



FACULTY OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN LANGUAGES

HONOUR SCHOOL OF MODERN LANGUAGES 2017

STATISTICS

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

EXAMINERS' REPORTS

TRINITY TERM 2017

REPORT ON THE FINAL HONOUR SCHOOL OF MODERN LANGUAGES 2017

Part I

A. STATISTICS (1) Numbers and percentages in each class/category

TABLE 1 : Total Entries, Main School and Joint Schools

	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011
Total Entry	211	201	209	204	186	196	188
Withdrawals	9	6	2	12	6	3	4
Sat Exam	202	195	207	192	180	193	184

TABLE 2 : Total Entries by language, Main School

Main School Languages - Data										
Language or ..	2016/17	2015/16	2014/15	2013/14	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2007/08
French	138	138	142	116	126	137	128	128	134	132
German	59	52	66	62	58	55	69	55	67	66
Spanish	56	48	49	52	51	56	45	48	49	39
Italian	39	27	29	30	27	37	30	38	30	32
Russian	23	24	25	23	18	19	27	23	23	20
Linguistics	20	25	19	23	17	18	18	18	26	13
Portuguese	13	16	11	11	9	10	11	10	9	7
Czech w Slovak		2	6	3	2	2	4	3	5	3
Modern Greek		2	3	2	1	2		1	1	
Polish			4	1	2	1	1		1	1
Celtic				1						
Grand Total	202	195	207	192	180	193	185	189	198	178

TABLE 3 : Main School entries by language / course / combination (*Joint Schools separately below*)

Language	2016/17	2015/16	2014/15	2013/14	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2007/08
French	33	36	39	30	33	28	16	31	31	21
German	18	10	17	22	12	15	15	11	14	17
Italian		2	1				1	3	3	2
Russian	2	5		3	1	2	4	5	3	1
Spanish	3	3	3	5	3	4	1	4		2
French and Celtic Languages				1						
French and Czech w/ Slovak		1			1		1	1		1
French and German	26	25	32	20	28	27	34	26	32	34
French and Italian	25	21	17	16	14	29	23	23	19	26
French and Lings	9	11	10	9	7	10	12	9	11	8
French and Modern Greek		2	2	1		2			1	
French and Portuguese	2	5	3	3	1	3	4	3	4	2
French and Russian	15	14	10	8	11	6	9	8	7	11
French and Spanish	28	23	28	28	31	31	29	27	29	29
French w/ Polish			1			1				
German and Czech w/ Slovak			1	1		1	2	2	3	1
German and Italian	7		6	9	7	1	1	2	2	2
German and Lings	2	6	3	5	3	3	4	4	7	4
German and Modern Greek					1			1		
German and Portuguese		1			1	1	1			
German and Russian	2	3	3	3	1	4	8	6	6	5
German and Spanish	4	7	4	1	4	3	3	3	3	2
German w/ Polish				1	1		1			1
Italian and Lings	2	2	1		2	1		4		1
Italian and Portuguese				1				1	1	
Italian and Russian			2	1	1	1	2		2	1
Italian and Spanish	5	2	2	3	3	5	3	5	3	
Portuguese and Lings		1		1	1					
Portuguese and Modern Greek			1							
Portuguese and Russian	2									
Russian and Czech w/ Slovak		1	4	2	1	1	1		2	1
Russian and Lings	1	1	2	3	1	1	1	1		
Russian w/ Polish			3		1				1	
Spanish and Czech w/ Slovak			1							
Spanish and Lings	6	4	3	5	3	3	1		8	
Spanish and Modern Greek				1						
Spanish and Portuguese	9	9	7	6	6	6	6	6	4	5
Spanish and Russian	1		1	3	1	4	2	3	2	1
Total	202	195	207	192	180	193	185	189	198	178

TABLE 4 : Joint School entries by language combination

School (group)	Language	Joint Schools									
		2016/17	2015/16	2014/15	2013/14	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2007/08
Bachelor of Arts in Classics and Modern Languages	French	5	4	9	5	5	5	3	2	4	10
	German	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1
	Italian	2					1	1	1	1	
	Modern Greek						1			1	
	Russian	1						2	1	4	
	Spanish		1			1		3			
Bachelor of Arts in Classics a..	German		1								
Bachelor of Arts in English and Modern Languages	Czech (with Slovak)				1						
	French	11	11	10	13	13	16	17	10	13	9
	German	3	4	4	4	5	5	6	5	3	5
	Italian			1	2	1				1	
	Portuguese	1				1		1			1
	Russian		1		1	1					1
	Spanish	1	2	3	1	3	1	6	6	3	
					2	4		2	2		
Bachelor of Arts in Euro and Mid East Langs	Celtic			1							
	French	2	4	7	5	4		4	3	1	4
	German	3		1	1	3		1	2		
	Italian			1			1				
	Russian	1	1	1	1			2	1		3
	Spanish		2								
Bachelor of Arts in History and Modern Languages	Czech (with Slovak)				1						
	French	6	7	5	7	5	10	9	10	11	14
	German	5	6	3	3	4		6	6	2	4
	Italian		1	1	1	1	1	2		3	1
	Portuguese				1	1				1	
	Russian	2		1	3	1	1	2	2		
	Spanish	2		3		2	3	1	1	1	3
Bachelor of Arts in Philosophy and Modern Languages	Celtic			1							
	Czech (with Slovak)					1					
	French	8	10	8	11	9	9	9	12	4	11
	German	2	2	6	2	4	5	3	3	6	3
	Italian	1	2		2		2			3	1
	Modern Greek			1		1			2	1	
	Russian		1	1			1	1	4		1
	Spanish	1	4	1	1		4	1		3	1
Grand Total		59	66	70	69	71	67	84	74	68	73

TABLE 5 : Numbers and Percentages in each class, Main School (*rounded to nearest decimal place*)

Main School Classifications																				
CLASS	2016/17		2015/16		2014/15		2013/14		2012/13		2011/12		2010/11		2009/10		2008/09		2007/08	
1	67	33.2%	67	34.4%	59	28.5%	60	31.3%	53	29.4%	54	28.0%	48	25.9%	41	21.7%	47	23.7%	52	29.2%
2.1	131	64.9%	123	63.1%	141	68.1%	125	65.1%	124	68.9%	132	68.4%	130	70.3%	143	75.7%	138	69.7%	107	60.1%
2.2	4	2.0%	5	2.6%	6	2.9%	6	3.1%	3	1.7%	7	3.6%	7	3.8%	5	2.6%	13	6.6%	19	10.7%
3					1	0.5%	1	0.5%												
Candidates	202	100.0%	195	100.0%	207	100.0%	192	100.0%	180	100.0%	193	100.0%	185	100.0%	189	100.0%	198	100.0%	178	100.0%

TABLE 6 : Distribution of Firsts, Main School

Main School Firsts

Language	2016/17	2015/16	2014/15	2013/14	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2007/08
French	4	12	9	7	10	3	3	6	5	6
German	6	3	10	8	4	3	7	2	3	6
Italian		2						1	1	1
Russian	1					1		1	2	
Spanish				1	1	1		3		
French and Celtic Languages				1						
French and Czech w/ Slovak		1						1		
French and German	7	12	12	2	6	10	8	5	8	11
French and Italian	11	9	4	6	7	9	8	5	5	11
French and Lings	3	3	4	3		5	4	1	3	2
French and Modern Greek		1								
French and Portuguese	1	2		1	1		1	1		1
French and Russian	6	6	2	2	3		2	4	1	2
French and Spanish	8	8	5	11	8	8	4	4	4	6
French w/ Polish						1				
German and Czech w/ Slovak							1			
German and Italian	2		1	6	1	1			2	
German and Lings	1	1	1	3	1	1	3	1	5	2
German and Portuguese						1				
German and Russian	2	1				1	3		2	2
German and Spanish	1	3	3	1	3	1	1	2	1	
German w/ Polish					1					
Italian and Lings			1		1	1		2		
Italian and Portuguese				1				1		
Italian and Russian			2		1		1			
Italian and Spanish	5			1	1	2			2	
Portuguese and Lings		1								
Portuguese and Modern Greek			1							
Portuguese and Russian	1									
Russian and Czech w/ Slovak				1		1				
Russian w/ Polish			1							
Spanish and Lings	3	1	1	3	1	1			1	
Spanish and Portuguese	5	1	1	2	3	2	2	1	1	2
Spanish and Russian			1			1			1	
Totals	67	67	59	60	53	54	48	41	47	52

(2) **Vivas:** there are no vivas in Modern Languages or joint schools with Modern Languages.

(3) Marking of scripts

All scripts are double-marked with the exception of the listening comprehension test which forms part of the oral examination. The oral examination counts as half a paper, and the listening test counts as one third of the oral examination. The questions require purely factual answers and the Senior Examiners in each language moderate the marking of their colleagues.

B. NEW EXAMINING METHODS AND PROCEDURES

1. Examination Conventions. These followed the model developed in 2016, updated to reflect small changes.

2. Marks above 85. In order to avoid distortion of averages, especially for native speakers, examiners had agreed not normally to award marks above 85.

3. Borderline criteria. It emerged that the definition of borderlines in the EML examining conventions had not been corrected to reflect the fact that candidates in EML (with 8.5 papers) require 4 marks above 70 for the Alternative Route to a First, rather than 5 for the main school. This should be flagged to the Joint Standing Committee for correction.

3. Comments Sheets. Last year's versions had been adapted to include a box for marks as well as a reminder that the process used to resolve discrepancies should be set out briefly. All examiners submitted comment sheets, and the externals commented on their usefulness.

4. Nomination of Examiners and Assessors. The paperwork for such nominations is extensive and burdensome; all of it is handled efficiently and professionally by Catherine Pillonel..

5. Proof-reading. As last year, final proof-reading was done on paper copies in the faculty office. Use of WebLearn has risks as well as advantages: access for all examiners and assessors means that setters can view papers remotely in the later stages of examining, which is useful. But the number of those who have access, and the fact that versions can be downloaded and uploaded without password protection, both increase the risk that an earlier version of a paper is accidentally uploaded, overwriting corrections already made. **It is recommended therefore that only examiners have access to WebLearn in the early stages of the process. It is also recommended that Senior Examiners should check camera ready copy before it goes off for printing..**

6. Academic Dress. Following the recommendation by one of the external examiners, the Proctors had required all candidates to present themselves in a commoner's gown in order to prevent unconscious bias. All except one candidate attended in correct academic dress.

C. Please list any changes in examining methods, procedures and conventions which the examiners would wish the faculty/department and the divisional board to consider.

FAO Educational Policy and Support, Proctors

1. FAPs.

a. Guidance on assessing FAPs is in urgent need of clarification: the impact of FAPs cannot be assessed in the abstract, but only in relation to marks and scripts, and because examiners cannot speculate about potential performance had circumstances been different, the only cases in which mitigating action is possible are those where FAPs have demonstrable effect on the classification.

b. Handling everything from circumstances affecting a single paper, long-standing medical or personal issues, to concerns about due process or complaints about papers by a single route may have looked efficient, but in current practice causes delay and risks inequity: colleges are uncertain which issues are handled by the Proctors, which through the FAP route; the Examination Team is overworked, so that a number of FAPs which were declared as 'approved' by the Examination Team turned out to be incomplete, requiring lengthy correspondence and causing delay. Handling concerns about the process (this year, for example, errors by an invigilator in the Examination Schools during the orals, or the failure of the air-conditioning in Ewert House on 29 May) through FAPs risks inequity: examiners are instructed explicitly only to consider FAPs for candidates who submit them – yet where such FAPs alert examining boards to legitimate concerns about the conduct of the examination, the only equitable way of treating these is to ensure that all candidates affected by such circumstances are considered. A clear separation between factors affecting an individual candidate, and those about the conduct of the examination with a bearing on groups of candidates, would be essential. In view of the lengthy delays experienced, in some cases beyond the relevant meeting of examiners, the current system of handling FAPs is in urgent need of review.

2. Missed Papers. Where candidates have not attended a paper, the Proctors will either inform the Chair of examiners that in their view the absence was for good reason and outline the range of options available to the examining board, or that no such instruction will be

forthcoming. Yet where candidates are taken ill in the early stages of a paper and are therefore also unable to write anything, this is currently deemed to lie outside the remit of the Proctors, and examining boards are required to treat such cases of 0 marks through the FAP route – requiring examiners to take a decision about whether the absence was for good reason. Handling very similar cases by two separate processes is inefficient (in more than one case, correspondence from the college had first been directed to the Proctors, was then forwarded to the Examination Team, and made its way to the examiners only after quite lengthy delays), lacks transparency, and risks inequitable treatment. The Proctors, who have oversight over all examination processes, are much better placed to take a view on the mostly medical evidence than individual examining boards.

3. FAP record forms and the new online reporting. The new online reporting system for all FAPs introduced this year is not fit for purpose: the database is clunky, the options offered are unclear and do not match the reporting forms which Chairs are required to fill out under the Policy and Guidance, and the delay in publishing results of all candidate unless and until the online reporting has been completed is unacceptable. It took the experienced Examination Officer and the Chair more than three hours to complete the online FAP reporting for 38 candidates – requiring work at unsociable hours during the night before the final meeting, because this was the only way to avoid delaying the publication of results by yet another day. The formulations used in the release to students are misleading: where FAPs have received careful scrutiny by the Chair, Vice-Chair, external examiners, and the final exam board but were found not to have had demonstrable impact on the classification, this is recorded as ‘no action taken’.

FAO Faculty of LPP

4. At present, candidates for MLL are classified as part of the main ML school, which is administered by ML. LPP will need to start preparation for 2019, when MLL will become a joint school requiring a separate exam board. It is recommended to consider the model of CML and PML, with the Chair alternating between both Faculties, the other Faculty providing a Co-Ordinator.

FAO Proctors

6. Communications. The Chair and Catherine Pillonel communicate with the Proctors’ Office on examination matters throughout the year and are grateful for the clarity and (in general) the promptness of these communications, especially when an urgent solution to the cancelled room bookings at the Examination Schools was required. Towards the end of the examining process such communications can be time-critical, and communication within the Proctors’ office appeared not always to work effectively.

D. Please describe how candidates are made aware of the examination conventions to be followed by the examiners

The Examination Conventions are attached. They were advertised on Modern Languages WebLearn in Michaelmas Term 2016, and the two letters from the Chair to candidates contained a link to the web-site (letters attached).

Part II

A. GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE EXAMINATION

1. Administration. The Chair and all examiners and assessors owe immense gratitude to Catherine Pillonel, whose efficiency, professionalism, and mastery of a complex administrative process are superb. This is all the more remarkable because she is handling two examination processes in tandem – FHS and Prelim take place at the same time. Her new assistant, Rachel Bell, joined the team part-way through the FHS process, and

Catherine has been exemplary in mentoring and training her – essential in order to minimise the risk of having a crucial administrative process rest on the knowledge of a single member of staff, but also very time-consuming. Such stress was compounded by the fact that another position in the examination office fell vacant in April, requiring Catherine to pick up work to do with the year abroad at one of the busiest times of preparing exams. Rhys Painton provided welcome relief as a temp during the final weeks of the examining process – but the additional burden falling on the Examination Officer was significant, and worrying. This was compounded by the unpardonable oversight of cancelling room bookings made by Catherine Pillonel without consultation or even information, necessitating hasty and stressful additional work in putting together a package of alternative arrangements, from consideration about where to store scripts for the scrutiny of externals, ensuring their security, to organising set up of rooms normally designed for lectures, not meetings. The fact that externals and examiners noted the squeeze but were otherwise content with the arrangements is a tribute to Catherine Pillonel's resourcefulness, but it was an avoidable and needless addition to her burdens.

2. Vice-Chair. I am extremely grateful to Geraldine Hazbun for her unfailing, sensible and effective support during the complex process.

