

A PROJECTION-ORIENTED MATHEMATICAL MODEL FOR SECOND-SPECIES COUNTERPOINT

OCTAVIO A. AGUSTÍN-AQUINO AND GUERINO MAZZOLA

ABSTRACT. Drawing inspiration from both the classical Guerino Mazzola’s symmetry-based model for first-species counterpoint (one note against one note) and Johann Joseph Fux’s *Gradus ad Parnassum*, we propose an extension for second-species (two notes against one note).

1. INTRODUCTION

Guerino Mazzola’s counterpoint model, founded on the concepts of

- (1) *strong dichotomy*, which encodes the notion of consonance and dissonance, and
- (2) *counterpoint symmetry*, which is the carrier of contrapuntal tension and allows to deduce the rules of counterpoint,

has been successful in explaining the necessity of regarding the fourth as a dissonance and obtaining the general prohibition of parallel fifths as a theorem. It also allows to define new understandings of consonance and dissonance, thereby leading to the concept of *counterpoint world*, i.e., paradigms for the handling of two-voice compositions represented as digraphs, whose vertices are consonant intervals and an arrow connects two of them whenever we have a valid progression. This, in turn, allows us to *morph* one world into another. See the monograph [2] and the treatise [4, Part VII] for a thorough account.

Despite these accomplishments, Mazzola’s model is restricted to the case of *first-species* counterpoint, which means that only one note can be placed against another. Hence, in order to increase the potential of Mazzola’s model for analysis and composition, it is indispensable to extend it to *second-species* counterpoint (i.e., two notes against one) and further. Our approach for a first step in this direction is to extend the notion of counterpoint interval to a 2-interval, i.e., one such that

Date: September 28th, 2018.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 00A65, 05E18.

Key words and phrases. Second-species, counterpoint.

This work was partially supported by a grant from the *Niels Hendrik Abel Board*.

two intervals are attached to a cantus firmus, the first one coming in the downbeat and the second one in the upbeat.

For our extension, the main idea is that the counterpoint symmetries in this case do not determine another 2-interval successor, but a first-species interval in the downbeat. The idea behind this is to blend the species of counterpoint more easily.

2. GENERAL OVERVIEW OF MAZZOLA'S COUNTERPOINT MODEL

Here we quickly survey the key aspects of Mazzola's counterpoint model (we refer the reader to [2] and [4, Part VII] for a complete account). We consider the action of the group

$$\overrightarrow{GL}(\mathbb{Z}_{2k}) := \mathbb{Z}_{2k} \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_{2k}^\times$$

(which we call the group of *general affine symmetries*) on \mathbb{Z}_{2k} , which can be described in the following manner:

$$T^u.v(x) = vx + u;$$

here T^u is the *transposition* by u , and v is the *linear part* of the transformation.

We know [1, 2] that, for any $k > 4$, there is at least one dichotomy $\Delta = (X/Y)$ of \mathbb{Z}_{2k} such that there is a unique $p \in \overrightarrow{GL}(\mathbb{Z}_{2k})$ and

$$p(X) = Y \quad \text{and} \quad p \circ p = \text{id}_{\mathbb{Z}_{2k}},$$

which is called the *polarity* of the dichotomy. The dichotomies with this property are called *strong*, and represent the division of intervals into generalized *consonances* X and *dissonances* Y .

