

Order of Proceedings

Oration by Dr Ivan Callus, B.Ed.(Hons.), B.A.(Hons), M.A., Ph.D.(Cardiff)

Address by Stephen Spiteri, a Ph.D. graduand and
a representative of the graduands.

Conferment of Degrees

Solemn Declaration by Graduates

INNU MALTI

The Congregation rises when the Dignitaries leave the Hall.

Dr Ivan Callus

Department of English, Faculty of Education

I start my oration today in the knowledge that we know about oratory, we Maltese. From pulpit panegyrics to political demagoguery, we've known and heard it all. But what about orations from the academic lectern? What's our relation with that?

Academic orations typically come around once a year, during graduation ceremonies. They're part of graduation ritual. Indeed, they're as much part of that ritual as running around the country to secure a gown for the evening in the right Faculty colours; or the photographs taken while in our robed finery; or the messages of congratulation in the Classified sections of the newspapers; or the high spirits at the end of the evening that – for some strange reason – are rarely ever remembered in distinct detail. Yet while most graduates remember various aspects of the event, they rarely remember the oration. And why would they? The oration is thrust into the “official” part of the evening. It is a perfect example of one of the annoying rules of life: at significant moments in our careers, there will be a speech. We accept this because it seems unavoidable. Of course, we can choose to sit through the oration rowdily rather than attentively, but the oration will remain stubbornly there. It is part of the frame to the important business of the day, which has the University conferring its seal of approval upon our competence and expertise.

Our relation with the graduation oration, then, must be one of stoicism. The oration must be endured as we get on to what's really on our minds: that is, the business of having accreditation placed in our hands. You will forgive me if this makes me feel slightly unwelcome as I stand here today. I am expected to say something which fits the occasion, but which can then be forgotten. I am expected to get on with it, and perform the forgettable.

You would not be entirely surprised, then, if someone in my position were to feel disinclined to say something forgettable, and to say something controversial instead. As we all know, however, most controversies are themselves forgettable. They tend to get swallowed up by the next controversy anyway. So instead what I shall say at this oration is not unforgettable or controversial. It is merely something I consider to be important. And as I'm convinced that it's important, I shall hope that you will be able to relate to it, and to remember something of it.

On with it then. You will have noticed that on really important occasions – at a superpower summit, for instance – the speeches are usually short. Let me therefore tell you briefly – in a nutshell – what I would like to say today, in the hope that you will not forget it. It is, quite simply, this: The humanities matter. So what are we doing about them?

I have uttered my soundbite, you see. I repeat it: it is this one. The humanities matter. So what are we doing about them? Indeed, in the spirit of speeches at important occasions being short, I would be tempted to leave it at that. But as I'm performing an oration, and as my position as a lecturer in English and literary criticism obliges me to observe "the law of genre," as one critic has it, I shall now respect the genre of the oration, and say something a little more involved than what can be consigned to a soundbite. But if you forget that part of the oration, I would ask you to at least remember my main point. The humanities matter. So what are we doing about them?

I shall not pitch my oration's response to that question today as an appeal to any of the various authorities present here today to "do more" – as the phrase goes – for the humanities. They and I know all too well that I have done that on other occasions, and they and I can cheerfully agree that I shall continue to badger them about the importance of doing more for the humanities. But that is not my purpose today because on this occasion I would instead like to address the question to you who are graduating this evening. The humanities matter. So what do you propose to do about them?

Let me comment on the background to this a little bit. It is easy to acknowledge that the humanities matter. The study within the university of philosophy, history, the arts, literature, music, theatre, the modern languages, linguistics, the classics, sociology, anthropology, political theory and international relations: of course all of this matters. Who would deny that? Do we not have an entire Faculty of Arts dedicated to them, in evidence of that mattering? It sometimes seems, however, that the puzzlement concerning how to respond to the fact that the humanities matter is not so much what to do about these humanities. The answer to that is relatively easy, not least because everyone thinks they know what ought to be done. For instance, that easiest of suggestions: give them more funding; or create (as I have myself suggested) a National Research Endowment for the study of the humanities, or, or, or ... (we will each have our own ideas on what to add to that "or"). The thornier issue, however, is not so much what to do about the humanities, as much as it is what to do with

them. All too often, in my view, this is responded to in the key of that familiar conundrum: “employability.” Thankfully, there is increasing awareness that a formation in the humanities, even for those following other career choices, does not run counter to employability. But I am not entirely sure that we are following up promotion of the humanities with a deeper awareness of why the fact that they matter is as self-evident as my soundbite assumes.