3. Examination Schools. Matthew Kirk and his team were, as ever, exemplary – quick in responding to request for modifications to the orals time-table in order to accommodate special needs, sympathetic to nervous candidates, and effective in controlling the often inconsiderate behaviour of students finishing other examinations or attending college collections or finishing examinations while orals were in progress. Producing a compressed time-table due to the Bank Holiday Monday is difficult, and this difficulty is compounded by the rising number of requests for special arrangements, often submitted at the last moment by candidates and/or colleges. Matthew Kirk and his team rose to the challenge, but it is recommended that colleges are reminded of the need to make such applications in good time. Matthew Kirk was exemplary in alerting the Chair to a minor problem in the preparation room and took steps to prevent it re-occurring.

4. Timetabling of written papers. After some difficulties with the time-tabling software last year, this year's process was smooth and largely trouble-free. The only potential problem arose when it emerged that the Oriental Institute had used the same paper code to set two partially different papers for EMEL candidates and candidates in Oriental Studies. This was remedied after consultation with the Education Committee. In order to accommodate the potential 8 over 8 combinations of languages for two-language candidates, paper II is time-tabled in two blocks on the morning and afternoon of Monday of week 5. Apart from this, the majority of candidates only sit one paper per day. Arrangements to allow candidates with extremely serious medical conditions to sit paper II over an extended period are complex, require examiners, exam office staff, and setters of papers to be on-call over a weekend, and necessitate lengthy advance planning. It should be noted that making such arrangements for more than one or two candidates at most would be logistically impossible.

5. Classification sheets. Mark-It was working without problem this year, but the lack of central support for it and the resulting need to run the time-consuming testing phase very close to the actual exam period are a significant burden on the Examination Officer, Catherine Pillonel. A further problem emerged in the classification of one joint school, where oral marks were erroneously included in the profile count for the alternative route to a First. Classifications were checked, corrected, and manually adapted; it is hoped that the bug can be fixed for next year.

6. Conduct of Written Examinations. Papers had been proof-read with exemplary efficiency, and with one exception (see section 8), there were no problems with form or content of the papers. The Senior Invigilator in Ewert House, to whom I am extremely

grateful, had prepared the task of setting out and collecting exam papers with commendable common sense and efficiency. There was one significant problem: on 29 May, an exceptionally hot day, the air-conditioning in Ewert House failed in the afternoon. Efforts were made to cool the room, but Chair and Vice-Chair, who were present that day, can attest to the difficult conditions. This affected 70 candidates (46 for Spanish VIII, 21 for Russian VIII, 3 for Italian X). Examiners analysed the statistics for the largest cohort in Spanish, where there was a demonstrable difference in performance between candidates sitting the paper in Ewert House, and those with special arrangements sitting the paper in colleges or the word-processing suite. After consultation with the external examiners, it was agreed to scale marks for all candidates affected in Ewert House by 2 points. Where candidates had submitted FAPs, Chair and Vice-Chair and the Pre-Final meeting assessed whether these related solely to the conditions, for which the scaling was considered adequate mitigation, or to medical complications, which were considered separately.

7. Illegible scripts. The hand-writing on some scripts of two candidates posed such difficulty to markers that they had to be typed.

8. Complaints. One complaint about a paper was received via the Proctors. The complaint was justified, but examiners satisfied themselves that the performance of the three candidates affected had not been impaired. Measures are in place to avoid the mistake re-occurring.

9. FAPs. In a dramatic rise over last year, 38 submissions were received (2016: 25). Two of these concerning the orals were received several weeks after the oral marks meeting; one relating to a written paper was communicated by the case officer responsible in the Proctors' Office two days after the final examiners' meeting, despite having been submitted in good time by the college concerned. Fortunately for the candidates, their circumstances had no adverse effect on the classification, but such delay is a cause for serious concern. In order to balance transparency with the need to maintain confidentiality of often sensitive personal information or medical records, FAPs were considered in three stages: the Chair and Vice-Chair reviewed all submissions and agreed recommendations to the Pre-Final Meeting of Senior Examiners and a representative of the externals. I am particularly grateful to Ranjan Sen, the external examiner in Linguistics, for his willingness to consider the most complex case in some detail. All such cases were flagged (without detail) to the final meeting of examiners, as well as the recommendation about mitigating action where required, for decision. The options (though not the personal details) about how to handle the most complex case were discussed at greater length, and the board agreed to award a classified degree after hearing the deliberations of the Pre-Final meeting, noting that this was exceptional but appropriate in this case. It is recommended to include more explicit guidance about good practice in handling sensitive personal information in the Policy and Guidance document – the practice, as observed in other faculties of reading FAP applications verbatim to the full board of examiners is not compatible with good practice on confidentiality or indeed the principle that candidates should not communicate directly with examiners..

10. Performance. There were fewer stellar performances than last year, but overall, results were in line with previous years. Only 4 candidates were classified as Lower Second. There were no Thirds.

11. External Examiners. This year, nine colleagues from the six languages represented, as well as Linguistics, acted as external examiners. They are involved from the early stages of the process, reviewing draft exam papers and orals materials, moderating special subject submissions and extended essays, attending or sampling recordings of the oral examinations, finally scrutinizing scripts in the two days preceding the final meeting. I would like to express my gratitude to them for the thoroughness and collegiality with which they

conducted their scrutiny. Particular thanks are due to Katherine Ibbett at the end of their three year stint.

12. Congratulatory Firsts. One candidate received a letter of congratulation from the Chair, to recognize exceptional achievement (either an average of 75.0 or more, or a complete run of First Class marks): Mr Arkadiusz Kwapiszewski, St Hugh's College, (German sole).

13. Prizes

ARTEAGA PRIZE

Best performance in Spanish FHS

Ms Alma PRELEC (Wadham)

(Spanish & Portuguese)

DAVID GIBBS PRIZES

Best performance in Modern Languages

1. Mr Arkadiusz KWAPISZEWSKI

(St Hugh's) *(German sole)*

2. Ms Emily CUNNINGAM

(Brasenose) *(French & German)*

DAVID GIBBS PRIZES

*Best performance in Joint Schools with
Modern Languages*

1. Mr Angus RUSSELL (St John's)

(History & Russian)

2. Ms Mercy HADFIELD (Queen's)

(Philosophy & German)

DAVID GIBBS PRIZES

*Best performance in Modern Languages
for best submitted work in Special Subject
Paper XII and Extended Essay Paper XIV*

Special Subject:

Ms Sarah BRIDGE (Somerville)

(Classics & French)

Extended Essay:

Mr Marcus LI (Magdalen)

(German & Italian)

**DAVID MCLINTOCK PRIZE IN
GERMANIC PHILOLOGY**

*Best performance in German Philology
(V(i) or XII)*

Mr Brendan KJELLBERG-MOTTON

(Merton) *(German sole)*

**DOLORES ORIA MERINO PRIZE IN
WRITTEN SPANISH**

*Best performance in Spanish Prose
(Paper I)*

Ms Monica BURNS (Balliol)

(Italian & Spanish)

FRED HODCROFT PRIZE

*Best FHS performance: History of
Spanish Language or Spanish dialects*

Ms Caris HERNANDEZ-BROOKS

(Magdalen) *(Spanish & Linguistics)*

GERARD DAVIS PRIZE

*Best extended essay in French literary
studies*

Mr Charles HIERONS (Keble)

(Philosophy & French)

**PHILIPPA OF LANCASTER
PORTUGUESE PRIZE**

Best FHS performance in Portuguese

Mr Sacha MEHTA (St Peter's)

(Portuguese & Russian)

RAMÓN SILVA MEMORIAL PRIZE

*Best performance in Spanish Orals (not
to be awarded to a native or bilingual
speaker)*

Ms Alma PRELEC (Wadham)

(Spanish & Portuguese)

14. Detailed Report on the Oral Examination.

1. Question Papers. These were set and proof-read in good time. A few minor typographical errors in French and Spanish were reported by examiners during the examination week; these were corrected by Catherine Pillonel or by hand. Changes to the text of the listening comprehension were agreed during the rehearsals and noted on the copy archived in the faculty and the Language Centre.

2. Timetable. Catherine Pillonel, the Chair and Vice-Chair had a meeting with Matthew Kirk in the Examination Schools at the beginning of Hilary Term to discuss the time-table for the forthcoming orals, noting that it would be particularly tight due to the Easter Bank Holiday falling on the Monday of 0th week. The requirement for EMEL Arabic candidates to have 24 hours of preparation time for the Arabic oral, and the rising case of special needs, made this particularly challenging. Matthew Kirk and his staff produced a time-table with exemplary efficiency, making further adjustments to accommodate special needs, constraints on the part of the examiners, and in order to avoid college tutors examining their own students. Because many native speaker assessors teach for five or more colleges, this is a particularly complex task, and it is crucial for Catherine Pillonel and Matthew Kirk to have an up-to-date and accurate list of ALL college associations for all assessors from the start.

3. Special cases. Catherine Pillonel keeps a record of all special need dispensations, and most of these are dealt with routinely – yet this is an increasingly complex task for the faculty exam office and the time-tabling team. 38 of the 386 candidates for the listening comprehensions this year had special requirements, the most common being extra time, use of a word processor with or without spell-checker, rest breaks, and combinations of these three. It is extremely important that requests by colleges are made in good time, so that these often complex arrangements can be accommodated in the time-table – yet, as in previous years, some requests arrived just days before the examination. A small number of non-standard special needs were accommodated efficiently and sensitively by Catherine Pillonel and the staff at the Examination Schools.

4. Conduct of the Examination. This is a complex logistical exercise: even with only six Modern Languages represented this year, the process involved 38 internal and 6 external examiners and nearly 250 candidates taking either 2 or 4 oral exam exercises. It is a tribute to the meticulous preparation by Catherine Pillonel and her staff, and to the patience and resourcefulness of Matthew Kirk and his team, that this year's operation went very smoothly despite the tight time-table. Catherine Pillonel had prepared all documentation for the Chair, Vice-Chair, Examiners, Schools Staff, Invigilators, and candidates. There were only the most minor of hitches, mostly the result of human error on the part of candidates, examiners, or invigilators, and all corrected by quick action on the part of the exam school staff or colleagues:

a. The clock in the preparation room was three minutes late, and candidates were only dispatched from the room at the start time of their examination slot. This invariably meant that candidates arrived at their examination room some five minutes later than time-tabled. **It is recommended that, as in previous years, invigilators allow two or three minutes for candidates to reach the exam rooms, so that examinations can start as time-tabled. It would be preferable if clocks in the examination rooms were accurate, and that where there are two clocks in a room, these show the same time.**

b. On the first day, candidates were given answer booklets, which resulted in some candidates writing out answers, despite instructions only to use notes. On the second day, invigilators reverted to handing out the usual single sheets of coloured paper. **It**

is recommended that invigilators be reminded to use single pieces of paper for the discourse preparation.

c. Most candidates arrived in time for their sessions, though in three cases only just before the start of the listening comprehension, despite reminders in the letters to candidates to arrive in good time.

d. No candidate went missing; two examiners misread the time-table and missed one of their slots, but a colleague was on hand on both occasions.

e. One preparation session was started slightly late, which resulted in a late start to the oral exam. At the request of the Proctors, examiners checked that marks for the affected students were in line with their performance in the other part of the exercise. There were no adverse effects, and all other preparation sessions started on time. **It is recommended that clocks in the preparation and examination rooms should be checked and synchronised in order to avoid additional complexities for invigilators.**

f. When one of the examiners had to withdraw due to a bereavement, the examiners and assessors in the language, with collegial generosity, agreed to share out the examination slots, since there were no 'spare' examiners able to step in at short notice.

5. External examiners. Most external examiners were able to attend for part of the examination process, acting as moderators. For those who were unable, recordings of certain sessions were made.

6. Other matters and Recommendations.

a. **Room bookings.** It had emerged after the oral examination that the room bookings at the Examination Schools, where traditionally, the final rounds of meetings and the scrutiny of scripts by externals are held, had been cancelled without consultation. Neither the FHS chair nor Catherine Pillonel as Examination Officer had been consulted or made aware. The rooms available at the faculty were not of sufficient size, and there was considerable doubt about their suitability. Most importantly, making alternative arrangements at such short notice would place considerable strain on Catherine Pillonel. **Senior Examiners deplored this, and requested that the Chair alert the Proctors in the hope of re-instating the booking. It is recommended that for the following year, the booking at the Examination Schools should be re-instated.** [Post-meeting note: the faculty was notified that it would be impossible to re-instate the booking at the Examination Schools for this year. Despite assurances that there were a number of alternative venues, no venue other than 47 Wellington Square proved to be available. The Proctors confirmed that they consider the rooms adequate in terms of maintaining security and confidentiality. **It will be essential to revert to us of the purpose-built rooms in the Examination School next year, given the larger number of examiners.**]

b. **Confidentiality.** As last year, examiners and assessors were permitted to take the listening comprehension passage away after the rehearsal session, rather than collecting them immediately before the listening comprehension exercise, as had been the practice in the past. They were reminded of the need to keep such materials strictly confidential, and all examiners acted with great professionalism. Candidates benefitted from the fact that assessors were thus able to practise reading the passage.

c. Discussion of marks. The Oral Procedures stipulate that in the discourse/conversation exercise, discussion between examiners should take place in the intervals between groups of candidates rather than following each candidate. In practice, most pairs of examiners discuss and assign marks after each candidate, reviewing these at intervals during the examination period, and this appears more equitable and therefore preferable. **It is recommended to update the Oral Procedures for next year accordingly.**

d. Attendance. As last year, Chair and Vice-Chair took turns to be in attendance for morning and afternoon sessions; when both were examining, Catherine Pillonel was present. **It is recommended that this is continued, so that someone is on hand if a problem arises.**

e. Listening Test. Because of the tight time-table, it had not proved possible to administer the listening test separately to candidates with special arrangements, because this would have necessitated an additional seven listening sessions (one for each language, and two for Portuguese, where candidates choose between Lusitan and Brazilian). There were no technical issues this year, yet the listening test remains the most complex and most stressful part of the examination process. At the same time, examiners and candidates are not universally convinced of the educational benefits of the current exercise, which largely relies on the ability to memorize. Listening to a lecture in the foreign language and taking notes are useful skills, but a number of examiners have suggested that these might be more usefully tested at an earlier stage in the course. This would make academic sense, in that such skills would build on Prelim language learning, provide preparation for the year abroad, but also help to simplify the oral examination process. **It is recommended that the Faculty consider abolition of the FHS listening comprehension, introducing instead a listening test at the end of the second year, as a simple pass /fail exam (or as a necessary condition of progressing to the final exams, comparable to the certification at Prelim). This recommendation has the support of Senior Examiners.**

f. Noise. Schools staff stationed at strategic points reminded those finishing collections or other examinations of the need to leave the building quietly. This was more successful than last year, though those leaving the building after their final paper don't always remember such instructions for very long.

g. Refreshments. Thanks are due to Catherine Pillonel for organising the tea, coffee, biscuits and fresh milk throughout the oral examinations, thereby saving the Faculty considerable expense.

