PROCESS-CONTROLLED COMPOSITION

Automation of compositional processes is not new. Perhaps the most frequently quoted is the Musical Dice Game (Musikalisches Würfelspiel) [10] often credited to Mozart, which was probably only one example of a game commonly played in Mozart’s day.

More recent examples of the automation of compositional processes include serial techniques, pastiche via Markov chains [11] and use of chaotic processes [4]. This area is often called algorithmic composition, but that name is a little restrictive. In particular in this paper we describe not an algorithm but a set of rules, and the algorithm of realisation is not specified.

Our rule-based approach is closer to the constraint system of Anders [2], or the Bach chorale harmonisations of Ebcioğlu [12]. Moreover we are dedicated to writing compact and simple rules, with no sequentialisation or interpretation. Our work is based on the logic programming paradigm called Answer Set Programming.

3. ANSWER SET PROGRAMMING

Our system uses a form of logic programming called Answer Set Programming (ASP) [3] and specifically the language AnsProlog. Here we only present a short flavour of the language AnsProlog, and the interested reader is referred to [3] for a more in-depth coverage.

AnsProlog is a declarative knowledge representation language that allows the programmer to describe a problem and the requirements on the solutions in an intuitive way, rather than describing the algorithm to find the solutions to the problem.

The basic components of the language are atoms, elements that can be assigned a truth value. An atom can be negated using negation as failure in order to create the literal not `a`. We say that not `a` is true if we cannot find evidence supporting the truth of `a`; somebody is not guilty unless evidence is available. If `a` is true then not `a` is false and vice versa.

Atoms and literals are used to create rules of the general form: `a ← B, not C` where `a` is an atom, `B` and `C` are sets of atoms. Intuitively, this means *if all elements of B are known true and no element of C is known true, then a must be known true*. We refer to `a` as the head and `B ∪ not C` as the body of the rule. Rules with empty body are called *facts*; the head should always be true. A *AnsProlog program* is a finite set of rules.

The semantics of AnsProlog are defined in terms of *answer sets* – assignments of true and false to all atoms in the program that satisfy the rules in a minimal and consistent fashion. A program has zero or more answer sets, each corresponding to a solution, or in this case, a different musical piece. We exploit this semantics to produce different musical pieces that do not break rules of the style.

When used as a programming language, AnsProlog is enhanced to contain constraints (e.g. `← b, not c`) and choice rules (e.g. `{a, b, c} ← b, not c`). The former are
rules with an empty head, stating that an answer set cannot meet the conditions given in the body. The latter is a short hand notation for a conditional, non-deterministic choice; if the conditions in the body are met then one of the atoms in the head must be contained in an answer set. These additions are syntactic sugar and can be removed with linear, modular transformations (see [3]). Variables and predicated rules are also used and are handled, at the theoretical level and in most implementations, by instantiation (referred to as grounding).

An ASP system is composed of two processes, removing the variables from the program by instantiation with a grounder and computing answer sets of the propositional program with an answer set solver. We use GRINGO [14] and CLASP [13] for these.

4. ANTON

Our system implements the melody and counterpoint rules described by [16]. We treat these two components simultaneously; that is we do not create a melody and then harmonise it. It is also a composition system rather than improvisation, as it considers the whole piece out of time. Other modes of operation are supported, including computer aided composition and diagnosis of existing pieces.

The rules aim to compose in a sub-style of Renaissance Counterpoint, but there are also rules that govern sequence and timing. The rules can be considered in three areas; basic rules, style rules and rhythm rules.

4.1. Basic Rules

The basic rules define fundamental concepts of Western diatonic music such as consonant intervals, time passing, and valid note sequences, keys and modes. For example in the rule section called notes we define consonance:

```prolog
%% Consonant intervals are
%% unison (0), minor third (3),
%% major third (4), fourth (5),
%% perfect fifth (7) (mod 12)
consonantInterval(0).
consonantInterval(3).
consonantInterval(4).
consonantInterval(5).
consonantInterval(7).
```

and rules for melodic minor, where \( T \) is a time step and \( P \) is a part; the rule can be read as it is an error for a part to have move upwards to note 9 in the minor mode, i.e. the minor sixth is only usable in a minor key when the melody is descending.

```prolog
error(P,T,"Invalid in a minor key") :-
    chosenChromatic(P,T,9), upAt(P,T-1),
    mode(minor), partTime(P,T-1).
```

We use the predicate `error` rather than an empty clause so it can be instantiated to print a message when we are running in diagnostic mode (see section 6). When we are composing a constraint is used to prevent error occurring in the solution.

These rules are held in a number of files and are included via a PERL script to suit the requested style, in particular the mode, number of parts, etc.

The rules in this section apply in a wide range of styles.

4.2. Style Rules

The second class of rules relate to the details of Renaissance Counterpoint. For example we have the rules A leap of an octave is only allowed from the fundamental, and No tri-tone, the later encodes as:

```prolog
error(MP,T,"Tri-tone") :-
    chosenNote(MP,T,N1),
    chosenNote(MP,T+2,N1+6).
error(MP,T,"Tri-tone") :-
    chosenNote(MP,T,N1),
    chosenNote(MP,T+2,N1-6).
```

These are negative rules, which are in effect constraints. In fact the rules are either definitional or constraints. For example the style rule that parts should not cross can easily be encoded as it should not being the case that a part is lower than the next part at any time. All the rules were developed from [16] in a very short time by a musician and a computer scientist sitting together. Indeed it is our contention that rule-based mechanisms are easy to develop.

4.3. Rhythm Rules

Our first version of ANTON created simple chorale-like pieces which is a major restriction, and so we have developed a set of rules that encode some types of rhythm. Much of this follows the use of Farey sequences as developed in [5], which can model a large variety of rhythmic structures.