Please don't get me wrong. I appreciate all too well that there is ample evidence nationwide of a widespread attunement and loyalty to the humanities, and of an appreciation of what the humanities can “do” for us. People continue to buy books; they attend art exhibitions and plays and concerts; they talk and speculate about matters raised in fields ranging from philosophy to history, from politics to anthropology; they participate – in some cases professionally, in others in a more leisurely way – in various events that broadly speaking have to do with the issue of “culture,” which, however we define it, is ultimately what the humanities are surely about in the end. It is not then as if we have all become “Philistines” or “anarchic,” to use the terms the nineteenth-century poet and thinker Matthew Arnold used when he wished to alarm his readership about the consequences of not doing anything about or with “culture.” “Culture,” it should here be stressed, is a problematic and highly political entity whose definition arouses passionate differences of opinion among practitioners of various fields within the humanities themselves. For we must remember, of course, that when speaking about the humanities it is not as if we are speaking about a set of disciplines which somehow magically cohere conceptually, perceptually, organisationally. The humanities experience diverse fissures within and across the constituent disciplines, so that speaking of them collectively is not entirely a cogent position to take, least of all when considering their differing takes on culture. Despite that, however, or perhaps because of it, it is tempting to feel reassured that we are all doing something about the humanities, or at least about “culture.” That happens to the extent that we feel we are taking initiatives in the interest of “culture,” individually, institutionally, nationally. After all, nobody would want to think themselves “uncultured,” even though there continues to be some preoccupation over whether there is or is not sufficient “enculturation,” so to speak, in regard to the fact that the humanities matter. And certainly nobody would want to be on the wrong end of the suggestion that they are not doing enough for the humanities, or for culture. Least of all nowadays, when it is manifestly clear to everyone there are advantages for national prosperity if we attend to “culture” – and presumably, therefore, to what is that the humanities “do.” Our question,

therefore, now suddenly appears timely and urgent. The humanities matter. What are we to do about them?

Let me suggest that living or helping others to live a “cultured life,” whatever that might mean, is not a sufficient response or an adequate testimony to the value of the humanities or of a “liberal education,” as it is occasionally referred to. It does not “do” enough. I would like to put two scenarios before you. It is possible to feel that a “part-time” commitment to what the humanities represent – as in maintaining an “after hours” interest in, for instance, the theatre generally, or art exhibitions, or contemporary fiction or poetry – is a reasonable level of commitment, and this may well feel right and be right for many of us who are unable to commit more and who are, indeed, glad to be able devote that much time to “culture,” as we continue to call it. The other option, which may perhaps be more fairly expected of graduates in the Arts, is to profess the humanities. The phrase is adapted from the critic Gerald Graff, who in a book called *Professing Literature* (1989) identified the main consequence of the professionalisation of the humanities within the academy as a greater need to profess – in the sense of “bear witness to” – the importance and continuing relevance of the humanities outside academe. In other words, what would be needed here would be the conviction that it is not an indulgence to devote oneself to the humanities “full-time,” and that resisting the the notion that that would be an indulgence is itself a professional calling.

This leads me to a crucial point. It is that we shall not be able to respond adequately – as a university, as a society, as a culture, as a nation even – to what it is that we ought to be doing about the humanities unless we are mindful of how that debate is being prosecuted elsewhere. And the debate is one that rages strongly even as we speak. I have had occasion before, within our university, to refer to that debate. In the 2002 Annual Report I wrote about the continued significance of a book by Bill Readings, *The University in Ruins* (1996). Readings there addresses a number of contemporary issues impinging on institutions of higher education in the West, and especially on the role of the humanities within those institutions. These include the university’s leanings towards corporate culture, perceptions of “the bankruptcy of a liberal education” and a rethought “idea of excellence,” and the developing relationship between the university and the community at a time when the former is alleged to have become “posthistorical” and the latter marked by “dissensus.” But the thematic thread unifying Readings’ study is the idea of ruin. For Readings, ruin can be understood in diverse senses of decay, despoliation, destitution and destruction, and in reference also to the importance of ensuring