Professor Almut Suerbaum
FHS Chair of Examiners

B. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY ISSUES AND BREAKDOWN OF THE RESULTS BY GENDER

TABLE 7 : Gender Statistics, Main School

		1		2.1		2.2		3		Total	
Overall	2014/15	59	28.5%	141	68.1%	6	2.9%	1	0.5%	207	100.0%
	2013/14	60	31.3%	125	65.1%	6	3.1%	1	0.5%	192	100.0%
	2012/13	53	29.4%	124	68.9%	3	1.7%			180	100.0%
	2011/12	54	28.0%	132	68.4%	7	3.6%			193	100.0%
	2010/11	48	25.9%	130	70.3%	7	3.8%			185	100.0%
	2009/10	41	21.7%	143	75.7%	5	2.6%			189	100.0%
	2008/09	47	23.7%	138	69.7%	13	6.6%			198	100.0%
	2007/08	52	29.2%	107	60.1%	19	10.7%			178	100.0%
		1		2.1		2.2		3		Total	
Female	2016/17	40	29.4%	95	69.9%	1	0.7%			136	100.0%
	2015/16	45	32.8%	89	65.0%	3	2.2%			137	100.0%
	2014/15	38	27.5%	98	71.0%	2	1.4%			138	100.0%
	2013/14	35	30.2%	78	67.2%	2	1.7%	1	0.9%	116	100.0%
	2012/13	36	31.0%	77	66.4%	3	2.6%			116	100.0%
	2011/12	27	22.7%	88	73.9%	4	3.4%			119	100.0%
	2010/11	33	25.6%	90	69.8%	6	4.7%			129	100.0%
	2009/10	28	21.5%	99	76.2%	3	2.3%			130	100.0%
	2008/09	31	23.3%	95	71.4%	7	5.3%			133	100.0%
	2007/08	29	25.4%	72	63.2%	13	11.4%			114	100.0%
Male	2016/17	27	40.9%	36	54.5%	3	4.5%			66	100.0%
	2015/16	22	37.9%	34	58.6%	2	3.4%			58	100.0%
	2014/15	21	30.4%	43	62.3%	4	5.8%	1	1.4%	69	100.0%
	2013/14	25	32.9%	47	61.8%	4	5.3%			76	100.0%
	2012/13	17	26.6%	47	73.4%					64	100.0%
	2011/12	27	36.5%	44	59.5%	3	4.1%			74	100.0%
	2010/11	15	26.8%	40	71.4%	1	1.8%			56	100.0%
	2009/10	13	22.0%	44	74.6%	2	3.4%			59	100.0%
	2008/09	16	24.6%	43	66.2%	6	9.2%			65	100.0%
	2007/08	23	35.9%	35	54.7%	6	9.4%			64	100.0%

C. DETAILED NUMBERS ON CANDIDATES' PERFORMANCE IN EACH PART OF THE EXAMINATION

TABLE 8A : Entries for Papers I – IX (*including Joint Schools*)

Lang:	YEAR	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX
FREN	2016/17	169	169	32	26	23	13	51	130	34
	2015/16	174	174	36	30	36	22	47	130	37
	2014/15	181	181	39	22	35	24	57	130	41
	2013/14	156	156	29	23	30	17	39	121	35
	2012/13	161	161	33	26	22	19	53	112	38
	2011/12	176	176	27	27	34	14	57	129	29
	2010/11	169	169	16	21	29	13	42	126	25
	2009/10	164	164	31	22	27	19	55	117	34
	2008/09	167	167	97	28	35	13	49	122	31
	2007/08	180	180	88	28	26	10	65	119	35
GERM	2016/17	74	74	18	18	15	10	9	70	24
	2015/16	66	66	10	18	15	10	13	53	14
	2014/15	81	81	17	6	29	12	16	68	22
	2013/14	73	73	22	18	32	9	13	67	24
	2012/13	75	75	12	19	22	6	16	65	14
	2011/12	66	66	15	6	26	6	15	60	19
	2010/11	86	86	15	12	24	15	11	75	20
	2009/10	72	72	11	13	23	9	8	66	13
	2008/09	80	80	41	10	30	7	9	74	18
	2007/08	79	79	46	12	30	12	12	69	21
ITAL	2016/17	42	42		4	5	9	9	24	38
	2015/16	30	30	2	4	5	4	5	23	28
	2014/15	32	32	1	4	3	5	14	14	29
	2013/14	35	35			3	7	12	16	34
	2012/13	29	29		2	6	3	6	20	24
	2011/12	42	42		2	5	6	13	23	38
	2010/11	33	33	1	2	1	1	7	26	32
	2009/10	39	39	3	10	6	6	14	22	37
	2008/09	38	38	15	2	3	3	16	21	36
	2007/08	34	34	20	3	5	4	5	1	31
SPAN	2016/17	60	60	3	14	8	7	16	40	8
	2015/16	57	57	3	8	6	3	14	43	5
	2014/15	56	56	3	8	5	6	19	34	12
	2013/14	56	56	5	9	9	7	20	33	16
	2012/13	61	61	3	8	3	6	16	42	8
	2011/12	64	64	4	9	7	5	17	43	10
	2010/11	58	58	1	8	2	3	13	43	6
	2009/10	57	57	4	9	3	5	24	32	13
	2008/09	56	56	27	11	9	3	18	35	7
	2007/08	43	43	18	2		1	10	34	13

Lang:	YEAR	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX
PORT	2016/17	14	14		5			7	7	
	2015/16	16	16		2	1		8	8	
	2014/15	11	11		1			2	9	
	2013/14	12	12		3	1		6	6	
	2012/13	11	11		3	1		4	7	
	2011/12	10	10		4			6	4	
	2010/11	11	11		4			7	4	
	2009/10	10	10		2			5	5	
	2008/09	10	10	7				5	5	
	2007/08	8	8	5	1			5	3	
RUSS	2016/17	27	27	2	2	11		3	26	3
	2015/16	27	27	5	5	5		5	27	6
	2014/15	28	28		5	8			28	7
	2013/14	28	28	3	7	9		3	28	4
	2012/13	20	20	1	2	4		1	20	2
	2011/12	21	21	2	1	10		2	21	4
	2010/11	34	34	4	3	17		5	33	8
	2009/10	31	31	5	4	12	2	2	29	5
	2008/09	26	26	10	2	6		4	26	5
	2007/08	25	25	7		6				1
CZEC	2015/16	2	2						2	
	2014/15	6	6		2				6	
	2013/14	5	5		1				5	
	2012/13	3	3		1				3	
	2011/12	2	2		1				2	
	2010/11	4	4						4	1
	2009/10	3	3		3				3	
	2008/09	4	4	2	2				5	
	2007/08	3	3		2				2	
GREK	2016/17					3				
	2015/16	2	2			2			2	
	2014/15	4	4			1			4	
	2013/14	2	2			1			2	
	2012/13	2	2						2	
	2011/12	3	3			1			3	
	2010/11					2				
	2009/10	3	3		1	1			3	
	2008/09	3	3						3	
CELT	2014/15	2	2		2		2			
	2013/14	1	1				1			
PISH	2014/15		4			4		4		
	2013/14		1			1		1		
	2012/13		2			2		2		
	2011/12		1			1		1		
	2010/11		1			1		1		
	2008/09		1			1		1		
	2007/08		1			1		1		
POLI	2010/11	1								

TABLE 8B : General Linguistics (XIII)

Paper XIII totals	
2016/17	24
2015/16	26
2014/15	23
2013/14	33
2012/13	18
2011/12	21
2010/11	19
2009/10	25
2008/09	37
2007/08	18

TABLE 8C : Entries for Papers X – IX (*including Joint Schools*)

Lang:	Paper No:	UNIT TITLE	2016/17	2015/16	2014/15	2013/14	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2007/08
FREN	X	French X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i)	84	82	93	77	79	74	72	88	103	
		French X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Diderot	31	28	25	16	15	17	10	28	31	23
		French X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Moliere	48	42	60	43	49	44	51	53	44	42
		French X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Montaigne	21	15	26	18	11	20	13	14		
		French X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Pascal	5	5	5	4	6	6	9	8	19	9
		French X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Rabelais	7	14	11	9	11	11	16	8	20	6
		French X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Racine	31	27	31	34	35	22	26	28	29	25
		French X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Voltaire	25	33	26	30	31	28	19	37	34	29
		French XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii)	94	85	91	70	74	84	74	73	64	
		French XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Barthes	15	13	10	6						
		French XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Baudelaire	24	31	36	21	20	28	23	16	17	32
		French XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Duras	36	26	24	15	26	29	17	18	15	15
		French XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Flaubert	31	39	35	34	24	37	29	33	22	34
		French XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Gide	28	18	27	18	25	25	32	26	20	29
GERM	X	French XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Mallarme	9	11	8	12	6	10	4	2	7	10
		French XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Sartre	32	19	17	19	27	16	28	34	28	35
		French XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Stendhal	13	13	25	15	20	23	15	17	19	23
		Total	140	133	145	118	121	135	127	128	139	141
		German X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i)	55	44	59	51	51	48	68	52	57	
		German X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Brecht	10	12	13	15	11	10	8	10	14	16
		German X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Christa Wolf	11	3	3	6	5	2	10	6	7	8
		German X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Elfriede Jelinek	13	5	5	6	5	6	4	3	9	
		German X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Goethe as a Dramatist	3	4	7	2	6	2	8	3	3	10
		German X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Grass	3	1	5	6	6	6	5	3	9	8
		German X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Grimmelshausen		3	3	1		3	2	4	2	1
		German X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Gryphius				1		1	2		1	
		German X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Heine	6	6	7	7	6	3	10	11	3	4
		German X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Hoffmann	7	5	10	9	7	10	9	5	7	3
GERM	XI	German X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Holderlin	3	2	1	1	1	2		1		2
		German X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Kafka	23	20	27	21	17	16	26	19	25	22
		German X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Kleist	4	3	5	6	9	10	11	8	8	8
		German X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Luther	1	3	3	4	2	2	6	2	4	7
		German X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Rainer Werner Fassbi..	1	2	3	4	2	1	2	1	5	
		German X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Rilke	4	4	4	3	7	7	7	8	4	3
		German X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Schiller		2	5	1	1	2	2	3	6	11
		German X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Thomas Mann	16	10	10	6	9	10	18	10	10	16
		German X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): W. G. Sebald	5	3	7	3	8	3	6	7		
		German X: Modern Prescribed Authors I (old regs)									2	
		German X: Modern Prescribed Authors I: Goethe as a Poet and ..										3
		German XIA: Early Modern Literary Texts	2	4	2	2	1		2	3	6	
		German XIA: Early Modern Literary Texts: Baroque tragedy	2	3		1	1		2		3	
		German XIA: Early Modern Literary Texts: Luther	2	4	1	2	1		2	3		
GERM	XII	German XIA: Early Modern Literary Texts: Reformation controver..	2	3	1	2	1		2	3	3	
		German XIA: Early Modern Literary Texts: Religious poetry	1	2	2	2				3	4	
		German XIA: Early Modern Literary Texts: Secular poetry		1	2					3	5	
		German XIA: Early Modern Literary Texts: The novel	1	3	2	1	1		2		5	
		German XIB: Goethe	1	2	4	4	4	4	4	7	6	
		Total	57	47	63	54	55	51	72	56	63	61

Lang:	Paper No:	UNIT TITLE	2016/17	2015/16	2014/15	2013/14	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2007/08
ITAL	X	Italian X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i)	3	3	2	2	2	6	4	2	3	
		Italian X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Ariosto				1	2	1	1		1	
		Italian X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Boccaccio	3	2	1	2		5	3	2	2	1
		Italian X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Machiavelli		1	1		1	2	2	1	2	1
		Italian X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Petrarch	3	3	2	1	1	3	2	1	1	2
		Italian X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Tasso						1				
	XI	Italian XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii)	2	3	1	7	2	5	5	10	9	
		Italian XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Calvino	1	2	1	4	2	3	4	7		
		Italian XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): D'Annunzio			1					1	1	1
		Italian XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Leopardi		1		1		2	1	2		2
		Italian XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Manzoni		1				2	2	2	2	
		Italian XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Montale				2	2	3	2	3	3	2
		Italian XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Pirandello	2	2		5				4	3	2
		Italian XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Verga	1			2			1	1	1	1
	Total		5	6	3	9	4	11	8	12	12	7
SPAN	X	Spanish X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i)	24	16	13	13	24	18	23	16	21	
		Spanish X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Calderon	19	8	6	7	21	13	14	14	17	11
		Spanish X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Cervantes	20	12	9	10	22	15	21	15	19	13
		Spanish X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Garcilaso de la Vega		2	2	3	1	1	3	1		
		Spanish X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Gongora	2	3	4	4	3	3	5		1	1
		Spanish X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Quevedo	7	7	5	2	1	4	3	2	5	1
	XI	Spanish XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii)	25	28	29	23	26	34	21	22	25	
		Spanish XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Borges	15	12	16	13	8	19	10	9	19	6
		Spanish XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Federico Garcia Lorca	8	11	15	10	13	18	11	9	8	11
		Spanish XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Leopoldo Alas	2	5	3	3	10	6	10	8	3	5
	XI	Spanish XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Neruda	11	12	12	9	10	11	6	7	12	7
		Spanish XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Perez Galdos	2	2	3	5	4	5	3	9	3	6
		Spanish XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Valle-Inclan	4	7	9	6	7	9	2	2	5	3
		Total		48	44	41	35	50	50	42	38	46
PORT	X	Portuguese X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i)	3	4	2	1		2	1	3	2	
		Portuguese X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Antonio Ferreira	1									
		Portuguese X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): António Ferreira		4					1	1	2	1
		Portuguese X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Camoes	3	3	2	1		2	1	3	2	2
		Portuguese X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Gil Vicente	2	1	1	1		2		2		
		Portuguese X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Joao de Barros			1							
	XI	Portuguese XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii)	5	10	8	10	8	6	5	6	8	
		Portuguese XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Almeida Garrett					2		1			
		Portuguese XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Clarice Lispector	4	3	1	2	2	4	1	2	5	2
		Portuguese XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Eca de Quieros	1	7	1	4	3	5	1	3	1	2
		Portuguese XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Fernando Pessoa	1	3	3	1	3	1	4	1	6	2
		Portuguese XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Graciliano Ramos	2		4	1				1	3	1
		Portuguese XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Machado de Assis		6		10	3	2	3	2	1	1
		Portuguese XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Mia Couto	2	1	7	2	3			3		
	Total		8	14	10	11	8	8	6	8	10	6
RUSS	X	Russian X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i)	6	11	11	13	10	11	14	17	13	
		Russian X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Bulgakov	3	10	9	12	5	5	11	11	8	8
		Russian X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Gogol	2	6	8	7	6	7	8	11	6	9
		Russian X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Mandel'shtam	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	3	3	1
		Russian X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Mayakovsky	4	1		2	1	2	3	5	3	2
		Russian X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Pushkin	1	3	4	4	7	6	4	4		
	XI	Russian XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii)	11	15	9	6	8	5	10	8	9	
		Russian XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Chekhov	3	5	5	5	4	4	7	6	8	4
		Russian XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Dostoevsky	8	6	1	1	5	2	4	7	6	5
		Russian XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Nabokov	2	7	2	2	2					
		Russian XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Solzhenitsyn	6	6	6	4	2	1	5	2	1	3
		Russian XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): Tolstoy	3	6	4		3	3	4	1	3	2
	Total		16	26	20	19	16	16	21	25	21	19
CZEC	X	Czech with Slovak X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i)		2	4	3	2	1	4	1	4	
		Czech with Slovak X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Comenius		2	1	2	2	1	4		4	
		Czech with Slovak X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Hodrova			4	2	2	1	2	1	1	
		Czech with Slovak X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Holan		2	3	1			2	1	2	
		Czech with Slovak X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Hrabal		2	4	3	2	1	3	1	4	
		Czech with Slovak X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Mitana				1			1		1	
	Total			2	4	3	2	1	4	1	4	
GREK	X	Medieval and Modern Greek X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i)		1						1		
		Medieval and Modern Greek X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): D..		1						1		
		Medieval and Modern Greek X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): E..		1						1		
	XI	Medieval and Modern Greek XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii)			2	2	2	3		1	3	
		Medieval and Modern Greek XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): ..			2	2	2	2		1	2	
		Medieval and Modern Greek XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): ..				2	2	2			1	
		Medieval and Modern Greek XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): ..			2			2		1	2	
		Medieval and Modern Greek XI: Modern Prescribed Authors (ii): ..									1	
Total			1	2	2	2	3		2	3		
CELT	X	Celtic Paper X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i)				1						
		Celtic X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Gramadegau'r Penceird..				1						
		Celtic X: Modern Prescribed Authors (i): Gwaith Guto'r Glyn				1						
	Total					1						

TABLE 9 : Special Subjects (XII) (including Joint Schools)

