analyst and the creative theorist, all of whom have equal dignity and value. The author seems somewhat reluctant to accept the equality of these related functions of his ideal professional theorist, due probably to his own experiences with one or more of these types. Criticisms of the current curricula and "theory pedagogues" are all too well founded — but the deplorable conditions described are by no means universal, and efforts are being made to remedy present conditions.

Professor Kraehenbuehl's paper is an honest and able effort to clarify the training and the functions of the theorist, though, perhaps wisely, little is said about his "habits." Since agreement is lacking among eminent musicians and educators regarding these matters, we are indebted to the author for his conscientious effort to summarize the problem and suggest suitable solutions.

Discussion by Gordon Binkerd

I find myself basically in agreement with nearly all of Mr. Kraehenbuehl's paper. The picture he projects of an intelligently trained and oriented theorist is refreshing and encouraging.

This suggested theorist appears to be in reality a musical historian, i.e. a scholar concerned in the main with systematic knowledge and understanding of the past. Such an historian would interpret the past as beginning with today and extending backwards through time. Concern with the music of our own times as well as that of more remote periods adds a significant dimension to what would otherwise be simply a specialist in the history of music. This kind of musical scholar would fall directly in the line of theorists reaching from the Middle Ages to Mr. Kraehenbuehl's own teacher, Paul Hindemith.

Basic musicianship, that is, training in singing and hearing, is certainly not theory, and I agree that there is no more reason for a theorist to preempt this field of instruction than for any other musician. I agree with his definition of the term "music theory." I agree with his statements as to what functions a music theorist should concern himself with and in which he should demonstrate competence. I agree that the present theorists more often than not exist in a kind of musical no-man's land with their feet on no discernible soil of their own. They are often regarded by their colleagues with suspicion and "bitter amusement," as Mr. Kraehenbuehl says. I agree that the theorist's training should be on a par with that of any other specialist. I agree that he should be a demonstrably gifted musician, either as a composer or as a performer, or both. I agree that he should be trained in scientific method. I agree that the theorist should be charged with providing understanding to the performer, whether the music be old or recent. Both the present-day composer and performer are at a great disadvantage in their lack of any kind of intelligent codification of operating principles. Scholars who develop a theory of composing procedure related to our own times would perhaps do as much for the significant progress of the art as any composer or group of composers. I agree that the music faculty, no matter how small, should include one of these envisioned theorists. I also would agree that a real stumbling block to progress in this direction lies in the present body of theory

teachers.

I do have some disagreement, however. I wonder if it is true, as Mr. Kraehenbuehl says, that "music theory may have little or nothing to do" with harmony and counterpoint. The bulk of the European musical heritage is either harmonic in nature, contrapuntal, or possesses some combination of both. Any theoretical concern with that music, then, would be intimately bound up with the harmonic and contrapuntal aspects of it. If this be so, then the "study" of harmony or counterpoint would seem a natural occupation.

I am not so prepared as Mr. Kraehenbuehl to throw out the actual writing of fugue or the admittedly artificial practice with species counterpoint. I do not agree that species counterpoint is unsatisfactory as a basis for understanding renaissance counterpoint. Theorists of the 15th and 16th centuries speak continuously of the treatment of dissonance in accordance with the temporal value of the note and its rhythmic placement, and this seems to me to be a satisfactory definition of species counterpoint. In fact, of all theoretical procedures in use today, that kind of treatment to be found in Jeppesen's books on the music of Palestrina seems the most nearly related to what Mr. Kraehenbuehl proposes as valid theory.

To answer Mr. Kraehenbuehl's question as to why anyone today should learn to write a fugue, I must speak only with respect to my own training as a composer. The study of Bach fugues and the Gedalge fugue book with Walter Piston proved the most important single factor in my preparation as a composer. When one attempts the writing of any of the contrapuntal styles of the Renaissance, one is slightly surprised on finding how easy it is. Leaving aside the matter of accurately reproducing the individualities of the various composers, one soon finds that the relating of voices to each other intervalically makes for realtive ease of handling. Similarly, a fair example of "modern" counterpoint can be rather easily written, since here also so much emphasis is placed on intervalic relationships. When one is forced, however, to produce a like contrapuntal freedom within a relatively restricted and demanding harmonic framework, as in the 18th-century fugue, one finds significant difficulties. It is an exercise which makes more telling demands upon the composer than any other technical form and puts the composer very much on his mettle. But this is not only an academic exercise. In my opinion, the unrestricted contrapuntal freedom of much of today's music must eventually come to grips with an organized harmonic framework, and when that happens the composer may be writing under very nearly the same circumstances as when he is trying to produce a "Bach fugue." I do not know of anything else which so develops the composer's ability to produce meaningful lines against a clear and intelligible harmonic foil. It is true that fugue lends itself to teaching, but it resists strongly to writing.

In my opinion there are three broad types of combining parts, and they are all important today. The first is the kind of polyphony written during the Renaissance, where the binding factors are interval and mode. The second is that of 18th-century counterpoint built upon an imperative harmony. The third is that found in the 19th century where harmonic organization is predominant, and where counterpoint is to a degree vestigial. The writing of the present and of the future is not

likely, in my opinion, to uncover a further comparable method of combination.

I think a distinction snould be made between the musician, at least insofar as he is a composer, and the natural scientist. The scientist is concerned primarily with current matters. As Mr. Kraehenbuehl says, "the past is summed up for him in a few general principles which he can observe in action in a series of carefully selected laboratory experiments." The difference seems to me to be that which separates a science from an art. The scientist is inclined to dispose rather quickly of past achievements and to dwell upon the present and future. A work of art, once produced, takes on a kind of timeless quality and may be as significant now as it was five hundred years ago. Also, the musician, as distinct from the scientist, is much more concerned with developing skills, and difficult skills they are. The composer learns by his own experience, but also by absorbing the experience of the past. In this connection, it is somewhat disturbing to me to hear Mr. Kraehenbuehl say that tradition for the composer is "the activity of the immediately preceding generation, perhaps even little more than the music of the past few years." And again, "the music of his own century, the only music that will be of any great significance to him within 20 or 30 years."

It will be noted that most of my objections concern the training of the composer. I should like to make the point, however, that often the composer is a musician who has been trained as a performer or as a historian, and who only eventually emerges as a composer. For this reason, if for no other, I believe we must keep in our curricula those aspects of our art which attempt to keep alive the basic skills of the past.

Discussion by Robert Melcher

Most theory teachers agree that standards, procedures, and course contents in their profession have too long been static, and in some areas even nonexistent. For theory study on the graduate level, Mr. Kraehenbuehl has provided some stimulating and provocative ideas, and it is sincerely to be hoped that many of his goals will be realized in considerably less time than the thirty to fifty years he prophesies. But when his suggestions are applied to the undergraduate level, serious doubts arise in my mind, for it seems to me that he fails to distinguish between the needs of graduate and undergraduate students and the kind of teaching required in each of these fields. I shall therefore restrict my comments to the effects of Mr. Kraehenbuehl's recommendations as they bear upon the teaching of music theory at the undergraduate level.

Mr. Kraehenbuehl says that the course of graduate study he proposes would develop the student into "an excellent theory pedagogue." But would it? The possession of a vast store of knowledge is not enough in itself to make one a successful teacher on the undergraduate level. The teacher of undergraduate students must, indeed, be a scholar, but he must also be able to present his knowledge to immature minds in a clear and stimulating fashion. Although graduate schools have produced