that those senses are not suffered in the pursuit of knowledge. Linked to this is the paradoxical attractiveness which ruins, in their various forms, have always had for the inquiring mind. In another sense, too, ruin is the fate of the university, for there is hardly any worthwhile experience of the university that is not “ruinous” in the financial sense. Other commentators, taking further a tradition of critique of the university that stretches back to F. R. Leavis, T. S. Eliot, and Cardinal Newman, have since weighed in with their opinions on the issue. The titles of some of the more recent studies in this tradition are revealing. They include William Clarke, *Academic Charisma and the Origins of the Research University* (2006); Harry R. Lewis, *Excellence without a Soul: How a Great University Forgot Education* (2006); Derek Bok, *Universities in the Marketplace: The Commercialization of Higher Education* (2004); or Gerald Graff’s own *Clueless in Academe: How Schooling Obscures the Life of the Mind* (2003). That such books continue to be issued by reputable university presses – the studies I have cited are published, among others, by Chicago University Press, Princeton University Press, and Yale University Press – should concentrate our minds. It suggests that there is sustained and considerable reflexivity within the humanities in regard to what they are about and how they carry themselves amidst contemporary pressures. And that reflexivity occupies a genre in itself within the humanities: the genre which asks, in effect, *The humanities matter. So what are we doing about them?*

Within that genre, few ideas have been more influential than that involving the “post-humanities.” The post-humanities are not, as it might be too tempting to think, what supplant the humanities. They are not the result of the humanities becoming a casualty in any “contest of the faculties,” to borrow a phrase from Immanuel Kant. They are, rather, the humanities renewed, revitalised, and reaffirmed. The post-humanities are the multiform response of the humanities in the face of the recurrent need for their own renewal; in the face of all the challenges facing the ideals of a liberal education; in the face of lingering doubts that the humanities can be professed, in the face of the distinctive challenges of the global, technoscientific, information-rich twenty-first century. The post-humanities occur when one no longer feels self-indulgent in committing to the humanities, and when their importance does not require any apology. In the end, therefore – and certainly in events like a graduation ceremony, when the past, present, and future of higher education come together in significant ways – they are what ought to be glimpsed when responding to a question that will not go away.

The humanities matter. So what are we doing about them?

INESTIMABLE PATRIMONY

Stephen C Spiteri

Oliver Wendell Holmes, the great nineteenth-century American poet and physician wrote that every calling is great, if greatly pursued. My own particular ‘calling’ has been the study of military engineering and fortifications. The greatest difficulty in following this vocation is that it has had its heyday two to three centuries ago. In the days of the Comte de Pagan, Marshal Vauban, or Lord Palmerston it would have been possible to follow and foster a career devoted to the design and building of fortifications. In this day and age, however, there is very little demand for expertise in this field.

Still, in an island like Malta, which boasts one of the richest and largest concentrations of fortifications to be found anywhere around the world, an expert knowledge of fortifications does take on a whole new relevance. Even more so now that the country has finally woken up to the need and obligation to restore and rehabilitate this unique and inestimable heritage of forts and fortifications.

It is the field of conservation and restoration studies, therefore, rather than that of design proper, that presents several opportunities for the study of military engineering and architecture. Here, prospects for advanced studies are not lacking since the poor state of this military heritage is to be seen all over the country.

The work to be done is immense and urgent.

Despite the important historical and architectural significance of these “bulwarks of Christendom” and “ramparts of empire”, the larger part of this heritage is to be found in a poor and deplorable state of preservation. The deterioration of these buildings has become rampant especially during these last few decades. The heavy bombing during the war, followed by neglect and destruction as a result of de-militarization, industrialization, and urbanization in the post-war period all account for their present state.

The overall picture that emerges today of Malta’s fortifications is one of general abandonment and misuse, accompanied by an accelerating deterioration of the architectural fabric, all compounded further by the sheer scale, magnitude, and diversity of this huge mass of buildings.

Up to post-war boom in urban development, military architecture represented the largest local product resulting from geomorphic activity, in the process changing and re-modelling the topography and landscape of our Islands. Compared stone for stone, fortifications surpass all our churches and palaces put together.

What all this really means today, is that finding the financial and human resources, and technical expertise to tackle conservation is now so huge a problem that it will not be possible to remedy the situation without help from foreign sources.