Lang:	PAPER CODE	Special Subject	2016/17	2015/16	2014/15	2013/14	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2007/08
FREN	A02392S1	Literature and the Visual Arts from Diderot to Zola									3	10
	A02393W1	The Old French Epic					1	1	1		2	1
	A02394S1	Francophone Literature									6	4
	A02395S1	Literature and the Visual Arts							1	5		
	A02396W1	Late Medieval Responses to Le Roman de la rose					1	2	2	1		
	A13401S1	Jean-Jacques Rousseau	2	3	1	5	3	4	3	7	6	5
	A13402S1	Honore de Balzac	1	4	3	5	1	4	1	5	2	10
	A13403S1	French Poetry 1870 to 1918	1	4	5	3	3	7	3		4	4
	A13404S1	French Literature and the Modern War	13	9	7	5	5		5	10	11	9
	A13405S1	Marcel Proust	5	6	5	8	5	8	13	7	10	13
	A13406S1	French Women Writers			12	6	11	11	8	7	8	7
	A13407S1	Advanced French Translation: Theory and Practice	26	27	25	22	30	18	12	18	14	9
	A13408S1	French Satire from Rabelais to Beaumarchais	5	5	2	5	2	4	5	1	4	4
	A13409S1	Old Ootlan	1	2								
	A13409W1	Old Ootlan			4	1	3		1			
	A13410S1	French Poetry from Surrealism to the Present	1		2	2	2		2	3	2	
	A13411S1	Francophone Literature: Colonial and Post-colonial perspectives	10	8	8	6	11	9	4	9		
	A13412S1	Literature and the Visual Arts in France	6		7	5	6	6	9			
	A13413W1	Late Medieval Responses to the Roman de la Rose				1						
	A13443W1	The Twelfth and Thirteenth Century Grail Romances			1		5	1	1			2
	A14303S1	French Poetry of the Mid-Sixteenth Century	1	2			1				3	
	A14329W1	Anglo-Norman Language and Literature										1
GERM	A02397S1	German Political Writing in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries										2
	A02398S1	German Expressionism in Literature and the Visual Arts									3	1
	A02399W1	German Poets: Hofmannsthal								1		
	A02400W1	German Poets: Rilke								1		
	A02401W1	German Poetry since 1945: Bachmann										1
	A02402W1	German Poetry since 1945: Brecht										2
	A02403W1	German Poetry since 1945: Celan										1
	A02404W1	German Poetry since 1945: Enzensberger										1
	A02405W1	German Poetry since 1945: Sachs										1
	A02411W1	The poetry of Hofmannsthal, George and Rilke								1		
	A02412S1	German Poetry since 1945							4	2	1	
	A13414S1	Gottfried's Tristan and Medieval German Court Society			1			2	2	5		1
	A13415S1	The Bildungsroman		1		1	1		1			1
	A13416S1	Narrative Identities in the German Novel since 1945	1		1	1	1		2	1	2	1
	A13417S1	Mechtild von Magdeburg and Womens Writing In German 1150-..				2					2	
	A13418S1	Literature in the GDR	4	5	6	5	6	3	3	3	1	8
	A13419S1	Advanced German Translation: Theory and Practice	7	7	8	9	8	8	9	9	8	8
	A13420S1	Contemporary German Literature			4	1			1		1	1
	A13421R1	Old High German: Old English				1						
	A13421S1	Old High German: Old English		2								
	A13422S1	Nineteenth-Century German Drama			1						2	
	A13424S1	Old High German				1			3		1	
	A13425S1	Expressionism in German literature and the visual arts				1			1			
	A13426S1	Drama and theatre since 1960		1		3	1	3	1			
	A13427S1	German modernist prose fiction 1898-1933	1	1	2	2	3	2	2			
	A14304S1	Walther von der Vogelweide and the Origins of the German Love ..							1			1
	A14305S1	German Women's Writers of the early modern period			1							1
	A14306S1	Eighteenth-Century German Aesthetics from Baumgarten to Schill...						2	1	1	1	
	A14307S1	Nietzsche and His Impact	7	4	6		1	4	4	3	8	
	A14309S1	Old High German: Gothic							3			1
	A14311S1	The poetry of Hofmannsthal, George and Rilke	2		1		1	3				
	A14312S1	Cinema in a Cultural Context: German Film 1930-70	2		5		4	4	3	1		
	A14314S1	Post 1945 Women's Writing In German	3					3				
	A14315S1	Comic Writing In German 1740-1850	1									
	A14316S1	German Poetry from 1945	1	2	2							
ITAL	A02415S1	Questione Della Lingua							1		1	
	A13429S1	Dante's Minor Works	1	5		1		3				
	A13430S1	Women Writers of the Italian Renaissance	1		1					1		2
	A13431S1	Italian Culture during the Fascist Period	4	1	3		1	1	1	3	3	
	A13432S1	Stollan Literature 1945 to Present Day			2	1	3		2	2	4	4
	A13433S1	Italian Women Writers 1945 to the Present Day				1	1	4	2		2	3
	A14327S1	Narratives of National Identity in Postwar Italy	1	1				2		3	3	
	A14328S1	Italian Poetry 1956 to the Present Day	1									
	A02422S1	Modern Catalan Literature					1				1	1
	A02423S1	Literature, historiography and society in Late Medieval Spain					1					
SPAN	A13465S1	Bilingualism: Spanish and English				2	1			2		
	A13466S1	The Discovery and Conquest of Mexico and the Antilles	3	5	3	3	3	6	7	3	4	5
	A13467S1	Modern Catalan	1	2	1			1	2	1	3	2
	A13468S1	Modern Galician	1		1	1		1		1		
	A13469S1	Women Writers in Modern Spain	1	6	3	1	1	1				
	A13470S1	The Literature and Culture of al-Andalus	2		2	1	2	2	1	1		
	A13471S1	Latin American Cinema	11	10	3	9	10					
	A13472S1	Contemporary Catalan Literature	1	1	1	4						
	A13473S1	Literature, history and society in Late Medieval Spain	1		1	2						
	A14336W1	Spanish Drama before Lope de Vega					1			1		
	A14337S1	Spanish Devotional and Mystical Writing 1577-88						1		1	1	
	A14338S1	Modern Galician Literature					1		2			1
	A14339S1	Art and Literature in the Golden Age of Spain		1			1					
	A14343S1	Spanish-American Literature in the fin de siglo		1								
PORT	A02418S1	Twentieth-Century Portuguese and Brazilian Women Writers								2	2	
	A13458S1	The Literature of the Portuguese Expansion in Asia				2		2			1	2
	A13459S1	The Literature of Portuguese-Speaking Africa	2		1	1	1	2	2	2		1
	A13460S1	Twentieth Century Lusophone Women Writers			1	1		1				
	A14334S1	The Galician-Portuguese Cancioneiros									1	

Lang:	PAPER CODE	Special Subject	2016/17	2015/16	2014/15	2013/14	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2007/08
RUSS	A02489W1	Russian Literature of the 20th century (1890 to the Present Day)									1	5
	A13449W1	The Structure and History of a Language: Bulgarian/Macedonian				1	1					1
	A13450W1	The Structure and History of a Language: Serbian/Croatian				2		2	2		2	
	A13451W1	The Structure and History of a Language: Czech				1		1				
	A13452W1	The Structure and History of a Language: Polish	2			1	1	2		2	3	
	A13453W1	The Structure and History of a Language: Ukrainian			2	1		1	1			
	A13451W1	Russian Drama of the 19th and 20th Centuries	3	7		3	4	3	4	6	1	1
GREK	A13462S1	Russian Womens Writing			1	1						1
	A13463W1	Russian Literature of the 20th century (1953 to the Present Day)	2	3		1			2	1	2	
	A14335W1	Comparative Slavonic Philology			2		1			1		
	A02413S1	Readings of Popular Culture in twentieth-century Greece						1				
	A14317S1	The Greek Novel 1918-1940									1	
	A14319S1	Modern Greek Film			1		1			1		
	A14320S1	Advanced Modern Greek Translation: Theory and Practice			1							
CELT	A13396S1	Saunders Lewis			1	1						
	A14299W1	The Structure and History of the Welsh Language						1	1			1
	A14300S1	The Structure and History of the Irish Language			2							
	A14300W1	The Structure and History of the Irish Language								1		
LING	A02416W1	Translation Theory								2	4	
	A13439W1	Psycholinguistics	3	9	2	2	5	6	7	2	8	3
	A13440W1	Semantics	4	1	1	1		2	1	1	3	2
	A13442W1	Romanee Philology and Linguistics	2		3	1		1		1	1	
	A13444W1	Phonetics and Phonology (Aural)			4	3		2	1	3	3	
	A13445W1	Syntax	5	5	3	3	2	3	5	3	6	4
	A13446S1	Phonetics and Phonology (Lab Report)	4	2								
	A13446W1	Phonetics and Phonology			5	7		2	1	3	3	
		Phonetics and Phonology (written paper)	6	6								
	A13446W2	Phonetics and Phonology (Aural)	2	4								
	A13447W1	Sociolinguistics	4	2	4	5	9	5	5	2	8	6
	A13448S1	Linguistic Project			3	8	2	1	1	4	2	4
	A13454W1	Language Change and Historical Linguistics	5	2	2	3	2	3	2			
	A13455W1	The Structure and History of a Language: Romanian		2		6	1					
	A13456S1	Phonetics and Phonology (Lab Report)			1	4						
	A13429S1	Anglo-Norman Language and Literature	4									
	A14331W1	Morphology	1	1	2		2					
	A14332S1	The Genetic Basis of Language		2								
	A02417W1	The History of Polish					1					
	A14333W1	Postwar Polish Literature					1					
	A02421W1	Old Church Slavonic In Relation to Common Slavonic and Russian							1		1	
	A13399S1	European Cinema	24	18	15	17	10	22	17	15	31	31
	A13441S1	Modern Literary Theory	2	5	8		8	5	5	12	8	5
Total			169	175	186	180	181	186	172	176	192	179

TABLE 10 : Oral Examination (including Joint Schools): Candidates and Distinctions

		1		2.1		2.2		3	Grand Total	
2016/17	French	52	30.8%	116	68.6%	1	0.6%		169	100.0%
	German	28	37.8%	44	59.5%	2	2.7%		74	100.0%
	Italian	19	45.2%	23	54.8%				42	100.0%
	Portuguese	7	50.0%	7	50.0%				14	100.0%
	Russian	13	48.1%	14	51.9%				27	100.0%
	Spanish	25	41.7%	34	56.7%	1	1.7%		60	100.0%
2015/16	Czech w Slovak	1	50.0%	1	50.0%				2	100.0%
	French	72	41.4%	98	56.3%	4	2.3%		174	100.0%
	German	31	47.0%	32	48.5%	3	4.5%		66	100.0%
	Italian	12	40.0%	18	60.0%				30	100.0%
	Modern Greek	1	50.0%	1	50.0%				2	100.0%
	Portuguese	4	25.0%	12	75.0%				16	100.0%
	Russian	8	29.6%	18	66.7%	1	3.7%		27	100.0%
	Spanish	14	24.6%	43	75.4%				57	100.0%
2014/15	Celtic			2	100.0%				2	100.0%
	German	33	40.7%	44	54.3%	4	4.9%		81	100.0%
	Italian	10	31.3%	22	68.8%				32	100.0%
	Modern Greek	2	50.0%	2	50.0%				4	100.0%
	Portuguese	2	18.2%	9	81.8%				11	100.0%
	Russian	8	28.6%	18	64.3%	2	7.1%		28	100.0%
	Spanish	15	26.8%	41	73.2%				56	100.0%

		1		2.1		2.2		3		Grand Total	
2013/14	Celtic	1	100.0%							1	100.0%
	Czech w Slovak	1	20.0%	3	60.0%	1	20.0%			5	100.0%
	French	43	27.6%	111	71.2%	2	1.3%			156	100.0%
	German	24	32.9%	47	64.4%	1	1.4%	1	1.4%	73	100.0%
	Italian	17	48.6%	17	48.6%			1	2.9%	35	100.0%
	Modern Greek			2	100.0%					2	100.0%
	Portuguese	4	33.3%	8	66.7%					12	100.0%
	Russian	5	17.9%	20	71.4%	3	10.7%			28	100.0%
	Spanish	20	35.7%	33	58.9%	3	5.4%			56	100.0%
2012/13	Czech w Slovak			2	66.7%	1	33.3%			3	100.0%
	French	46	28.6%	112	69.6%	3	1.9%			161	100.0%
	German	23	30.7%	51	68.0%	1	1.3%			75	100.0%
	Italian	12	41.4%	16	55.2%	1	3.4%			29	100.0%
	Modern Greek			2	100.0%					2	100.0%
	Portuguese	5	45.5%	6	54.5%					11	100.0%
	Russian	4	20.0%	16	80.0%					20	100.0%
	Spanish	22	36.1%	37	60.7%	2	3.3%			61	100.0%
2011/12	Czech w Slovak	1	50.0%	1	50.0%					2	100.0%
	French	49	27.8%	123	69.9%	4	2.3%			176	100.0%
	German	24	36.4%	42	63.6%					66	100.0%
	Italian	13	31.0%	28	66.7%	1	2.4%			42	100.0%
	Modern Greek	1	33.3%	2	66.7%					3	100.0%
	Portuguese	3	30.0%	7	70.0%					10	100.0%
	Russian	4	19.0%	16	76.2%	1	4.8%			21	100.0%
	Spanish	18	28.1%	42	65.6%	4	6.3%			64	100.0%
2010/11	Czech w Slovak	1	25.0%	2	50.0%	1	25.0%			4	100.0%
	French	45	26.6%	117	69.2%	7	4.1%			169	100.0%
	German	32	37.2%	49	57.0%	5	5.8%			86	100.0%
	Italian	9	27.3%	24	72.7%					33	100.0%
	Portuguese	3	27.3%	8	72.7%					11	100.0%
	Russian	11	32.4%	22	64.7%	1	2.9%			34	100.0%
	Spanish	15	25.9%	43	74.1%					58	100.0%
2009/10	Czech w Slovak	1	33.3%	2	66.7%					3	100.0%
	French	38	22.9%	124	74.7%	4	2.4%			166	100.0%
	German	16	22.2%	54	75.0%	2	2.8%			72	100.0%
	Italian	9	23.1%	29	74.4%	1	2.6%			39	100.0%
	Modern Greek	1	33.3%	2	66.7%					3	100.0%
	Portuguese	3	30.0%	6	60.0%	1	10.0%			10	100.0%
	Russian	7	22.6%	23	74.2%	1	3.2%			31	100.0%
	Spanish	13	22.8%	44	77.2%					57	100.0%
2008/09	Czech w Slovak			3	75.0%	1	25.0%			4	100.0%
	French	37	21.8%	122	71.8%	11	6.5%			170	100.0%
	German	23	28.8%	52	65.0%	5	6.3%			80	100.0%
	Italian	12	31.6%	25	65.8%	1	2.6%			38	100.0%
	Modern Greek	1	33.3%	2	66.7%					3	100.0%
	Portuguese	1	10.0%	8	80.0%	1	10.0%			10	100.0%
	Russian	5	20.0%	19	76.0%	1	4.0%			25	100.0%
	Spanish	11	19.3%	43	75.4%	3	5.3%			57	100.0%
2007/08	Czech w Slovak			2	66.7%	1	33.3%			3	100.0%
	French	49	27.2%	115	63.9%	16	8.9%			180	100.0%
	German	30	38.0%	42	53.2%	7	8.9%			79	100.0%
	Italian	12	35.3%	21	61.8%	1	2.9%			34	100.0%
	Portuguese	3	37.5%	5	62.5%					8	100.0%
	Russian	7	26.9%	15	57.7%	4	15.4%			26	100.0%
	Spanish	10	22.7%	32	72.7%	2	4.5%			44	100.0%

TABLE 11: Class distribution by language in the Oral Examination: number and percentage in each language (*including Joint Schools*)