Allen [1] describes the 13 possible relations between two temporal intervals. These have been used as the basis of temporal interval logics and give a very expressive language for talking about the relations (and thus harmonisation) between different parts. However directly expressing these relations within AnsProlog is problematic. Part of this difficulty due to current solvers requiring programs to be instantiated before answer sets can be computed. The 13 different relations over a large domain would result in an extremely large grounded program with which current solvers cannot cope. For this reason we have used a simplification of the Allen intervals, using a single predicate, `noteOverlap` which is true if there is any instant when both its arguments are extant. The `noteOverlap` predicate combines nine (begins, contained, overlaps, ends and their converses plus same) of the different Allen relations. This is are sufficient for the style of music that we are currently modelling; we will consider relaxing this in section 7.

The rhythm is created via a tree, where each node is a musical time interval and the children are equal spaced subdivisions. The number of children is limited by the
order of the Farey sequence, and each child can be subdi-
vided. While the code is written to allow any maximum
order, for reasons of efficiency, and providing sufficient
variety for our style of music, we restrict the order to be
less than or equal to 3. This provides us with as a suf-
ficiently rich subset of trees (and hence rhythms) for our
musical genre.

The rhythm tree for our style has three duration levels
(measure, metre and notes) with each its own set of rules,
allowing us to specify points of stress, chords and time
signatures. While for each part an individual note duration
layer is created, all parts will have the same structure for
the measure and metre layer. Without this constraint no
consistency in piece can be guaranteed.

In figure 1 we present a small fragment of an ANTON
piece, clearly showing the independence of the parts, and
including triplets from the Farey sequence maximum of
three.

4.4. Process Control

The complete system consists of three major phases; build-
ing the program, running the solver and interpreting the
results. First we use a Perl script to assemble the rules
required for a particular piece; for example suppose we
wish to create a 4 bar piece in E major with rhythm one
would use the Perl wrapper and write

$ programBuilder.pl --task=compose \ 
   --mode=major --time=16 \ 
   --rhythm > program

which builds the AnsProlog program, giving the length
and mode.

These rules are passed to the grounder and on to the
solver to create solution; that is pieces of music that sat-
ify the rules provided.

$ gringo --compat < program \ 
   | clasp > piece

The third stage is to interpret the results. At present
we provide three interpretations; a printed list of notes, a
incorporating a simple orchestra.

$ ./parse.pl --output=csound \ 
   < piece > piece.csd
$ ./parse.pl --output=lilypond \ 
   < piece > piece.ly

5. EVALUATION OF ANTON

An important question that is hard to answer is whether
the notes created by ANTON are truly music. Clearly we
have listened to many outputs as part of the development,
and are satisfied with them. But in an attempt to give
more credence to our assertions we have started a program
of listening comparisons.\(^1\) We have collected a number
of ANTON pieces, together with transcriptions of histori-
cal composers and contemporary composers\(^2\), and pieces
written using random note selection.

A blind selection from these are then presented to a
number of individuals, both musically trained and not, for
rating.

At the time of writing we do not have sufficient trials
for any statistical significance, but we can report that so
far the results are as expected; ANTON does write music.
We intend to develop this evaluation strategy in the near
future.

6. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

As described above this is a rule based composition sys-
tem. But ANTON is much more than that. If a complete
piece is presented to it it will indicate whether it conforms
to the rules, diagnostic mode. By defining the error predi-
cate to include messages as to which rule failed it is possi-
ble to see why the piece is not within the style. We envis-
age that this mode could be useful in testing student works
that are supposed to be in a particular style. We did indeed
use this mode while developing the rules.

There is also an intermediate state of use, when some
of the piece is specified, and the system will provide the
rest. In the simple case this becomes a harmoniser, such
as might be for Bach chorales, but it could be the end-
ing, or specific moments when certain notes or chords are
required. In the longer term this might be of use in film
music or similar commodity needs.

\(^1\)But not currently completed
\(^2\)Not necessarily of the same quality
It maybe possible to use an external program to implement the Allen relations in support of the ASP system, but this is a significant structural change.

There still remain a few areas that ANTON does not currently address. This include rhythmic structure, such as balancing, and the vexed problem of larger-scale design. We see the rôle of ANTON as more creating short passages, and a different set of rules will be needed to assemble them into a longer piece.

At present we have only one set of style rules. We have plans to explore other areas, and we are aware of an attempt to create trance. We are also exploring methods of varying the rule selection and presenting a more user-oriented interface to the underlying logic.

7. CONCLUSIONS

We have presented a rule-based system that can use recent advances in logic programming to create a constructive, diagnostic or flexible system for music in one particular style. The framework is adaptable to other musical styles with some additional sets of rules. The music it produces in compositional mode is generally pleasant and acceptable, according to very preliminary listener tests, and on occasions produces fine moments.

There are many ways the system could be developed. For example we might throw light on the compositional process by learning aspects of the rules, finding which are inconsistent or redundant, or determining the importance of rules. We could investigate whether there are ‘unspoken’ rules, and experiment to find unacknowledged rules of composition. One particularly interesting possibility is using the system to generate a large set of pieces, acquiring human evaluations of the ‘quality’ of each and then using techniques such as inductive logic programming to infer rules for composing ‘good’ pieces.

Real composers sometimes break the rules. This could be simulated by one of a number of extensions to answer set semantics (preferences, consistency restoring rules, defensible rules, etc.). However, how to systematise the knowledge of when it is acceptable to break the rules and in which contexts it is ‘better’ to break them is an open problem.

We present ANTON as a tool for better understanding of the compositional process.
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