One assumes that accession into EU will help us tap significant financial resources which otherwise may not have been available. To sustain large scale interventions (which cannot be remedied in the short term) it is also essential to create a pool of professionally trained architects, restorers, and craftsmen.

In this regard, we have to thank the Works Division and acknowledge the foresight that was shown by the founders of the Restoration Unit, when this branch was created more than a decade ago. Not only was this unit set up, but also equipped to deal with these special works. Right from the very beginning steps were taken to employ and train professional people and craftsmen in all the disciplines of scientific restoration.

Furthermore, over the past five years, in conjunction with the Institute of Baroque Studies, the Works Division has been sponsoring a number of courses dedicated to the appreciation and restoration of Baroque architecture. The curriculum includes the study of military architecture.

In the five years that I have been lecturing this subject, I was surprised to learn that a considerable proportion of our people are actually oblivious to the presence of these fortifications that surround us and their inestimable value. It is as if our educational system has failed altogether to inculcate an awareness, let alone a sense of appreciation, of the salient features that make up our historical landscape. For many of the students, the introduction to the subject of Maltese fortifications is nothing short of a revelation.

Once made aware, however, most quickly succumb to the fascination of these imposing structures. Despite its highly technical nature, military architecture has an allure that elicits considerable popular response, especially in those

already imbibed with a love of history and architecture. Nowadays, the student of Maltese military architecture is also fortunate in having several books and publications at his disposal for the subject has been, and continues to be, studied by several scholars.

Prominent among these are the pioneering works of the late Professor Quentin Hughes. His many studies on the subject were instrumental in focusing international attention on the uniqueness and significance of Malta's defence heritage and encouraging its study on an academic level. His long association with Malta, which spanned over more than half a century, and which began during the war, included his years when he was Head of the Dept of Architecture at the University of Malta.

In the few years I had the privilege to know him, in the last years of his life, he never failed to encourage me to persist in my studies. Right to the end he was working on various publications on the architecture and fortifications of Malta. When he passed away, Malta and its architecture lost a friend.

I take this opportunity to appeal to the Rector that our University should consider commemorating him in some tangible way.

One of Professor Hughes' unfulfilled ambitious was to establish a museum devoted to the military architecture of Malta. The need is still there and perhaps here the University, through the Faculty of Architecture or the Institute of Baroque studies can take the lead to create such an institution. If run on professional and academic lines, with emphasis on research and study, such a museum will give a legitimacy to the subject that at present it still fails to enjoy locally. It will serve both as a repository of information – a national database, so to speak, of all things fortification – and a public showpiece to explain and promote Malta's unique buildings to students and foreign visitors alike.

Certainly, the defence heritage, of which fortifications form the key part, can also have an important role to play if integrated into Malta's overall tourism product. Those who speak military architecture have known for many, many years that Malta is an extraordinary place. Architectural appreciation of the massive ramparts and the buildings they house within needs no longer remain simply a by-product of tourism, but rather a primary reason for it. A quick search through the internet promptly reveals the importance that many countries have begun to give to architecture-inspired tourism. In Pittsburgh,

for example, an architectural tourism committee was set up in late 1996 out of a desire to increase appreciation of the city's buildings.

Malta should follow suit. In the words of Adam Sobolak, architectural tourism is 'where everything else is stripped away and the buildings do the talking'. Nowhere, in my opinion, is the 'art of beholding' in the Maltese islands so abundantly rewarding as when confronted with the mighty rock-hewn ramparts and their powerful sculptural features, majestic essays of force countering force, of grace under pressure.

But a word of caution is required here. Military architecture, as all architecture for that matter, needs no gimmicks to be appreciated and understood. It has a 'gravitas' (to cite Sobolak once again) 'that goes beyond tour-guidedom'. Unfortunately, one cannot help but notice how our historic buildings and forts are increasingly being relegated to backdrops for so-called 're-enactments' and other aptly-defined 'fakelores' distracting the visitor's attention from the architectural *materia prima* to a counterfeit Disney-world type of entertainment that only panders to the tastes of the uninformed.

Professor Quentin Hughes sought to instil in his students the need to appreciate that fortifications, particularly those built prior to the onset of the industrial revolution and the technological inventions that followed quickly in its wake, were more than just functional works of engineering, more than just 'vast slabs of earth' to cite J.R. Hale 'laboriously wheel-barrowed into place'. The military men who built and fashioned these massive ramparts from the barren landscape of limestone hills and rocky promontories, were not only capable of building highly effective barriers against attack and invasion, but were still able to endow these massive buildings meant for the 'burdensome task of defence' with appropriate aesthetic appeal.