		CZEC	FREN	GERM	GREK	ITAL	PORT	RUSS	SPAN
Distinction	2016/17		7.99%	16.22%		25.00%	21.43%	20.37%	14.17%
			27	24		21	6	11	17
	2015/16	25.00%	14.37%	12.88%	25.00%	16.67%	31.25%	12.96%	16.67%
		1	50	17	1	10	10	7	19
	2014/15	16.67%	16.02%	15.43%	37.50%	17.19%	13.64%	8.93%	19.64%
		2	58	25	3	11	3	5	22
	2013/14	20.00%	15.38%	11.64%		15.71%	20.83%	10.71%	16.07%
		2	48	17		11	5	6	18
	2012/13		13.98%	12.00%	25.00%	13.79%	22.73%	12.50%	18.85%
			45	18	1	8	5	5	23
	2011/12	50.00%	15.34%	15.91%	16.67%	20.24%	15.00%	26.19%	17.97%
		2	54	21	1	17	3	11	23
	2010/11		11.83%	16.86%		24.24%	22.73%	17.65%	12.07%
			40	29		16	5	12	14
	2009/10	16.67%	11.45%	9.72%	16.67%	10.26%	25.00%	11.29%	8.77%
		1	38	14	1	8	5	7	10
	2008/09	25.00%	22.94%	20.00%	100.00%	34.21%	30.00%	16.00%	35.09%
		1	39	16	3	13	3	4	20
	2007/08	66.67%	33.89%	18.99%		41.18%	62.50%	34.62%	50.00%
		2	61	15		14	5	9	22
II.i 60-69	2016/17		34.32%	27.03%		19.05%	25.00%	24.07%	31.67%
			116	40		16	7	13	38
	2015/16	25.00%	27.87%	29.55%	25.00%	31.67%	18.75%	20.37%	31.58%
		1	97	39	1	19	6	11	36
	2014/15	25.00%	27.62%	22.22%	12.50%	31.25%	18.18%	28.57%	27.68%
		3	100	36	1	20	4	16	31
	2013/14	10.00%	28.53%	26.03%	50.00%	28.57%	25.00%	21.43%	27.68%
		1	89	38	2	20	6	12	31
	2012/13	33.33%	23.91%	23.33%	25.00%	34.48%	22.73%	25.00%	28.69%
		2	77	35	1	20	5	10	35
	2011/12		27.56%	27.27%	33.33%	27.38%	35.00%	23.81%	17.97%
			97	36	2	23	7	10	23
	2010/11	25.00%	28.99%	21.51%		19.70%	18.18%	25.00%	26.72%
		2	98	37		13	4	17	31
	2009/10	33.33%	28.61%	29.17%	33.33%	37.18%	20.00%	20.97%	31.58%
		2	95	42	2	29	4	13	36
	2008/09	25.00%	50.00%	56.25%		44.74%	40.00%	60.00%	45.61%
		1	85	45		17	4	15	26
	2007/08		46.67%	37.97%		44.12%	37.50%	42.31%	36.36%
			84	30		15	3	11	16

		CZEC	FREN	GERM	GREK	ITAL	PORT	RUSS	SPAN
II.ii 50-59	2016/17		7.69%	6.76%		4.76%	3.57%	3.70%	3.33%
			26	10		4	1	2	4
	2015/16		6.90%	7.58%		1.67%		7.41%	1.75%
			24	10		1		4	2
	2014/15		5.80%	11.11%		1.56%	18.18%	8.93%	2.68%
			21	18		1	4	5	3
II.ii 50-59	2013/14	20.00%	5.77%	10.96%		4.29%	4.17%	14.29%	5.36%
		2	18	16		3	1	8	6
	2012/13	16.67%	10.56%	14.00%		1.72%	4.55%	12.50%	2.46%
		1	34	21		1	1	5	3
	2011/12		6.53%	6.82%		1.19%			13.28%
			23	9		1			17
	2010/11	12.50%	8.88%	11.05%		3.03%	4.55%	7.35%	10.34%
		1	30	19		2	1	5	12
	2009/10		9.64%	10.42%		2.56%	5.00%	17.74%	9.65%
			32	15		2	1	11	11
	2008/09	25.00%	25.29%	20.00%		21.05%	30.00%	24.00%	19.30%
		1	43	16		8	3	6	11
	2007/08	33.33%	12.78%	24.05%		11.76%		15.38%	9.09%
		1	23	19		4		4	4
III 40-49	2016/17					1.19%		1.85%	0.83%
						1		1	1
	2015/16		0.86%					9.26%	
			3					5	
	2014/15	8.33%	0.28%	1.23%				1.79%	
		1	1	2				1	
	2013/14			1.37%		1.43%		3.57%	0.89%
				2		1		2	1
	2012/13		1.55%	0.67%					
			5	1					
	2011/12		0.57%			1.19%			0.78%
			2			1			1
	2010/11		0.30%	0.58%		3.03%	4.55%		0.86%
			1	1		2	1		1
	2009/10		0.30%	0.69%					
			1	1					
Pass	2008/09	25.00%	1.76%	3.75%					
		1	3	3					
	2007/08		0.56%	15.19%				3.85%	2.27%
			1	12				1	1
	2014/15							1.79%	
								1	
	2010/11	12.50%							
		1							

		CZEC	FREN	GERM	GREK	ITAL	PORT	RUSS	SPAN
Non satis	2016/17		50.00%	50.00%		50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%
			169	74		42	14	27	60
	2015/16	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%
		2	174	66	2	30	16	27	57
	2014/15	50.00%	50.28%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%
		6	182	81	4	32	11	28	56
	2013/14	50.00%	50.32%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%
		5	157	73	2	35	12	28	56
	2012/13	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%
		3	161	75	2	29	11	20	61
	2011/12	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%
		2	176	66	3	42	10	21	64
	2010/11	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%		50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%
		4	169	86		33	11	34	58
	2009/10	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%
		3	166	72	3	39	10	31	57
	2007/08		6.11%	3.80%		2.94%		3.85%	2.27%
			11	3		1		1	1

D. COMMENTS ON PAPERS AND INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS

FHS EXAMINERS' REPORTS IN MEDIEVAL AND MODERN LANGUAGES 2015

• French	p 26 - 34
• German	p 35 - 42
• Italian	p 43 - 46
• Linguistics	p 47 - 48
• Portuguese	p 49 - 51
• Russian	p 52 - 54
• Spanish	p 55 - 66
• Special Subject / Paper XII	p 67 - 74

FRENCH

French I

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii	III
28 (16.57%)	113 (66.86%)	27 (15.98%)	1 (0.59%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
78 - 67	66 - 64	64 - 61	61 - 48

In general, students performed well and convincingly on this paper. The level of French used in some cases was extremely good, with a relatively high number of scripts achieving first class marks. Some of the language used was remarkably idiomatic and literary, while a surprising number of candidates made basic mistakes such as misuse of gender and spelling errors (including words featuring in the titles), faulty agreement of past participles and nonstandard verb accords, as well as erratic usage of accents. The quality of the content was varied. Students were particularly inspired by discussions of “La bande dessinée” and “Les représentations de la guerre”. Examiners were impressed with some scripts that were particularly imaginative and original in their approach, drawing from different sources (not only literature but also art and film). The longest essays were not necessarily the best, as some students tended towards dilution and repetition, much to the detriment of clarity and structure. Lack of transitions between the paragraphs was also a major drawback of less successful scripts. For example, students could have made more systematic use of connectors such as 'cependant', 'inutile de dire', 'd'une certaine manière', 'dans un autre domaine', 'du point de vue littéraire/cinématographique' to make their essay more fluid and read less abruptly. The weakest essays were off-topic or contained recycled material from former essays and discourse topics. However, the majority of the candidates were well-informed about current affairs and showed a good level of background knowledge, supporting their arguments with political as well as cultural references pertaining to the Francophone world. Of the sixteen essay questions, all were answered except for 3, 15, and 16.

French II (IIA and IIB)

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii	III
39 (23.08%)	102 (60.36%)	27 (15.98%)	1 (0.59%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
80 - 69	69 - 65	65 - 62	62 - 47

French IIA

The FHS unseen translation, a passage from Jean Rouaud, provided candidates with a number of challenges to which the best of them rose impressively. Although not enormously difficult from a conceptual perspective, it did contain several phrases which required some thought (for example, by no means all candidates realised that 'un échange avec un voisin' did not refer to any kind of conversation). By the same token, although the vocabulary was not especially abstruse, certain terms did give more trouble than perhaps they should have: examples include 'étroites', too often rendered as 'straight'; 'sinueuses', which sometimes came out as 'sinewy' (especially odd given that it referred to 'routes'), and 'une nationale', which many took to be a large town or city; also problematic for many were certain phrases, including 'tant l'allure est lente', 'au bas des côtes', 'être demandeur' and '— voilà qui est humiliant —'. Of a slightly different order is the term 'transhumance', which was taken by perhaps a majority of candidates to refer to some sort of spiritual or transcendent experience -- probably a misconstrual following on from 'rituellement'. This illustrates what was arguably the greatest disappointment: a kind of failure of inferential logic

by many candidates, best exemplified by how many of them dealt with the term 'le pis'. In context, this clearly referred to a part of the anatomy of a 'vache'; the latter biological fact should have eliminated a number of conjectural options and this should have allowed candidates to reach a logical conclusion that the term meant 'udder', even if it was not a word familiar to them. That a majority of them did not reach this conclusion seemed to imply a tendency to think about the exercise in a rather inflexible way; similar points could be made about the identification of the person in charge of the cattle in the text as a 'shepherd or shepherdess', and a number of other lapses in logic. However, many candidates dealt with the passage very successfully indeed, with the best of them not only surmounting difficulties of vocabulary, idiom, and syntax, but also making a good attempt at emulating Rouaud's style and the rhythm of the passage, and very few indeed were entirely baffled by it.

French IIB

This was a rewarding exercise for both candidates and markers. Much of the basic grammar was sound, and there were many examples of imaginative engagement with the various lexical and syntactic challenges posed by the passage. There were, of course, misunderstandings. The verb *violier* has a specific meaning when applied to persons, and that meaning was entirely inappropriate here. Words like 'stumble', 'mainstream', 'legacy', and 'premise', were often paraphrased so inaccurately that their meaning was lost. On the other hand, there were many commendable attempts to render 'give a flourish at the end of a sentence' and other idiomatic expressions. Indefinite clauses were not well mastered: for every correct *quel que soit le dialecte* there were several **quelque (or quoique) soit le (or often la) dialecte* or **n'importe lequel dialecte*, and for every correct *que nous parlions l'anglais de Harlem...*, there were many *si nous parlons...*, which is not incorrect French, but does not mean the same thing (unless preceded by *peu importe*). The very end of the passage proved too challenging for many, from those who thought that the equivalent of 'that overwhelms one with darkness' was **que se noie dans les ténèbres* or **qui l'on couvrit d'obscurité* to those who tried a wild paraphrase such as **domine avec la profondeur*. Common basic errors included **écouter à*, **proche à* and **se rapprocher à*, **sembler de*, **nous tous voulons sentir chez soi* (for *nous voulons tous nous sentir chez nous*), and the usual crop of wrong genders (one candidate managed to get *autorité*, *dialecte*, *variété*, *créole*, *conte* and *rage* all wrong, but still scraped a first-class mark thanks to a good sense of idiom) and accents and other spellings (**mesure*, **espace*, **différent*, **vigueur*, **suffissament*, **rhythme* – the h was dropped in 1878!). Several candidates misread 'one of his stories in *The Ebony Tower*' as if the story itself bore that title; and very few were able to produce the whole expression *La tour d'ébène* correctly. But there was a commendable willingness to exploit the resources of French lexis and idiom to create a version that read more like French than English, and while some 20% of the scripts fell below the 2.1 borderline, nearly 24% achieved a first-class mark, with six marks of 80 or above.

French III

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii
6 (18.75%)	24 (75.%)	2 (6.25%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
74 – 67	66 – 64	64 – 62	62 – 55

As has often been the case in previous years, the medieval French verse (0) and prose (5) passages attracted disappointingly few takers, nor were the 16C (4) and 18C (10) verse extracts especially popular, with the majority of candidates favouring the 17C (24) and 18C (21) prose excerpts. It is not without interest that the least popular passages inspired some of the most impressive responses. The best scripts struck an admirable balance between fidelity to the source text and fluency of the target text, with some particularly stirring

attempts to capture the voices of Bougainville and of Satan in the Du Boccage extract. In the weaker scripts, syntax tended to cause the greatest problems of comprehension, closely followed by lexis; while rendering occasionally suffered from an unidiomatically literal approach, a number of translations also erred towards a freedom which suffered from unnecessary innovation and prolixity, with it sometimes not being entirely clear whether underlying incomprehension or translation strategy was responsible. Although identified as problematic in the previous year's examiners' report, 'au reste' caused problems again; other items of vocabulary which produced some rather unexpected errors included 'côtoyer', 'insensiblement', 'disposer de', 'concours', 'dans le jour', and 'sous la figure'.

French IV

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii
3 (12%)	20 (80%)	2 (8%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
71 – 67	67 – 65	65 – 62	62 – 57

Candidates' performance on this paper was perhaps a little disappointing compared to recent years, with relatively few scripts falling in the First Class. As usual, a rather small number of questions attracted the majority of answers — especially popular topics were negation, articles, nasalization, and Germanic influence. More candidates than expected wrote on the impact of Vaugelas. Several candidates attempted the questions at the beginning of the paper on general problems of theory and method. Answers to these were very variable, with some showing competence and others showing little understanding of the issues — and one blatantly using the general question on theory to answer a completely different question on a specific topic which had not actually been set. It goes without saying that this type of 'answer' will score a poor mark. Likewise the commentaries were of variable quality: some were excellent and some poor. Candidates should be aware that answering a commentary question is a rather different exercise from writing an essay — whereas the latter requires an in-depth knowledge of a particular topic, group of related topics, or underlying issue, a successful commentary will deal with every major point of interest in the text, and hence a priori require a greater breadth of knowledge. A final general point is that far too many of the answers were poorly structured. The most successful candidates began by unpacking the question, defining terms, and saying why the topic might be considered important or relevant, and then proceeded to construct a cogent and coherent argument, before coming to an identifiable conclusion which was consequent on what had come before. Too many candidates instead adopted a scattergun 'all I know' approach.

French V

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii
2 (9.09%)	19 (86.36%)	1 (4.55%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
73 – 68	68 – 64	64 – 62	61 – 44

The best answers engaged fully with the questions in an original and thorough manner, drawing on relevant research but rather than fitting quotations round a semi-prepared essay, they used published research to inform the discussion throughout. Some answers used personal examples very well, which was pleasing. They were also well structured at all levels and thus presented a coherent whole.

Candidates who did less well had either failed to engage with the question, or had evidently recycled a tutorial essay on the same topic, but which had been prepared in answer to a different question. This once again underlines the importance of post-tutorial consolidation of

knowledge on a topic. Answers with a lack of examples to illustrate the points made by candidates were much less convincing than those with few or no examples, or a handful of familiar examples from textbooks. Some of the weaker answers were less well-structured or less coherent (candidates should note in particular that the inclusion of headings is no substitute for careful planning of an answer).

Some questions were more straightforwardly descriptive, leaving less scope for constructing an argument. There was nevertheless still a great deal of variation in quality. For example, some answers on Canadian French were very good, citing recent research and structuring the answer so it was more than a list of points, but too many relied on regurgitating information from a very limited number of often out-of-date textbooks and ignoring the great range of articles published on aspects of Canadian varieties.

A very small number of candidates had problems with timing and produced excellent answers to two questions and then incomplete / rushed answers to the third.