Next we consider the *dual numbers*

$$\mathbb{Z}_{2k}[\epsilon] = \frac{\mathbb{Z}_{2k}[\mathcal{X}]}{\langle \mathcal{X}^2 \rangle} = \{x + \epsilon.y : x, y \in \mathbb{Z}_{2k}, \epsilon^2 = 0\}$$

in order to attach to each *cantus firmus* x the interval y that separates it from its *discantus*¹. Thus for a strong dichotomy $\Delta = (X/Y)$ we have the consonant intervals

$$X[\epsilon] := \{c + \epsilon.x : c \in \mathbb{Z}_{2k}, x \in X\}$$

and the dissonant intervals $Y[\epsilon] = \mathbb{Z}_{2k} \setminus X[\epsilon]$. Considering the group

$$\overrightarrow{GL}(\mathbb{Z}_{2k}[\epsilon]) := \{T^{a+\epsilon.b}.(v + \epsilon.w) : a, b, w \in \mathbb{Z}_{2k}, v \in \mathbb{Z}_{2k}^\times\},$$

¹The discantus can be understood in the *sweeping* ($x+y$) or the *hanging* ($x-y$) orientations, but we will only use the sweeping orientation from this point on.

there is a canonical autocomplementary symmetry $p_\Delta^c \in \overrightarrow{GL}(\mathbb{Z}_{2k})$ such that

$$p_\Delta^c(X[\epsilon]) = Y[\epsilon] \quad \text{and}$$

and leaves the *tangent space* $c + \epsilon.\mathbb{Z}_{2k}$ invariant.

With this preamble it is possible to state a classical paradox for first-species counterpoint theory: all the intervals $c + \epsilon.k$ used in a first-species counterpoint composition or improvisation are consonances. Hence, how can any tension between the voices arise, if at all? Mazzola's solution is inspired in the fact [6, p. 33-35] that it is not that the point c which is to be confronted against $c + k$, but it is the consonant point $\xi = c_1 + \epsilon.k_1$ who will face a successor $\eta = c_2 + \epsilon.k_1$. The idea is to *deform* the dichotomy $(X[\epsilon]/Y[\epsilon])$ into $(gX[\epsilon], gY[\epsilon])$ through a symmetry $g \in \overrightarrow{GL}(\mathbb{Z}_{2k}[\epsilon])$, such that

- (1) the interval ξ becomes a deformed dissonance, i.e., $\xi \in gY[\epsilon]$,
- (2) the symmetry g is an autocomplementary function of

$$(gX[\epsilon], gY[\epsilon])$$

which means that $p(gX[\epsilon]) = gY[\epsilon]$,

and thus we can transit from ξ to a consonance η which is also a deformed consonance, i.e., $\eta \in gX[\epsilon] \cap X[\epsilon]$. Since we wish to have the maximum amount of choices, we request also that

- (3) the set $gX[\epsilon] \cap X[\epsilon]$ is of maximum cardinality among the symmetries that satisfy conditions 1 and 2.

The elements of this latter set are the *admitted successors*.

3. DICHOTOMIES OF 2-INTERVALS

For the purposes of the second-species counterpoint, we need now an algebraic structure such that two intervals can be attached to a base tone. In the spirit of the model presented in the previous section, we take all the polynomials of the form

$$c + \epsilon_1.x + \epsilon_2.y \in \frac{\mathbb{Z}_{2k}[\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}]}{\langle \mathcal{X}^2, \mathcal{Y}^2, \mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y} \rangle} = \mathbb{Z}_{2k}[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2]$$

where $\epsilon_1 \equiv \mathcal{X} \pmod{\langle \mathcal{X}^2, \mathcal{Y}^2, \mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y} \rangle}$, $\epsilon_2 \equiv \mathcal{Y} \pmod{\langle \mathcal{X}^2, \mathcal{Y}^2, \mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y} \rangle}$, c is the cantus firmus and x, y are the intervals (x is for the downbeat and y is for the upbeat). An element $\xi \in \mathbb{Z}_{2k}[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2]$ is called a *2-interval*. If $\Delta = (X/Y)$ is a strong dichotomy with polarity $p = T^u \circ v$, then

$$X[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2] := \mathbb{Z}_{2k} + \epsilon_1.X + \epsilon_2.\mathbb{Z}_{2k}$$

is an dichotomy in $\mathbb{Z}_{2k}[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2]$. We choose this dichotomy because the rules of counterpoint demand that the interval that comes on the down-beat to be a consonance. A polarity for this dichotomy, which is analogous to the one for the first-species case, is

