About

Ideologies

Music theory can sometimes be a really vague topic. We hear items about theory all the time. *Ooh, that's a perfect cadence* and *there's a picardy third!* But, what do these really mean? I mean yes, there's the definition that we can get on wikipedia or google, but so what? We can give labels all day, but labels are just labels. I can just as easily hear a random melody and say "*Oh wow this is truly exquisite. It's an perfectly implemented inverse sub-transit chain from the C to a B.* It's good to understand how to label certain ideas and concepts–after all, we need some way to communicate with one another–but, the hard part often has more to do with what we can do with this knowledge and how to expand on it. As I mentioned in the probably too long preface of this book, I view music theory in the same way as I view mathematics or physics. Knowledge of the field and its models evolves over time, but old "outdated" ideas can still be applied where appropriate. Additionally, there are differences between laws, theories, hypotheses, etc. This book is based on this ideology.

A different approach

With this view of music theory as a science, I hope to use a bit of a different approach. Don't worry though, there won't be heavy math involved :) (or at least not for most of the book). Moving on, the idea is of course to take the good parts of both artistic and scientific (these can be the same thing can't they?) styles of teaching, and combine it with a bit of traditional music pedagogy.

- **Examples.** TODO:
- **Theory (Concepts).** TODO:
- **Practice.** TODO:

Now at this point you might be looking at the bullet points and wondering how this is a different approach at all. And you'd be right, because I thought it was different until I reread this. I'm going to keep it here, though, because I still think there is some truth in it.

Coverage

Structure

How to get the most out of this book