French VI

Class profile		Quartiles			
I	II.i	1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
4 (30.77%)	9 (69.23%)	76 – 71	68 – 64	64 – 64	63 – 60

The number of candidates choosing Paper VI was lower than in previous years (13, from 22 in 2016, 24 in 2015 and 17 in 2014) but the results were stronger, with 30% obtaining 1st (from 22.73% in 2016) and no 2.ii marks (compared to two last year). The results in the first quartile were also more impressive, ranging from 76 to 71 instead of 74-68 last year. The most popular questions were 15, on the relevance of time as a concept in late medieval theatre (6 answers), 6 on heroes' vices and virtues in romances (4 answers), and 16 on Christine de Pizan's authority (4 answers). Several questions were not attempted (3, 5, 14, 19, 21). Discussions on the evolution of authority in the works of Christine de Pisan tended to eschew any definition of what authority is, and some wrongly equated it with a pro-feminine stance or (proto)feminism. Another case where important concepts were left unexplained occurred in discussions of identity in question 1 on *chansons de geste* or of narrative progress in question 18b on late narrative poetry. On the whole, though, there were some very impressive essays, and several 2.i scripts contained at least one answer of first-class quality. References to secondary reading were made effectively and in some cases impressively, and candidates provided excellent examples from the primary texts. Generic questions attracted original answers: question 6 on heroes' vices and virtues in romances for example were variously based on Chrétien's romances, the *Tristan* stories or the prose *Lancelot* cycle; question 8 on the importance of orality was explored in connection to medieval *lais*.

French VII

Class profile		Quartiles			
I	II.i	1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
20 (40%)	30 (60%)	75 – 70	70 – 67	67 – 65	65 – 60

50 candidates took the paper this year, and the overall standard was very good.

Particularly encouraging were the scripts which undertook creative, even adventurous discussion of authors across century boundaries, and not only for qn.6. The best essays had an excellent range of material, but, more than that, many candidates were prepared to

engage with the questions, to think creatively, and to use specific examples in sharp and illuminating ways. Often drawing on wide and ambitious reading (including discussion of L  ry, Fontenelle, Perrault, Dacier, d'Urf  ), these essays did not seek a comprehensive or 'correct' answer, which can often lead to bland generalisation, but aimed to provide a positive and informed response based on consideration of appropriately chosen, and often contrasting, texts.

In general, candidates referred to a good range of authors, with just a few scripts which were (disappointingly) limited in their focus on a single century or a single genre. Some candidates could afford to be more adventurous with material offered in lectures: too many essays presented the same textual examples (from the *moralistes*, or from just two C18th texts), minimally recycled to suit the questions under discussion. The principal weaknesses of the less successful scripts were a tendency to describe texts rather than to analyse them, and a reluctance on occasion to problematize key terms in a question. This was evident, for instance, in some discussions of the significance of *grandeur* in tragedy (qn.10), the claim that satire is *conservative* (qn.15), or that writers depict the self as *incompr  hensible* (qn.3). Some responses to qn.37 (on the hybridity of eighteenth-century writing) described ways in which the chosen texts may be characterised as 'hybrid', but they did not explore how the coexistence of different registers, forms or genres in a single text affects the ways in which it is read, responded to, or interpreted. The same was true of the question on *Coeur* and *raison* (qn.26), which often elicited quite descriptive, even narrative responses rather than more structured reflexions on the implications and consequences of this tension. The instruction to 'discuss' statements made in a question is not simply (if at all) an invitation to validate, but also to question, explore, even contradict.

The most popular questions were 3, 10, 11, and 37, all of which had at least 10 takers; questions 2, 9, 14, 15, 22 and 26 all had at least 5. Only questions 1, 8, 13, 18, 20, 30, 32, and 33, had no takers at all.

French VIII

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii
34 (26.36%)	84 (65.12%)	11 (8.53%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
78 – 70	70 – 67	67 – 64	64 – 53

This paper was largely done impressively well, testifying to the hard work and wide-ranging reading of our students. Many questions generated answers on a variety of different kinds of material, and candidates were often inventive in their choice of texts. The best scripts demonstrated active and original thinking, sometimes by combining texts in creative ways and sometimes by successfully using the question as a springboard for a fresh engagement with more familiar movements or schools. More middle-range answers tended to be a little more predictable, and often missed the nuance hinted at in the question. The question on representation as a 'broken mirror', for example, generated a lot of answers on realism and its problems, but not enough explored the metaphor in detail or thought to comment on the fragmentation that the image implies. As in previous years, many candidates chose to answer on Zola, though struggled to understand what a 'moraliste exp  rimentateur' might mean, and many also wrote on the Theatre of the Absurd but failed to attend to the subtlety of the Artaud quotation in question 25. The question on revolt was very popular, but it would have been nice to see more consideration of the role specifically of artistic creativity in this, as the question generated of slightly pedestrian thematic answers. It was a shame that some of the more focused eighteenth-century questions were only answered by a few people, as many chose instead to write more predictably on Voltaire and travel, for example. Broadly,

though, the range of writers covered by the scripts as a whole was commendably broad, and the vast majority of candidates were able to produce convincing responses.

French IX

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii	III
4 (11.76%)	24 (70.59%)	5 (14.71%)	1 (2.94%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
76 – 70	68 – 66	65 – 63	63 – 58

The overall level of performance on this paper was a little lower than in the preceding year, with only half as many first-class performances. The strongest commentaries impressed through their grasp of the significance of the extract and their sensitivity to textual detail (lexis, syntax, versification, etc.), while the weaker scripts tended to discuss themes in fairly general terms, and sometimes included outright misreadings of the passage. The best essays gave careful consideration to the implications of the terms used in the questions, adhered to the structure deduced from this consideration, and eschewed digression and extraneous material, whereas in the less accomplished essays there was a tendency not to interrogate the question, but rather to use it as a springboard for observations which, if in themselves interesting, were not always equally relevant. The most impressive scripts also made judicious and discerning use of secondary material or critical theory, and avoided the infelicities seen in some other scripts (misuse of 'as such', the misspelling 'valliant', etc.). Only three candidates took the option of completing two commentaries and one essay.

In Section A, the *Roland* passage was by far the most popular (19), followed by Bérout (10) and Villon (7). All of the passages caused varying degrees of problems for the translation task, especially syntax and lexis: it was a little surprising that so few scripts spotted that the verb is present subjunctive in *Ne placet Damnedeu!* (lit. 'Let it not please God'), and that so many did not recognise key substantives such as *maroi* ('marsh') and *testes* ('heads'). Such slips had natural consequences for the accuracy of the textual analysis, and future candidates are again directed towards the medieval French language resources on Weblearn, as well as the glossaries in the numerous editions of these canonical texts. For the *Roland* passage, many scripts identified the differences in the speeches of Tierri and Pinabel, the echoes of David/Goliath, similarities to other battle descriptions etc., but fewer conveyed a full sense of the significance of the outcome of the *judicium Dei* for the work as a whole, and fewer still noted that the mysterious *AOI* appeared at the end of every *laisse*. For the Bérout passage, there was generally useful discussion of humour, dramatic irony, and Mark's charity, although more might have been made of the use of dialogue, Tristan's acting, and the significance of leprosy; a number of candidates also misread v. 35, *Mais plus bele ne fu que une* ('But there was only one lady more beautiful'). The Villon passage posed some problems of contextualisation, with even those who placed it correctly in the *Testament* not mentioning the Cemetery of the Innocents. Candidates were willing to address questions of irony and satire, but less the thoroughgoing treatment of death, the great leveller, including in relation to other parts of the text; a surprising number of candidates also referred to the *huitains* as '*laisses*'.

In Section B, question 5a was the most popular (19), followed by 6a (14), 4a (12), and 6b (12). For 4a, most answers considered the portrayal of the Saracens and cited Ganelon as a counter-example, but fewer considered the overarching context of the Crusades, or the significance of key features such as Roland vs. Marsilie, the horn scenes, Roland's death, the figure of Turpin, etc.; a few scripts also interpreted *tort* and *dreit* as 'evil' and 'good'. The few answers to 4b tended to focus on oral performance, but could have usefully considered other aspects of orality, such as (counterfeit?) oral formulaic composition, the psychodynamics of orality, and the effects of aural reception. 5a inspired a good number of

answers dealing with Tristan and Yseut's relationship and Mark's failings, but the best scripts gave more careful consideration to the further possible implications of 'experience of love' and 'perils of human weakness'; there were some erroneous claims that the expiry of the potion is unique to Béroul, and occasional comments which suggested that Bédier's composite version of the legend was being discussed. The few answers to 5b tended to identify some of the text-types echoed by Béroul, but had less to say about literary play and the manipulation of audience expectations. 6a provoked a significant number of answers considering life-based vs. art-based approaches to the *Testament*, but relatively few attempts to engage with the actual terms of the question (e.g. that Marot refers specifically to the bequests in the *Testament*). For 6b, there was some useful discussion of multiple voices, misuse of *auctoritates*, and instability of textual transmission, but less often did this emerge from a careful consideration of what 'the very nature of language itself' might imply.

French X

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii
33 (39.29%)	50 (59.52%)	1 (1.19%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
78 – 70	70 – 67	67 – 65	65 – 55

This paper was in general very well done, with candidates displaying broad and deep knowledge of the authors they had studied, as well as enthusiasm in tackling the questions and commentary passages set.

The best commentaries demonstrated excellent understanding of the passage and what was at stake in it, and were able to describe in focused and exemplified detail its themes and stylistic composition, looking at genre, syntax, lexis, patterning, versification (where applicable), voice/s, development, etc; they also located it within the wider text and *œuvre*. There were many good commentaries which displayed a good range of these features; the weaker ones might talk in more general or abstract or merely psychologising terms or might misunderstand certain aspects. There were commentary answers on all authors except for Rabelais.

The best essays answered the question directly and addressed all aspects of it, analysing their corpus in the light of the question. They might display wide and relevant knowledge of a selection of texts including but going beyond the prescribed texts, they might develop a particularly probing line of analysis, or a mixture of both. The less convincing essays might miss out some aspect of the question or not quite address it directly or not be very ambitious in terms of the material they looked at, either with respect to range or depth. There were 28 questions in all; 26 were answered (Pascal 9 and Racine 19 had no takers).

Molière was by far the most popular author. There were 7 essays on Rabelais, 22 on Montaigne, 5 on Pascal, 47 on Molière, 31 on Racine, 24 on Voltaire, 30 on Diderot.

French XI

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii
50 (21.51%)	60 (64.52%)	13 (13.98%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
80 – 69	69 – 65	65 – 62	62 – 57

The overall standard of answers on this paper was high. The best scripts offered sophisticated analysis of a wide range of texts and engaged very thoughtfully with the questions asked. The weaker answers tended to rely on prepared material and did not

answer the questions, difficulties which were particularly striking in the case of Sartre. The commentaries were in general carefully undertaken, although too often candidates tended to limit themselves to a narrowly formal analysis rather than explaining the passage in relation to their wider knowledge of an author. All questions except two were attempted, and most questions attracted a number of answers, although there was perhaps inevitably some clustering around the Duras questions on the unsayable and on repetition, and around the Sartre question on his embeddedness in his era (almost invariably answered with a summary of how his thought evolved in the course of his life). It was striking that some of the less apparently straightforward questions elicited some of the best answers, with the very best candidates showing a good understanding of the context in which the quotations originated and reflecting critically on them. It should be emphasized that the best answers were not necessarily the longest, and that clarity of thought was invariably more impressive than exhaustive coverage.

French Orals Report

The French orals ran smoothly. The comprehension text was rehearsed by all 7 native speakers, with all assessors in attendance, and the test was subsequently conducted without difficulties. All candidates who had extra time or had been authorised to use a word processor were all in the same room, and it all passed smoothly. The answers were generally well-done and showed that instructions had been clearly understood. The speaking part of the oral examination (discourse and conversation) also ran smoothly. There were 32 texts in all (8 for each of the four topics) and all worked well. We had seven examining pairs, and although one assessor was unable to work that week, others stepped in, and there was no disruption to the candidates.

GERMAN

German I

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii
25 (33.78%)	36 (48.65%)	13 (17.57%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
80 – 71	71 – 66	66 – 61	61 – 54

Essay

A wide range of the questions on offer was taken up by students, with mixed success (the most popular were e. Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers, and o. Die Machtverhältnisse zwischen den Geschlechtern; j, l, p and s attracted no answers). The best scripts managed to unfold a serious and interesting argument in vigorous style and fluent German. What was particularly noticeable, however, was how poorly many students master the art of essay writing. Confronted with a relatively general or abstract looking title, they were unable to make their arguments particular, to use well the material that they know from their own study and experience, and so to lead the reader persuasively towards a conclusion. Many tried to provide an entirely generalised philosophical answer, apparently unaware that the questions are only so formulated to enable candidates to write about whatever material they have to hand. Essays should not be conjured out of thin air. What is more, although essay structures in this exercise, in the foreign language and written under exam pressure, have to be simple, that need not mean that the arguments should be simple-minded. The other category of problems were of course the linguistic: it was disappointing that many candidates struggled with basic agreements, genders of common nouns, plurals, parts of common verbs and so on (the parts of 'schreiben' and the difference between 'konnte' and 'könnte', and the inflection of 'hoch', for example, created shockingly many problems). Candidates whose handwriting made it systematically difficult to decipher 'r', 's', 'n' and 'm' endings were not given the benefit of the doubt. Having said all that, nearly everyone was able to write a coherent and linguistically at least adequate piece of work – so there were few scripts in the 2iis. Two scripts were penalised for short-weight, i.e. Essays under 550 words, where the rubric asks for 700 or more.

Prose

The passage proved a good test: its often idiomatic English expression forced candidates to think of appropriate German constructions, and the best translations rose to that challenge with resourcefulness and a good sense of nuance. As often, candidates were let down by their lack of active vocabulary – either by not knowing the appropriate expressions, even for words in semantic fields that could have been expected to be familiar (e.g. 'die Kleider' or 'die Kleidung' for 'dresses', frequently rendered as 'Kleide' or another ungrammatical plural form, or mistranslated as 'Röcke', or 'Roben'; 'das Vermögen' or 'der Reichtum' for 'fortune'; 'die Theke', 'der Tresen' or 'die Bar' for 'bar' – some candidates had clearly heard the terms, but were not familiar with their orthography), or by not differentiating between related words: instead of 'bestechen' for 'to bribe', some candidates tried 'erstechen'; the difference between 'enthalten' and 'behalten' was not always understood, and many candidates were generally unsure how to use phrasal verbs. Particular difficulties arose over phrases like 'von etwas wissen' versus 'über etwas Bescheid wissen', or 'jemanden verfluchen', 'über etwas fluchen' for 'to curse', which is not the same as 'schwören', 'beschwören' (or indeed 'flüchten'). Common syntactic structures such as time expressions ('an diesem Morgen'; 'in der Nacht des 12. Mai') or quantity phrases ('fünfzig Pfund') threw some candidates, and a few showed almost total disregard for adjectival endings or strong verb forms. At the top, it was very pleasing to see candidates demonstrate their awareness of register ('Das Vermögen war weg. Punkt.') as well as an ability to navigate the complexities of modal constructions ('das konnte nur eines bedeuten').