$$p^c = T^{c(1-v)+\epsilon_1.u+\epsilon_2.u} \circ v$$

because

$$\begin{aligned} p^c X[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2] &= T^{c(1-v)} \circ v.\mathbb{Z}_{2k} + \epsilon_1.pX + \epsilon_2.p\mathbb{Z}_{2k} \\ &= \mathbb{Z}_{2k} + \epsilon_1.Y + \epsilon_2.\mathbb{Z}_{2k} \\ &= Y[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2] \end{aligned}$$

and it is such that

$$p^c(c + \epsilon_1.\mathbb{Z}_{2k} + \epsilon_2.\mathbb{Z}_{2k}) = c + \epsilon_1.\mathbb{Z}_{2k} + \epsilon_2.\mathbb{Z}_{2k},$$

which means p^c fixes the tangent space to cantus firmus c as well.

We also check the following formula for future use:

$$\begin{aligned} p^{c_1+c_2} &= T^{(c_1+c_2)(1-v)+\epsilon_1.u+\epsilon_2.u} \circ v \\ &= T^{c_1(1-v)+c_2(1-v)+\epsilon_1.u+\epsilon_2.u} \circ v \\ &= T^{c_1} \circ T^{-vc_1} \circ T^{c_2(1-v)+\epsilon_1.u+\epsilon_2.u} \circ v \\ &= T^{c_1} \circ T^{c_2(1-v)+\epsilon_1.u+\epsilon_2.u} \circ v \circ T^{-c_1} \\ &= T^{c_1} \circ p^{c_2} \circ T^{-c_1}. \end{aligned}$$

4. SPECIES PROJECTIONS

If we represent the polynomial $c + \epsilon_1.x + \epsilon_2.y$ as a column vector, the candidates to (non-invertible) *species projections* are

$$\begin{aligned} g : \mathbb{Z}_{2k}[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2] &\rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{2k}[\epsilon_1] \\ \begin{pmatrix} c \\ x \\ y \end{pmatrix} &\mapsto \begin{pmatrix} s & 0 & 0 \\ sw_1 & s & sw_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c \\ x \\ y \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} t_1 \\ t_2 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= [sc + t_1] + \epsilon_1.[s(w_1c + x + w_2y) + t_2] \end{aligned}$$

for we want to keep it as simple as possible and that the second part of the interval to influence the first part of the successor, but not the second one. We do not require the transformation to be bijective for we want it to be able to swap from second-species to first-species if necessary².

²For the converse swap the standard rules of counterpoint suffice: we can arbitrarily define the third component of the 2-interval. This is coherent with the local application of counterpoint rules in Fux's theory, and also with the particular

Let $X[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2.y] := \mathbb{Z}_{12} + \epsilon_1.X + \epsilon_2.y$. We might define a species projection of a 2-interval $\xi = c + \epsilon_1.x + \epsilon_2.y$ as one such that

- (1) the condition $c + \epsilon_1.x \notin gX[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2.y]$ holds,
- (2) the square

$$(1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{Z}_{2k}[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2] & \xrightarrow{g} & \mathbb{Z}_{2k}[\epsilon_1] \\ p^c \downarrow & & \downarrow p_\Delta^c \\ \mathbb{Z}_{2k}[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2] & \xrightarrow{g} & \mathbb{Z}_{2k}[\epsilon_1] \end{array}$$

commutes, where

$$p_\Delta^c := T^{c(1-v)+\epsilon_1.u} \circ v$$

is the *canonical* polarity of $(X[\epsilon_1]/Y[\epsilon_1])$, and

- (3) the cardinality of $gX[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2.y] \cap X[\epsilon_1]$ is maximal among the projections with the previous properties.

The reason for the second requirement is that when it is fulfilled then

$$p_\Delta^c(gX[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2]) = g(p^c X[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2]) = gY[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2],$$

thus p_Δ^c is an autocomplementary function of $gX[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2]$.