One needs only to look at the spatial arrangement of the *piazza* of Fort Manoel, with its arcaded barracks and Baroque church, the gatecourt of Mdina, and the triumphal gateways of Porte de Bombes, Birgu, and Cottonera Lines with their delicate proportions and exquisite carvings, to appreciate the importance that was assigned to "design" in the military profession of the time. Indeed, according to Pietro Cataneo in his *Quattro Primi Libri di Architettura*, 'DISEGNO' was considered as much a main prerequisite of military architecture as it was of civil works. Most military engineers sought to apply Vitruvius' criteria of excellence for civic and religious buildings

– Firmitas (durability), Utilitas (convenience), and Venustas (beauty) - also to a city's fortified carapace. Mederico Blondel, the Order's resident military engineer in the latter half of the seventeenth century, was quick to remind Grand Master Carafa that in works of fortification "anche l'occhio vuol suo".

It is indeed ironic that in our times, few of our 'modern' buildings come anywhere close in imparting that same sense of aesthetic quality, monumentality, and spatial grace that was so successfully achieved by the military men of past centuries, men who like Charles Francois de Mondion and Carlos de Grunenberg, were great builders as well as soldiers.

If we seem to have lost, or better still discarded, this sensibility and ability to build structures that can actually inspire and enrich our landscape, rather than exploit it for all that it is worth, let us at least make sure that we preserve that which was built with much ingenuity and skill.

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
**METHODUS CONFERENDO
GRADUS ACADEMICO
PHILOSOPHIAE DOCTORIS
IN UNIVERSITATE STUDIORUM MELITENSI**

Adiutor a libellis, Candidato propriam ante sedem stanti sit ait:

*PRAECLARISSIME DOMINE, PLACUIT AUCTORITATIBUS UNIVERSITATI
MODERANDAE PRAEFECTIS DIGNUM TE DECLARARE QUI LAUREAE
INSIGNIBUS DECORERIS.*

**Statim a Decano, in circulo medio, haec formula legitur, Candidatum
coram ipso:**

*TUUM IN CONSPECTUM, MAGNIFICE RECTOR, ADDUCIMUS HUNC
LECTISSIMUM CANDIDATUM, OMNIBUS LAUREAE INSIGNIBUS, MORE
INSTITUTOQUE MAJORUM, A TE HONESTANDUM QUI, A CONSILIARIIS ET
SENATORIBUS HUIUS UNIVERSITATIS DIGNISSIMIS PRAESENTATUS, TE MOX
ROGABIT UT, TIBI ATTRIBUTA POTESATE, EUM DOCTOREM IN PHILOSOPHIA
RENUNTIES, ATQUE IN EIUSMODI CENSU COOPTATUM ASCRIPTUMQUE
NOMINES ATQUE EDICAS.*

**Hac postulatione facta, ab Illmo. Rectore conferuntur gradus juxta
formulam, ut sequitur:**

FORMULA

**Ab Illmo. Rectore pronuncianda dum confert Candidato insignia
laureae.**

*UT ITAQUE DEUS, EXORATUS, VERTAT BENE, NOBIS ATTRIBUTA
AUCTORITATE, TE DOCTOREM IN PHILOSOPHIA EO JURE CENSERI ET
ESSE, QUO OPTIMO SUNT CREATI ALII, EDICIMUS ET PRONUNTIAMUS,
OMNIBUSQUE HONORIBUS, QUI CUM LAUREA SUNT CONIUNCTI, FRUENDI
ET UTENDI TIBI FACULTATEM FACIMUS.*

His expletis, Illmus. Rector Candidato insignia dabit, nempe Togam, Pileum, dicens:

CAPE JAM COLLATAE TIBI DIGNITATIS ORNAMENTA, ET QUID ILLA INSTITUTO MAJORUM PORTENDANT INTELLEGE.

GESTA SIC TOGAM HANC, UT NORINT OMNES TE IN DOCTORUM COLLEGIUM ALLECTUM ESSE. SIT TIBI LIBERALIS PILEUS HIC, VELUTI LAUREUM ORNAMENTUM, QUO DONABANTUR POST CERTAMEN VICTORES.