German II (IIA and IIB)

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii
26 (35.14%)	38 (51.35%)	10 (13.51%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
79 – 71	71 – 67	67 – 62	62 – 52

German IIA

Of the two translation passages, this text by Ulrike Draesner was the more ‘literary’ one, describing an early morning scene in impressionistic terms, using expressive metaphors, but also a range of very precise botanical and biological vocabulary. While the syntax was mostly straightforward, the main difficulties arose from vocabulary. The passage exposed some serious deficiencies of vocabulary, as a result of which some candidates also missed the tone of the passage, and were unable to distinguish between literal, descriptive, and more metaphorical passages. Others confused the time of day (dawn or dusk?) and the locality (some had us clearly in a Mediterranean landscape). Amongst the common words that caused frequent problems: zwergenhaft (Zwerg, anyone?), Kugel, stürzen, schwirren, Decke (here, Bettdecke), Zapfen, Wiese, Grille (‘a barbecue’ to a majority), zart, Tautröpfchen, schäbig, Rauschen, Stamm/Stämme, Pappel (even though this was a key term in Remarque’s *Im Westen nichts Neues*), Kruste (confused by many with Krümel), Traumrest/e (bed bugs? woodlice?), Muster, Schale (confused by a majority with Schal), Folie, Blase, schmettern, Bogen, Anleger, tuten, Fähre. Some of these were more excusable than others. Very few people had much grasp of the flora and fauna, but most at least recognised that the trees and bushes must be trees and bushes, and the birds birds – although there were regular confusions of Kiefer and Käfer, and one might have hoped that more would know Taube and Amsel, two of the most common birds in German vocabulary. Only two people knew the expression ‘auf links (gestülpt)’, meaning to be turned inside out. Such vocabulary problems led many candidates into confusion about what was metaphor, what real detail. Others were brought down by shocking spelling, or by their inability to find the correct words in English: Does a pigeon fly in a low arch, or a low arc? When faced with a passage containing difficult vocabulary, it’s important that candidates try to think logically about the overall meaning, and produce a text that makes sense and is internally consistent. For this it’s essential to read the translation through on its own and think about whether it sounds like idiomatic English, for instance to avoid mismatches between nouns and verbs: does a fly flutter or buzz around? Do crickets croak, or chirp? If an unfamiliar word crops up more than once, it’s likely to mean the same thing in both contexts, and this repetition can help to clarify its meaning. In fact, many candidates used these techniques successfully to work around vocabulary gaps and produce good and fluent translations; it was thus easy to produce an appropriately stretched marks profile.

German IIB

This, the more ‘discursive’ of the two passages, a reflection in myth by Hans Blumenberg, was likewise quite challenging but in a different way. Again, too many candidates were lacking some key elements of vocabulary – Beständigkeit, ausgeprägt, Reiz, bildnerisch, vertreiben, Unwissenheit (confused by many with Ungewissheit), Vertrautheit (really very few candidates knew this word), Strahlungen, beschwören, Entsetzen, and so on. Given that this passage developed quite a tightly structured argument about the role and purpose of myth, these gaps produced some serious problems of comprehension, reflected in wild guesses and some rather strange and clueless versions. Very few candidates could distinguish satisfactorily between the various pairs of terms with which the passage works: Kern / marginal; Beständigkeit / Veränderbarkeit; Unwissenheit / Unvertrautheit; noch unerkannt / unbekannt. But there were also problems unravelling the syntax and identifying pronouns and the connections between clauses and sentences correctly. Many candidates got the whole direction of certain sentences wrong. When faced with gaps, especially in more

abstract vocabulary, it's understandable that candidates try to cling onto words they know, such as Vertrauen (trust), which was often used to guess the meaning of Vertrautheit (familiarity), but often these are 'false friends'. In fact, if a word *resembles* another word but isn't *identical* to it, it's safe to assume that it's got a quite a different meaning.

The two exercises called for rather different linguistic and translation skills and, as a result, several candidates got markedly different marks for each. Both exercises, however, underline the need for candidates to put much more consistent, long-term effort into vocabulary and grammar revision, which are the bread and butter of any Modern Languages degree.

German III

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii
6 (33.33%)	10 (55.56%)	2 (11.11%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
80 - 70	70 - 67	67 - 64	64 - 54

Candidates have a choice of two medieval and two early modern passages. Most candidates this year appeared to have attempted the passages for which they had prepared, in most cases with good results. Those who attempted the early modern passage unseen had often underestimated the syntactical difficulties which the texts posed. The first of the two medieval passages from the 'Winsbeckin', required candidates to navigate dialogue, which some found challenging – especially those who relied on a handful of nouns to guess the context. Here, as in the early modern passages, an understanding of syntactical structures was the key to success. Examiners gave credit for resourcefulness, and at the top end, there were some very pleasing examples of accurate, but also fluent translations which managed to hit the right tone.

German IV

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii
7 (38.89%)	9 (50%)	1 (5.56%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
80 – 74	74 – 69	69 – 63	63 - 40

Two thirds of candidates opted for the medieval commentary; in the essay section, a pleasing range of questions (12 of 18) were answered. At the lower end, a tendency to write prepared essays which only loosely relate to the question resulted in lower second class marks. Some candidates were pulled down by the linguistic gaps evident in the commentary section, where a small number of translations read as if candidates were barely familiar with the set texts. On the other hand, many essays demonstrated a good knowledge of requisite technical terms and techniques, as well as suitable examples. The best answers were those which closely engaged with the questions, often challenging implicit assumptions, and supported their argument with original examples.

German V(i)

Class Profile: I: 2 (66.66%); II.i: 1 (33.33%)

Candidates tackled a pleasing range of texts and questions and demonstrated their familiarity with OHG. There were three candidates, two of whom received first-class marks.

German V(ii)

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii
2 (16.67%)	8 (66.67%)	2 (16.67%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
73 – 69	68 – 67	64 – 63	62 – 659

13 candidates (across ML and PPL) sat this paper, the majority of whom chose questions on Morphology (13/39), Language Acquisition (9/39), and *Kiezdeutsch* (8/39). Answers for these questions were generally competent, showing on the whole pleasing knowledge and understanding of linguistic phenomena and their description. Where candidates did not attain marks of upper second-class standard or above, this was due to the following factors:

- (i) candidates disregarded the demands of the question, and recycled material from tutorial essays that was only tangentially linked to the context of the question;
- (ii) candidates wrote essays whose scope did not extend beyond pre-theoretical, non-technical description, displaying both a lack of technical vocabulary and critical engagement;
- (iii) candidates were hampered in their analysis of German language data by limited knowledge of the German language itself.

Candidates who were awarded a first-class mark not only showed a solid and detailed knowledge of linguistic concepts and description, but also convinced by having very good essay organisation and argument structure.

German VI

Class profile

I	II.i
8 (80%)	2 (20%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
79 – 76	76 – 72	71 – 70	68 – 65

The overall standard of the paper was high: candidates had studied an impressive range of topics, from early medieval literature to late medieval lyric and religious writing, and from OHG to prose novels at the transition between MHG and ENHG. Questions on the concept of 'minne', encounters with a different world, and gender stereotypes in the 'maeren' proved particularly popular. Weaker candidates offered competent surveys of received ideas, but at the top, many essays showed originality of argument as well as nuanced close reading.

German VII

Class profile

I	II.i
1 (11.11%)	8 (88.89%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
75 – 68	67 – 66	65 – 65	65 – 63

Candidates had a choice of twenty-two questions, three of which had alternative options. Answers were spread across the period, with Luther, Hans Sachs and Grimmshausen being particular popular options. Few candidates chose to answer on poetry. At the lower end of the mark range, candidates demonstrated good understanding of the material, but sometimes failed to maintain a clear focus on the question. At the top end, there was

sophisticated argument and demonstration of good knowledge of both the texts and their contexts.

German VIII

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii
21 (30.43%)	36 (52.17%)	12 (17.39%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
80 – 71	70 – 66	66 – 61	61 - 52

The scripts manifested a great variety and suggested that this paper is still a great resource for the course: the range of authors and works discussed was impressive, and the approaches were likewise varied. There were of course some perennial favourites – Lessing; Tieck and Hoffmann; Büchner, Schnitzler, Wolf – but it was good too to see answers on Louise von François, Christian Dietrich Grabbe, Ludwig Renn, Franz Hessel, Werner Herzog, Ingo Schulze, Antje Rávic Strubel ... to name but a typically disparate handful. A repeated weakness, however, was the inability of candidates to choose the best question to match their material: we had some very poor fits, where better questions were obviously available. Or they simply read the questions in an uncareful, even slapdash, manner. At their worst, candidates used pre-prepared material (in some cases it felt like whole essays) with scant regard for the actual question. Students need to be able to deploy their knowledge flexibly and not be over-reliant on prefabricated answers (or remembered, and misremembered, quotations). There were also some rather thin essays: on one Lessing play, one work by Büchner, two *Novellen* (a bit of range and variety here would be nice: it's not just *Granit*, *Die Judenbuche* and *Der Schimmelreiter*), one Schlink novel. The worst of these were just descriptive accounts. At the other end of the scale, we had candidates who could tackle challenging texts, or range confidently over a wide variety of material, and nonetheless home in to make pertinent and illuminating remarks, and who could construct authoritative and interesting arguments. Only a very few candidates used the opportunity of the general questions in Section A to write answers that ranged up and down the period. Although most were able to develop a clear essay structure, it was striking how few candidates chose to start from their texts and work outwards, rather than starting from a general introduction and progressing in to examples. Sometimes the introduction was used well to formulate a problem, which the rest of the answer addressed, but often we had a brief, often inevitably naïve sounding, introduction to Romanticism or modernity, or whatever, followed by a discussion of texts that were taken to typify some of the features mentioned in the introduction (although often the relationship was very loose). It might sometimes have been more satisfying had the essays started with an observation of and response to salient features of a text or two (in other words, what the students can know for themselves, rather than some second-hand opinions), then the analysis, then the broadening out to ask how all this might relate to wider cultural historical issues. Cultural history is difficult, but there were too few candidates who seemed aware, talking, for example, about the *Novelle*, how much had changed between the 1840s and 1888, or between the 1780s and 1800s, or the 1890s and 1920s.

Coming back to the paper itself: 37 of the available questions were taken up by candidates, and on the whole, it was the more specific ones (above all, that specified a genre) that were avoided (qus 6, 7, 17, 19, 26, 27, 28, 31, 34, 37, 40, 46 and 50 attracted no answers). But the very open or general 'discuss'-type questions, of which there were probably too many on this paper, often did not inspire very interesting responses. This is an extremely difficult paper to set, and perhaps we should re-visit how we set it or how we frame the conventions and rubrics.

German IX

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii
7 (29.17%)	14 (58.33%)	3 (12.50%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
80 – 72	70 – 66	66 – 63	63 – 56

All questions on the paper were attempted, though there were clear favourites for translation (an even split between the *Nibelungenlied* and the Easter plays) and the commentary (Morungen). Regrettably, the translation exercise revealed that some candidates were struggling to make sense of the passage, and in a few cases, this was obvious in the commentaries as well, where interpretations were hampered by a lack of syntactical understanding (who created whom in the opening line of the Easter play) or knowledge about the context (attributing the speech by Gurnemanz to Sigune). The best answers were truly impressive: using theoretical frame-works such as Said's concept of orientalism, Auerbach on *figura*, or speech act theory in order to offer critical, often original assessments of the prescribed texts and their cultural context.

German X

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii
19 (35.55%)	30 (54.55%)	6 (10.91%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
81 – 73	72 – 66	66 – 64	64 – 58

This paper produced many very good scripts, with candidates demonstrating a secure and often impressive knowledge of the authors they had studied. Where essays were given a lower mark, this was often because candidates did not really answer the question, and instead wrote an obviously pre-conceived essay on different topic. Other essays were let down by a very narrow textual basis. It's okay to write on one novel or one play (though a comparison of several texts often yielded better, more ambitious answers), but to write on a single short story is not usually sufficient to achieve a good mark. Indeed, some candidates seemed to have read disappointingly little. There were many answers on Hoffmann, but only one candidate wrote about *Die Elixiere des Teufels*, only one about *Kater Murr*. Others seemed only to have read a narrow range of his short fiction.

Essays contained many quotations, sometimes long. It is of course essential to ground one's argument in precise reference to the text, but is it a good use of one's time to memorize passages of twenty or thirty words? One candidate illustrated Sebald's 'Verschachtelung' by quoting a 76-word sentence! If one has memorized long or longish passages, of course one wants to work them in, but one is then in danger of presenting an obviously prefabricated essay, whereas the educational point of essay questions is that one should use one's knowledge flexibly in response to an unexpected question.

Some essays were marred by misquotations. The person who quoted Rilke as 'ein kaum klein begonnenes Profil' should have realized that this version doesn't scan and therefore can't be right. Other misquotations suggested a shaky grasp of grammar, e.g. 'es gibt ein Weg aber keinen Ziel' (which is nonsense anyway: Kafka wrote 'Es gibt ein Ziel, aber keinen Weg'). Goethe's definition of the Novelle was twice misquoted as 'sich unerhörte Begebenheit'; this is nonsense because 'ereignete' has been omitted.

The commentary exercise involved the usual challenge of paying close attention to the passage, its imagery, grammar and syntax, while relating it to the text as a whole. The Examiners felt that candidates were less well prepared for this part of the examination. The best scripts succeeded in bringing out the nuances and development of a passage, rather

than using it as a springboard for a general (pre-conceived) essay on the set text. While most candidates were able to demonstrate a solid understanding of the passage within its context, a few struggled even with basic comprehension. The Kafka passage proved particularly challenging for several candidates, who did not pay close enough attention to the ambiguous narrative perspective and element of self-deception in K.'s response, and therefore misread the power dynamics between K. and the Direktor-Stellvertreter. As a general rule, students should make sure they spell out allusions in the commentary passage; for instance, only one candidate explained that 'der Verbrannte' in the Brecht passage is Giordano Bruno, although the play names him.

The take-up for individual authors was as follows: Luther 1, Goethe dram. 3, Schiller 0, Hölderlin 3, Hoffmann 7, Kleist 4, Heine 6, Rilke 4, Mann 16, Kafka 22, Brecht 10, Grass 3, Wolf 10, Sebald 5, Fassbinder 1, Jelinek 13.

German XIA

Candidates chose from five commentary passages in section A and from twelve questions in section B. The preference was for the earlier material, both in the commentaries on Luther and the questions on Sachs, although both candidates also answered on a seventeenth-century text.

German XIB

There was only 1 candidate for this Paper.

German Orals

The Orals were conducted in the normal way and presented no problems. Both externals attended for part of the week and witnessed all four pairs of Examiners/Assessors in action. Most candidates achieved marks in broadly the same range for each of the three exercises, but the profile for the Comprehension (which is a significantly different exercise and requires of course no active spoken German) was both more heavily weighted at the top (more first-class marks) and with a longer tail at the bottom (marks down to the 40s). The Markers held a brief meeting in advance of marking the scripts, to discuss what they were looking for and to ensure parity. It was thought that, in future years, it would be helpful if the Setter(s) could indicate more precisely how and for what they expect marks to be awarded. It was noted that discussions are underway about the format and usefulness of the Comprehension exercise. For the other exercises, again there was brief discussion, before the examination, to ensure parity between the pairs of Examiners and Assessors. It was agreed that a mark-sheet with criteria (including comprehension) would be useful in future years. This year's Examiners were generally impressed by the standard of pronunciation (down possibly to a more diagnostic and structured approach on the part of the LektorInnen). Many candidates were also able to present a well-structured and intellectually engaged Discourse.

There were 22 Distinctions in all (30%).

Extended Essays and Bridge Essays

German

There were some interesting and refreshingly independent pieces of work, some of them clearly far removed from the general run of tutorial work. Students deserve credit for taking on an Extended Essay at all, and these are often very independent projects, largely undertaken during the year abroad and with limited input from a supervisor. It was thought a coversheet could be helpful in making the expectations explicit to markers (who often have only one or two of these to mark) and that the Examiners must keep an overview and apply the appropriate standard.

There were 11 Extended Essays on German subjects. In half a dozen cases across the School as a whole the mark for this Essay (substituting for the lowest mark on a content paper) brought the candidate up a class. In addition there were three German Bridge Essays in EMEL (a full compulsory paper).

ITALIAN

Italian I

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii
22 (52.38%)	18 (42.86%)	2 (4.76%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
90 – 75	75 – 70	70 – 65	65 – 54

There were 42 scripts, of which 22 were awarded a First (including 5 scripts with a mark between 80-90); 18 scripts were in the 2:1 category; and two scripts were in 2:2. The choice of questions was evenly spread across the ten titles, covering the topics studied over the year. Examiners were impressed by the very high level of a large number of scripts, with only two falling in the 2:2 category and the fourth quartile ranging 58-64), some being truly sophisticated and well written. Scripts in the higher range displayed grammatical accuracy, elegance of style, an appropriate use of syntactical structures and vocabulary, with some or very few errors, or native or near-native competence in the higher range. From a content point of view, candidates dealt with the questions in a thoughtful, sophisticated and original way. Scripts in the 2:1 range were either lacking in grammatical accuracy or, very occasionally to be more superficial in content or presenting material that was not entirely relevant to the title. Some in the lower range were not persuasive or lacked coherent.