5. ALGORITHM FOR THE CALCULATION OF PROJECTIONS

As with the first-species case, if for a projection of the form

$$g = T^{\epsilon_1.t_2} \circ \begin{pmatrix} s & 0 & 0 \\ sw_1 & s & sw_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

we define

$$g^{(t_1)} = g \circ T^{\epsilon_1.s^{-1}w_1t_1+\epsilon_2.t_1}$$

then the relation

$$T^{t_1} \circ g = g^{(-t_1)} \circ T^{s^{-1}t_1+\epsilon_2.t_1},$$

holds, and hence contrapuntal projections can be calculated with *cantus firmus* 0 and successors can be suitably adjusted [2, Theorem 2.2]. Therefore, we can set $t_1 = 0$ and work with intervals of the form $\xi = \epsilon_1.y + \epsilon_2.z$. For (1) to commute, it is necessary and sufficient that

$$(2) \quad t_2 + su(1 + w_2) = u + vt_2.$$

For $\epsilon_1.y \notin gX[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2.z]$ we need

$$y = sp(\ell) + t_2 + sw_2z$$

idea of projection that stems from the fact that, in order to analyze a fragment, we “disregard” notes on the upbeat [3, pp. 41-43].

for some $\ell \in X$. Hence, for some $\ell \in X$ we have

$$(3) \quad t_2 = y - s(p(\ell) + w_2 z).$$

Remark 5.1. Letting $w_2 = 0$ in (2) and (3), they reduce to the first-species case. Thus, taking $s = v$ and $\ell = y$ both are satisfied and hence we conclude that there exists at least one second-species counterpoint projection.

We only need to work with the following set

$$\begin{aligned} gX[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2.z] &= \bigcup_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_k} g(x + \epsilon_1.X + \epsilon_2.z) \\ &= \bigcup_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_{2k}} (sx + \epsilon_1.(sw_1x + sw_2z + t_2 + sX)) \\ &= \bigcup_{r \in \mathbb{Z}_{2k}} (r + \epsilon_1.(w_1r + sX + w_2sz + t_2)) \\ &= \bigcup_{r \in \mathbb{Z}_{2k}} (r + \epsilon_1.T^{w_1r + w_2sz + t_2} \circ sX) \end{aligned}$$

to calculate the following cardinality

$$|gX[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2.z] \cap X[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2.z]| = \sum_{r \in \mathbb{Z}_{2k}} |T^{w_1r + w_2sz + t_2} \circ sX \cap X|.$$

When (3) holds, this reduces to

$$(4) \quad |gX[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2.z] \cap X[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2.z]| = \sum_{r \in \mathbb{Z}_{2k}} |T^{w_1r + y - sp(\ell)} \circ sX \cap X|.$$

From now on we only need to adapt *mutatis mutandis* Hichert's algorithm [2, Algorithm 2.1] to search projections that maximize the intersection.

We must remark that (2) and (3) are perturbations of the conditions to find the counterpoint symmetries for the first-species case. These, together with (4), show that the conditions for deducing a counterpoint theorem [2, Theorem 2.3] hold again, which yields the following result.

Theorem 5.2. *Given a marked strong dichotomy (X/Y) in \mathbb{Z}_{2k} , the 2-interval $\xi \in X[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2]$ has at least k^2 and at most $2k^2 - k$ admitted successors.*

Algorithm 5.3. Here $\chi(x, y)$ is the function that returns the cardinality $T^x.yX \cap X$.

Input: A strong dichotomy $\Delta = (X/Y)$ and its polarity $T^u.v$.