LIBRUM HUNC PLENUM SAPIENTIAE, CLAUSUM ET RESERATUM, ACCIPITO, EUMQUE EX EDITO SCHOLAE LOCO EXPLICANDI INTERPRETANDIQUE TIBI JUS ESSE SCITO.

QUANTOPERE VERO TE DE DIGNITATE ADEPTA IN TOTIUS ACADEMICI COETUS NOMINE GRATULAMUR, TESTETUR TIBI HIC NOSTER AMPLEXUS.

**Procedure of conferring the Academic Degree of a Doctor of
Philosophy at the University of Malta
(Liberally Translated)**

The Registrar calls the candidate as follows:

“Most distinguished Sir, it has pleased the Authorities of the University to declare you worthy to be honoured with the insignia of success”.

The sponsor, then approaches the dais and pronounces the following words:

“Rector, we are presenting this excellent candidate so that you confer the academic honour in the manner and tradition of our University. In accordance with the will of the senate and of the council, I am requesting that you, Rector, with the authority that you hold, declare him Doctor of Philosophy and that his name be recorded in the Book of Graduates”.

Following this pronouncement, the most Distinguished Rector proceeds to confer the Degree by first addressing the Graduand thus:

“By the authority vested in me, I declare and proclaim you to be enrolled and considered as Doctor of Philosophy by the same supreme Law as others have been chosen. We give you the opportunity of enjoying and using all the honours which are connected with the Degree”.

Subsequently, the Rector bestows the symbols of the Doctorate saying:

“Take now the insignia of merit conferred on you, and understand what they mean according to the traditions of the past.”

“Wear thus this gown so that all may recognise that you have been chosen for membership for our College of Graduates”.

“Let this cap be a sign of intellectual merit, analogous to the crown of laurel bestowed for excellence, in the past”.

“Accept this book full of wisdom, and be aware that you should now explain and interpret it from your important position as a teacher.”

“Indeed, Insofar as we, in the name of the whole academic gathering, congratulate you on the merit received, let this embrace be a testimony to you”.

MASTER OF ARTS IN CREATIVITY AND INNOVATION

Sponsor: Dr. S. Dingli

Sergio AZZOPARDI
Angele AZZOPARDI GIULIANO
Monica BUGEJA
Emanuel DARMANIN
Nathalie DEBONO

Joan HAMILTON
Joseph Joel MICALLEF
Richard Anthony MUSCAT
Stephen PORTELLI
Shirley PULIS XERXEN

MASTER IN DIPLOMACY

Sponsor: Dr. S. Calleja

Muhannad M. Alwan AL-MIAHI
Wang BANGFU
Ebru EKEMAN
Hanan EL KHATIB
Mohamed Raed HERGLI
Mohamed Nabil KASRAOUI
Lana Sadi Ibrahim LULU

Karim Fekry Mohamed
MOUKHTAR
Hanno PARKSEPP
Dmytro SENIK
Raimonds VINGRIS
Mourad YOUSSEY

MASTER OF ARTS IN DIPLOMATIC STUDIES

Sponsor: Dr. S. Calleja

Saviour AQUILINA
Lysanne Milja Celine BAKKER
Matthew BUTTIGIEG*
Christianne CARUANA
Valerie CROIN
Michela-Maria DEBATTISTA
Neil KERR
Maria KONSTANTINIDOU
Adam KUYMIZAKIS
David Ian MANSFIELD

Maria MICALLEF
Roberto PACE
Edward SPITERI
Maria Luisa SPITERI*
Vuk TRAJKOVIC
Darren VELLA*
Philip VELLA*
Keith ZAMMIT MARMARA
Alan Keith ZERAFI
Zhiqin ZHOU

* *in absentia*

MASTER OF ARTS C.C.T

Sponsor: Rev. Prof. S. Chircop

Joseph MERCIECA

MASTER OF ARTS IN EUROPEAN STUDIES

Sponsor: Prof. P. G. Xuereb

Brenda AZZOPARDI
Robert AZZOPARDI
Natasha BARBARA
Nicholas BUGEJA
Nadezhda CALLEJA
Marixei CALLUS
Mark DE MARTINO
Justin FACCIOL
Andre FENECH
Valerie FENECH
Sandra GALEA

