

WRITTEN PAPER

As a general comment, it is recommended that candidates intending to do the next grade of Musicianship take the time for adequate preparation and understanding of the syllabus requirements. The overall standard of the written paper, particularly the two-part and four-part writing which carry the highest marks, was very disappointing.

Q1: Melody Writing

All candidates were able to make a reasonably good attempt at preserving the style of the given flute melody and modulating at appropriate places.

Q2: Two-Part Writing

This was a disappointing section. This was a very straightforward two-part exercise in which the first bar could be exactly imitated in the second. Only two candidates realised this. The common errors and weaknesses included:

- lack of imitation of any kind
- not preserving the *allegretto* two-part style and allowing phrase ending to simply 'sit' statically
- not always recognising the modulations or, if recognised, forgetting the add/subtract accidentals as appropriate
- introducing syncopation that had no relevance to the given part
- failing to 'line-up' notes and creating very awkward rhythmic glitches.

Q3: Four-Part Harmonisation

This gave cause for great concern and no candidate reached the pass mark in this particular question. Candidates need to read the question carefully and use the resources requested, eg accented and unaccented passing and auxiliary notes and suspensions (the last bar was ideally set up for a suspension but this was mostly ignored). The common errors included:

- not recognising passing and/or cadential 6/4s
- not recognising the underlying harmonic framework (eg Bar 1 was simply a tonic to dominant progression, not submediant-subdominant-tonic)
- weak voice leading resulting in awkward progressions
- grammatical errors: exposed and consecutive fifths and octaves; spacing problems
- not always recognising the modulations or being able to realise them correctly; augmented intervals; and leading notes incorrectly treated
- using sevenths and then not resolving them properly
- introducing inappropriate rhythmic figures
- omitting suspensions and accented passing/auxiliary notes.

Overall, a far-greater understanding of chord function and voice-leading is needed at this advanced level.

Q4: Instruments

- A. This question was universally well answered whether the students chose to explain the function of the valves on a horn or the slide on a trombone.
- B. All but one candidate was able to describe the shape of the mouthpiece of the four named instruments; however *no* candidate was able to specify the type of bore found in those same instruments. Most simply gave a description of the instrument and/or its sound.

Q5: History

- A. Definitions of the nineteenth century concert overture and the eighteenth-century operatic overture presented no problems.
- B. Rather than focusing on the contribution of either Haydn or Mozart to the symphonic repertoire, most candidates gave the history of the Mannheim school, its composers and their developments. At this level it is expected that candidates will have more than just a vague notion of how to relate relevant information to a given question.

Q6: Set Works

- A. Brahms: this presented no problems with all candidates successfully naming the pre-existing melodies and quoting a theme.
- B. Haydn: citing the changes in the recap of the first movement as opposed to the exposition was far more problematic.

AURAL PAPER

In contrast to the written paper, candidates handled the aural paper well and there were no particular areas of weakness.