Title of lecture: Pt IA (4) Intro to Music Analysis

Response from: Nick Marston (15th February 2018)

I am gratified to find that the great majority of those 38 students who attended the final lecture and filled in the questionnaire responded positively, in the main, to the course and its content.

I am struck by the number of responses which express an interest in greater emphasis on analytical method, and Schenker in particular. At the beginning of each lecture I try to explain clearly what methodological approach I shall be taking (the introduction to topic theory in the third 'classical' lecture is a case in point). Moreover, I try to explain the general application of the methods and techniques that I must necessarily demonstrate through the analysis of an individual movement.

As to Schenker, if only . . . but there is simply not enough time to explicate this methodology in detail, given the wider remit of the course. Nor is a lecture format the best way in which to learn how to do Schenkerian analysis. Several lectures adopted a sometimes covert, 'Schenker-lite' approach, for example in the plotting of bass-line reductions across sonata-form development sections. Perhaps it will be possible to resurrect the Part IB Schenker option, last offered some years ago. I would be delighted.

If content sometimes goes beyond the requirements of the Part IA exam, I make little apology. Staged examinations are an irritating intrusion into the more important business of your education, which should be boundless!

The idea that multiple lecturers might be employed to give different perspectives is an interesting one which the Faculty might wish to consider. There would be an obvious loss in continuity; and one might argue that 'different perspectives' are precisely (or ought to be) the preserve of supervisions; thus, I worry slightly at the relatively frequent comment that supervisions and lectures have not been more closely related – I am not convinced that they should be.