Ryan GRECH*
Alexander GRIMA
Luke INCORVAJA
Janet SAID
Ivan-Carl SALIBA
Norma M SALIBA
Malcolm SCICLUNA
Clint TANTI
Ausonia VANCELL
John VELLA
Amanda ZAMMIT

MASTER OF ARTS IN BAROQUE STUDIES

Sponsor: Prof. D. De Lucca

Antonia FORMOSA

Vincent ZAMMIT

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Sponsor: Prof. A. J. Vella

Charlot AGIUS
Malcolm AZZOPARDI
Graziella BARTOLO
Michel CAMILLERI
Daniela CAUCHI
Thomas CUSCHIERI*
Ian DIMECH
Paulseph-John FARRUGIA

Tony FARRUGIA
Keith FENECH
Claudette GAMBIN
Marika Josepha GAUCI
Ruth GUILLAUMIER
Jonathan HENWOOD
Monique HILI
Mildred MAGRO

* *in absentia*

MASTER OF SCIENCE (*contd*)

Mary Rose PORTELLI
Simon SCIBERRAS
Martin SALIBA

Robert TANTI
Christine VELLA

MSC IN CONSERVATION TECH FOR MASONRY BUILDINGS

Sponsor: Prof. A. Torpiano

Tabitha MIFSUD

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN ENGINEERING

Sponsor: Prof. Ing. M. Grech

Duncan BONNICI
Blasio MUSCAT
Keith MUSCAT
Christopher Paul SANT

Jeremy SCERRI
Malcolm TABONE
Denis VELLA

MASTER OF ARTS

Sponsor: Prof. D. Fenech

Nidal AL-SHOUCAIRY
Suzanne BOTTONE
Aimee BRINCAT
Catherine CAMILLERI
Roberta CAUCHI SANTORIO*
Victor CARUANA
Therese CIANTAR
Isabelle CUTAJAR
Mireille DE GABRIELE
Angela DEBONO
Andre' DELICATA
Oriana FALZON
Nadine Victoria FARRUGIA
SCIBERRAS

James Paul FORMOSA
Sarah GALEA
Suzanne GATT
Frances GAUCI
Phyllisienne GAUCI
Miriam MINTOFF
Gilbert ROSS
Ann Marie SCERRI
Stela THIKA*
Caroline TONNA LOWELL
Olvin VELLA*
Valerie VISANICH
Jacqueline ZAMMIT
Stephanie ZARB

* *in absentia*

MASTER OF ARTS IN LINGUISTICS

Sponsor: Prof.D. Fenech

Maria GALEA

Angela SCERRI CASSAR

MASTER IN TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETING

Sponsor: Prof. D. Fenech

Anabel AQUILINA

Clementine AVETA

Angela BORG

Claudine BORG

Clare BUGEJA GAFA

Kenneth CAMILLERI

Maria P. CAMILLERI

Miriam CREMONA

Roland CUSCHIERI

Liana FALZON

Carlo FARRUGIA

Mary FARRUGIA

Fiona Noeline FORMOSA
BARTOLO

Annalise GAUCI BORDA

Kenneth GRIMA

Celine MCCARTHY

Charmaine MUSCAT

Antonia PACE BONELLO

Mark Anthony SAMMUT

Maris SANT

Muriel SCERRI

Brian SCHEMBRI

MASTER OF EDUCATION

Sponsor: Dr. C. Borg

Linda ATTARD SAID

Mario CARDONA

Anthony FARRUGIA

Tessie FENECH GALEA

Susan GRIXTI

Victoria MERCIECA

Daniella MICALLEF

Anna MUSCAT

Maud MUSCAT

Jacqueline VANHEAR

MASTER OF MUSIC

Sponsor: Rev. Prof. P. Serracino Inglott

Mario FRENDO

**MASTER OF CONSERVATION IN APPLIED
CONSERVATION STUDIES**

Sponsor: Prof. A. J. Vella

Francis CHETCUTI

Michael FORMOSA

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Sponsor: Prof. Ing. M. Grech

Nicholas SAMMUT

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Sponsor: Mr J. Falzon

Stephen SPITERI

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Sponsor: Prof. A.J. Vella

Alan DEIDUN

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Sponsor: Prof. D. Fenech

Mary Ann CASSAR