

Title of lecture: PT IB (Paper 2 Analysis 19th Century)**Response from: Nick Marston (08.02.2018)**

This is a response to the 20 questionnaires returned following the last of my six lectures (3 in MT, 3 in LT) on the 19th-century part of this paper. What follows from this is that something like 60% of the Part IB cohort were unable to, or chose not to attend the lecture; it is difficult to know whether this in itself constitutes a 'response' to the course.

Most of the comments received are entirely positive, and there is little that is genuinely negative in tone. One or two respondents would prefer lectures to focus more on general techniques or theoretical concepts rather than digging deep into specific examples. This is something that I will certainly wish to ponder, though I would point out that the exemplification of technique and/or theory really cannot be done without recourse to specific examples in real compositions. Furthermore, this is, after all, an examination in *analysis*, not pure theory; so I have hoped that working through a single composition (or a series of smaller pieces, as in the Wolf lecture) would in effect give the students the chance to see how an experienced analyst might tackle the kind of material they will face in the exam room. To pick up on another response here, my lecture presentations are designed in part to show students 'how to find things' as an analysis is developed. The methodological slant is intended to show how what you find is conditioned by the kind of question you ask, or the kind of thing for which you choose to look.

Of slightly more concern are the various comments about supervision arrangements, which are not in my control. I don't personally feel that lectures and supervisions must always dovetail perfectly – supervisions are surely the forum in which to demonstrate that there are ways and means other than those of the lecturer; but some remarks suggest that the supervision experience for this paper is not all that it might be.