Output: The set of counterpoint projections $\Sigma_{y,z} \subseteq H$ for each $\epsilon.y + \epsilon.z \in X[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2]$.

```

1: for all  $y, z \in X$  do
2:    $M \leftarrow 0, \Sigma_{y,z} \leftarrow \emptyset.$ 
3:   for all  $s \in GL(\mathbb{Z}_{2k})$  do
4:     for all  $\ell \in X$  do
5:       for all  $w_1, w_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{2k}$  do
6:          $t_2 \leftarrow y - s((v\ell + u) + w_2z).$ 
7:         if  $t_2 + su(1 + w_2) = u + vt_2$  then
8:           if  $w_1 = 0$  then
9:              $S \leftarrow 2k\chi(t_2, s).$ 
10:          else if  $w_1 \in GL(\mathbb{Z}_{2k})$  then
11:             $S \leftarrow k^2$ 
12:          else
13:             $\rho \leftarrow \gcd(w_1, 2k)$ 
14:             $S \leftarrow \rho \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{2k}{\rho}-1} \chi(j\rho + t_2 + w_2z, s).$ 
15:            if  $S > M$  then
16:               $\Sigma_{y,z} \leftarrow \left\{ T^{\epsilon_2.t_2} \circ \begin{pmatrix} s & 0 & 0 \\ sw_1 & s & sw_2 \end{pmatrix} \right\}.$ 
17:               $S \leftarrow M.$ 
18:            else if  $S = M$  then
19:               $\Sigma_{y,z} \leftarrow \Sigma_{y,z} \cup \left\{ T^{\epsilon_2.t_2} \circ \begin{pmatrix} s & 0 & 0 \\ sw_1 & s & sw_2 \end{pmatrix} \right\}.$ 
20:   return  $\Sigma_{y,z}.$ 

```

Example 5.4. The first (valid³) example of second-species counterpoint in the *Gradus ad Parnassum* [3, p. 45] is

$$\begin{aligned}
\xi_1 &= 2 + \epsilon_1.7 + \epsilon_2.0, & \xi_2 &= 5 + \epsilon_1.4 + \epsilon_2.6, & \xi_3 &= 4 + \epsilon_1.8 + \epsilon_2.3, \\
\xi_4 &= 2 + \epsilon_1.7 + \epsilon_2.0, & \xi_5 &= 7 + \epsilon_1.4 + \epsilon_2.5, & \xi_6 &= 5 + \epsilon_1.9 + \epsilon_2.4, \\
\xi_7 &= 9 + \epsilon_1.3 + \epsilon_2.5, & \xi_8 &= 7 + \epsilon_1.9 + \epsilon_2.4, & \xi_9 &= 5 + \epsilon_1.9 + \epsilon_2.4, \\
& & \xi_{10} &= 4 + \epsilon_1.7 + \epsilon_2.9, & \xi_{11} &= 2 + \epsilon_1.0
\end{aligned}$$



³The first example is the student's attempt to write a second-species discantus by himself, but he makes two mistakes near the end of the exercise, namely the steps from the sequence $7 + \epsilon_1.2 + \epsilon_2.11$, $5 + \epsilon_1.0 + \epsilon_2.9$, $4 + \epsilon_1.11 + \epsilon_2.1$. They are also forbidden steps in the projection model!

Some counterpoint projections for the successors are

$$g_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 7 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 7 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, g_2 = T^{\epsilon_1.6} \circ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 6 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, g_3 = T^{\epsilon_1.6} \circ \begin{pmatrix} 7 & 0 & 0 \\ 6 & 7 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$g_4 = g_1, g_5 = g_2, g_6 = T^{\epsilon_1.8} \circ \begin{pmatrix} 5 & 0 & 0 \\ 8 & 5 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$g_7 = \begin{pmatrix} 11 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 11 & 8 \end{pmatrix}, g_8 = g_6, g_9 = g_6, g_{10} = g_1.$$

Let us examine in little bit more of detail the first transition. Note that $\eta = 11 + \epsilon_1.4 + \epsilon_1.11$ is a consonance, and that

$$g_1(\eta) = \begin{pmatrix} 7 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 7 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 11 \\ 4 \\ 11 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 5 \\ 4 \end{pmatrix},$$

which justifies the fact that the 2-interval $5 + \epsilon_1.4 + \epsilon_2.6$ is an admitted successor.

6. COMPARISON WITH FUX'S APPROACH

Fux states the following in relation to second-species counterpoint (emphasis is our own) [3, p. 41]:

The second species results when two half notes are set against a whole note. The first of them comes on the downbeat and must always be consonant; the second comes on the upbeat and *it may be dissonant if it moves from the preceding note and to the following note stepwise*. However, *if it moves by a skip, it must be consonant*.

We made a program that compares the performance of a first-species model that takes into account Fux's restrictions against the projection model. More explicitly, taking a second-species step

$$(0 + \epsilon_1.k_1 + \epsilon_2.t_1, c_2 + \epsilon_1.k_2)$$

such that we can proceed (in first-species) from $0 + \epsilon_1.k_1$ to $c_2 + \epsilon_1.k_2$, we verify the following cases:

- (1) the upbeat interval t_1 of the first 2-interval is allowed to be dissonant only when it connects a valid progression of consonances stepwise, i.e., $0 + t_1$ is between $0 + k_1$ and $c_2 + k_2$ and it is separated at most 2 semitones from them and
- (2) if t_1 is consonant, we duplicate the cantus firmus and check if $(0 + \epsilon.k_1, 0 + \epsilon.t_1)$ and $(0 + \epsilon.t_1, c_2 + \epsilon.k_2)$ are valid first-species steps.

The results appear in Table 1 for cases 1 and 2. We must stress that the projection model was not restricted in case 1 to stepwise dissonances but it allowed any dissonance in the upbeat.

Number of steps	Case 1	Case 2
Total	1994	2592
Valid only for Fux model	9	178
Valid only for the projection model	1447	860
Valid in both models	301	1464

TABLE 1. Data for comparison of Fux’s model with restrictions for second species against the projection model.

We note that the number of cases the projection model cannot explain and only Fux can is relatively small: they amount to 2.9% and 17.1% for cases 1 and 2, respectively. Thus we can conclude that the vast majority of what is forbidden in the projection model is also forbidden in Fux’s model, or that we have successfully extended Fux’s handling of dissonance and consonance for second species. Even if this could be ascribed to the fact that the projection model admits 87.663% and 89.660% of the total of transitions in cases 1 and 2, respectively, it should be kept in mind that the one-species model admits 89.671% of the possible steps between consonant intervals [5, p. 48].

REFERENCES

1. Octavio A. Agustín-Aquino, *Counterpoint in 2k-tone equal temperament*, Journal of Mathematics and Music **3** (2009), no. 3, 153–164.
2. Octavio A. Agustín-Aquino, Julien Junod, and Guerino Mazzola, *Computational counterpoint worlds*, Springer, Heidelberg, 2015.
3. Alfred Mann, *The study of counterpoint*, W. W. Norton & Company, 1965, Translation of fragments of *Gradus ad Parnassum* by J.J. Fux.
4. Guerino Mazzola, *The Topos of Music*, 2nd ed., vol. I: Theory, Springer, Heidelberg, 2017.
5. Alejandro Nieto, *Una aplicación del teorema de contrapunto*, B. Sc. thesis, ITAM, 2010.
6. Klaus-Jürgen Sachs, *Der Contrapunctus im 14. und 15. Jahrhundert*, Beihefte zum Archiv für Musikwissenschaft, vol. 13, Franz Steiner Verlag, 1974.

INSTITUTO DE FÍSICA Y MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD TECNOLÓGICA DE LA MIXTECA, HUAJUAPAN DE LEÓN, OAXACA, MÉXICO
E-mail address: octavioalberto@mixteco.utm.mx

SCHOOL OF MUSIC, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, MN, USA
E-mail address: mazzola@umn.edu