Italian II (IIA and IIB)

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii	III
12 (28.57%)	23 (54.76%)	6 (14.29%)	1 (2.38%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
79 – 71	70 – 66	66 – 63	63 – 48

Italian IIA

42 candidates took this paper. There were no fails, and no third-class marks. The top first mark was a 79, the lowest a 53.

The passage adequately tested the candidate's comprehension, as well as their ability to translate into idiomatic English. There were some very good efforts in this respect, but also a surprising number of basic comprehension mistakes in the area of idiomatic expressions. On the whole, a good result.

Italian IIB

42 candidates took this paper. There was one mark of 39 for a dismal performance and an 84 for a stellar translation. The passage was challenging on grammar and syntax, but not so much on vocabulary; a disappointingly high number of basic mistakes (use of articles, pronouns, agreements).

Italian IV

The paper was taken by 4 candidates this year. The results were satisfactory: only one candidate was given a I, two candidates a higher II.i, and one candidate an upper II.ii.

Regarding the choice of questions, one candidate chose the text commentary offered in section A (which is no longer obligatory). Out of 17 questions in sections B and C, 9 were left untouched. One question in section B was chosen by three candidates (n. 7 on grammaticalization). Questions 13 (on Bembo) and 15 (on Manzoni) were chosen each by two candidates. Questions 2 (on Tuscan spirantization), 3 (on voiceless intervocalic

consonants), 5b (on noun morphology) and 17 (on language contact) were chosen by one candidate. This is summarised in the table below.

Question n.	Topic	N. of answers
1a	Text commentary	1
2	Tuscan spirantization	1
3	Development of Latin voiceless intervocalic consonants in Italian	1
5b	Survival of Latin neuter morphology in Italian	1
7	Grammaticalization	3
13	Bembo	2
15	Impact of Manzoni and Manzonianism	2
17	Role of language contact in the development of Italian	1

Overall, most answers showed competence and a good understanding of questions and relevant material but, unfortunately, very few answers showed a truly excellent range of relevant knowledge, some sophistication of argument and occasional originality.

Italian V

Class profile

I	II.i
1 (20%)	4 (80%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
72 – 68	67 – 67	65 – 65	64 – 64

The paper this year was taken by 5 candidates. One candidate was awarded a I, and the other four a 2i.

As usual, questions in Section A proved more popular than those in Section B, but not by much: out the total 15 answers, 9 were from the former and 6 from the latter.

All candidates chose Question 1, a transcription in IPA and commentary. The transcriptions were of a very good standard, accurately representing the various phonological phenomena, while there was quite a degree of variation in the commentaries. The highest marks were awarded to those commentaries that offered detailed and comparative notes. The remaining answers were spread across the following questions:

Q2: 1; Q4: 1; Q5: 1; Q6: 1; Q10: 3; Q12: 1; Q15: 2

The overall standard was good: most of the answers showed a good understanding of the topics and presented the material in a well-organised and structured manner, engaged directly with the questions, thoroughly discussing examples used, offered evidence in support of their claims and were able to make meaningful and relevant links between different areas of knowledge. In only a few cases, did candidates reproduce in a rather pedestrian or inaccurate way (or both) the material presented during the lectures. The highest marks were awarded to those answers that demonstrated an ability to apply the notions learnt to the data in the form of linguistic commentaries or comparative discussions.

Italian VI

Class profile

I	II.i
5 (55.56%)	4 (44.44%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
71 – 71	71 – 70	68 – 68	65 – 65

Nine candidates sat the exam. Five first class marks, two high II.1, and two mid II.1 were awarded. From the quality of the answers, it is clear that the students were very well prepared for the paper. Overall, the students chose a good spread of questions, with a focus on *stilnovo*, the *Vita Nova*, Petrarch, and Boccaccio. The students answered in a very competent manner. All students were able to engage very well with the texts, and mostly were able to quote relevant texts in Italian and fairly accurately. The students who reached the highest marks were those who stayed close to the terms of the question and were able to produce focused argument. Overall: an excellent year for paper VI.

Italian VII

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii
3 (33.33%)	4 (44.44%)	2 (22.22%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
72 – 70	66 – 65	65 – 63	59 – 56

Only 9 students sat this paper, but the quality of answers was on the whole very high, with one or two first class marks, and most of the others with marks in the upper second category. Most candidates concentrated on the major authors (Ariosto, Castiglione, Machiavelli), but it was encouraging to see that several students wanted to answer on less predictable texts such as those by Cellini and Michelangelo.

Italian VIII

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii
11 (45.83%)	12 (50%)	1 (4.17%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
77 – 73	72 – 69	69 – 65	64 – 57

Candidates did particularly well this year, despite what the examiners thought was a fairly original and challenging exam paper: 45% of them received a First class mark, albeit with no marks above 77. All authors in Sections A and B with the exception of Goldoni, D'Annunzio, Pascoli and Eco were chosen, with a clear preference for Verga in Section A, and for Pirandello in Section 2. Four students answered on Section C (Cinema). In Section D (Thematic and comparative topics), by far the most popular questions being addressed were respectively the one on Literature and history, and the thematic one asking to discuss the concept of conflict in TWO or more work of modern Italian literature.

The quality was generally very good, with only one candidate receiving a II.2 mark, and no III. One particular question seemed particularly problematic to many of the students who tackled it. This was the one on Leopardi based on a quotation from Prete. The expression “geografia delle passioni” was often wrongly interpreted literally thus misdirecting the candidates towards an answer based on an analysis of the treatment of space in Leopardi's poetry.

The examiners also noticed an anomaly in Section D on Thematic and Comparative Topics. Questions 25 and 26, on Thematic Topics, asked for a discussion of the named themes through reference to works of modern Italian literature. In past years, these questions were open to both works of literature and film. It was an oversight on the part of the exam setter which the examiners think had no influence on the overall running of the paper. However, it should be avoided in future years.

Total candidates: 24

Italian IX

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii
12 (31.58%)	22 (57.89%)	4 (10.53%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
75 – 70	70 – 68	68 – 65	64 – 52

38 students sat the exams. There were 12 first class marks, 4 II.2s, and the rest of the cohort sat comfortably in the II.1 area, with some remarkable 68s and 69s. Overall the students appeared very well prepared for the Dante exam and enthusiastic about the subject matter. Like last year, students choose to answer on a broad variety of topics, including questions on the whole of *Commedia* and even on *Paradiso*, which the examiners found extremely positive. The majority of students chose to write a commentary on the passages set from *Inferno* or *Purgatorio*, with a good balance between the two; two students answered on a passage from the *Paradiso*. The highest marks were awarded to candidates who showed detailed knowledge of Dante's texts and a sophisticated understanding of the concepts discussed. Candidates lost marks where they included material extraneous to the question or diverged too much from the topic in hand. Three candidates misidentified the commentary passage from *Inferno*. Overall, the examiners are very pleased with the outcome of the exams and the nuanced ways in which the students were able to engage with Dante.

Italian X

Class Profile: I: 1 (25%), II.i: 2 (75%)

Just three students took this paper, one obtaining a first-class mark, the other two with marks close to the II.1/First class border. All students answered a commentary and essay on Petrarch, whereas for the other author two chose Boccaccio and one Machiavelli. Overall the paper elicited high-quality responses.

Italian XI

Class Profile: II.i: 2 (100%)

LINGUISTICS

Paper XIII (Linguistics Paper A) General Linguistics (25 MLL & 11 PPL)

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii	III
3 (12.50%)	17 (70.83%)	3 (12.50%)	1 (4.17%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
72 – 68	67 – 66	65 – 61	60 - 49

(Thirty-six candidates: Twenty-four MLL, Eleven PPL)

Phonetics and Phonology (1-4)

Five candidates answered question 1: “What are consonants, and how do they relate to vowels?” Most answers presented the standard approach to the classification of consonants used in the IPA, which is quite distinct from the classification of vowels, and emphasises their differences. The best answers appreciate that other, more unified approaches to their classification in terms of place of constriction and degree of aperture are conceivable and have been attempted. Questions 2-4 were answered by five or fewer candidates.

Syntax (5-7) and Theory of Language & Language Universals (14-16)

Answers were generally competent, showing on the whole pleasing knowledge and understanding of linguistic phenomena and their description. Candidates are advised to:

- manage their time appropriately, so as to be able to write three answers of equal length;
- give evidence of intellectual progress since Prelims;
- make use of the theoretical apparatus of syntactic description (rather than providing impressionistic and imprecise accounts).

Semantics/Pragmatics (8–10)

Four candidates attempted question 8: the best answers clearly explained the queried term and its consequences for semantic theory. The lowest answer did not clearly define the term, was slightly superficial, and ended abruptly. Ten candidates attempted question 9: the best answers were thoughtful and debated the question thoroughly, with good examples. The lowest answers mistook *conventional implicature* for *conversational implicature*. The answers in the mid-range featured various errors of terminology or analysis. Three candidates attempted question 10.

Morphology (11-13)

Twelve candidates chose to answer question 11 on the notion of the ‘morpheme’. Only one candidate answered question 12 on ‘syncretism’, and two candidates answered question 13 on inflection vs derivation. With very few exceptions, answers were of a high quality, showing a good understanding of the question, relevant material, and linguistic data.

Language Change and Historical Linguistics (17-19)

Question 18 attracted seven answers, with a wide spread of marks: candidates who answered the question and provided evidence to justify their answer were rewarded; at the lower end there was a lack of both evidence and relevance. There were four answers to question 17 and three to question 19.

Psycholinguistics (20-23)

The question that attracted six answers, question 20, required the candidate to clearly identify at least one specific example of an argument from poverty of the stimulus and discuss it in relation to the theory of universal grammar and statistical learning. Questions 21 and 22, covering cognitive neuroscience of language and the role of modularity respectively, attracted only one attempt each. Question 23 received five responses. The strongest answers demonstrated a clear understanding of search-based vs. content-based memory retrieval and detailed specific studies that spoke directly to their competing predictions.

Sociolinguistics (24-25)

The best answer to question 24 engaged with the quotation in an intelligent way, discussing the different aspects in detail, with reference to theory and mentioning parallel cases. Most were less successful, often being short on theoretical and empirical substance. The examiners were rather shocked by the number of basic errors of general knowledge about the linguistic/political situation in China, which figures in the sociolinguistics literature. Question 25 also had a range of answers, one or two well-argued and well informed. However, many were brief and superficial and most candidates failed to mention the relevance of the pattern shown in the figure to change (a basic aspect of the Labovian model).

PORTUGUESE

Portuguese I

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii
8 (57.14%)	5 (35.71%)	1 (7.14%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
76 – 72	71 – 70	70 – 68	66 – 52

An impressive number of First Class marks and high 2.i category. Candidates were able to show maturity and sophistication of thought as well as eloquence and articulation in their use of Portuguese language. The essays engaged with the topics appropriately and managed to answer the questions with verve. One script demonstrated sophistication of syntax and vocabulary, but was penalised for not following the brief of devising a structured argumentative text. In the translations, candidates were able to find equivalences for the original English text in terms of tone, syntax, and vocabulary – vocabulary having been the most common source of mistakes. Candidate marks for Essay and Translation were comparable for most scripts, which suggests the two parts of the paper offer a fair reflection of students' ability in Portuguese.

Portuguese II (IIA and IIB)

Class profile

I	II.i
3 (21.43%)	11 (78.57%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
70 – 68	68 – 67	66 – 65	64 – 60

The passages chosen for translation were an extract from a short story by Altino do Tojal about a lonely man on Christmas Eve (IIA) and the opening paragraphs of an academic article by Nádia Battella Gotlib on letter writing as a literary genre (IIB). Each had their challenges and one or two tricky parts which offered a chance to show translation skills: IIA had an ironic tone and some idiomatic expressions that could not be translated literally, the multiple clauses of the text in IIB necessitated some judicious cutting and pasting.

The translations were all of a good 2:1 standard, but most bunched around 65/67; once averages had been calculated across both papers there three first class marks. Students' marks were largely consistent between the papers, some doing better on IIA and others on IIB.

IIA: Most candidates captured the cynical tone of the passage. The opening metaphor 'Eu sentia-me vagamente cão' meaning 'I was feeling a bit down in the dumps' was misinterpreted by some who tried to keep the cão/dog link, which didn't work: 'I was feeling slightly canine'. At least one candidate knew the meanings of 'capota' (cape with a hood) and 'reles' (scruffy/lousy). Most attempts at rendering the joky register of the conversation at the end were successful.

IIB: The main problem here was structure and navigating the many clauses. In the least successful translations this resulted in literal and therefore nonsensical prose. The objective academic tone was rendered well. Only one candidate realised that the 'paquete' referred to as the only means of carrying mail to some places in the nineteenth century was a boat.

Portuguese IV

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii
2 (40%)	2 (40%)	1 (20%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
72 – 70	69 – 69	66 – 66	57 – 57

All five candidates attempted the phonetic transcription exercise, the best answers combining accurate transcription with well organised commentaries clearly linked to the passage transcribed. The assimilation of word-final sibilants was the element least well handled.

Essay questions tended to converge on the familiar topics of forms of address and social variation in Portuguese, with not all candidates adjusting their material to the precise focus of the questions. Overall the answers presented a good range of material, with few serious misunderstandings and some good signs of engagement with linguistic issues.

Portuguese VII

Class profile

I	II.i
2 (28.57%)	5 (71.43%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
71 – 70	69 – 67	66 – 66	63 – 63

All the questions on the paper were attempted this year, which was pleasing to see, and candidates made good use of the general questions at the start of the paper. The very best answers were impressive for their close engagement with the question set and for the range and detail of the examples provided. These excellent answers did not shy away from ambiguities and could articulate the knottiness of the issues they tackled with clarity and by deploying precise examples from the texts being discussed.

Portuguese VIII

Class profile

I	II.i
5 (71.43%)	2 (28.57%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
75 – 72	71 – 71	70 – 68	66 – 66

Answers were fairly even spread between Brazilian texts and those originating from Portugal. Most candidates were able to display impressive breadth and depth to produce detailed, sharply argued answers. Candidates made good use of the general questions at the start of the paper. A wide range of questions were tackled which means that, in all, at least ten different authors were selected. It was pleasing to see that three scripts chose to concentrate on women writers, and did so to a very standard.

Portuguese X

This was an exceptional year for this paper, with all three candidates producing first-class scripts. The commentaries (2 on Vicente and 1 on Camões) could have all taken their analyses further, but covered the majority of the key points and offered convincing overarching readings of the passages set. No two candidates answered the same questions in sections B, C, and D, so a range of texts and issues were covered. Indeed, it was clear that the candidates had thought carefully about their selections, avoiding pre-rehearsed arguments and ideas. Their essays were incisive and engaged very directly with the

question set, offering nuanced arguments that allowed for the ways in which different texts might provide different perspectives on the issues addressed.

Portuguese XI

Class profile

I	II.i
2 (40%)	3(60%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
71 – 71	68 – 68	66 – 66	65 - 65

There were some excellent essays and highly proficient commentaries in this group. In the best essays, there was close attention to detail, perceptive analysis of the texts and confident, original readings. At the weaker end, answers were more descriptive, or lacked a coherent structure and commentaries failed to engage sufficiently with language.

Almost all the candidates showed proficient knowledge of the authors they had specialised in, the set texts studied and secondary criticism. Three commentaries were written on Lispector and the candidates tended to choose the same two essay questions on each author.

RUSSIAN

Russian I

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii	III
14 (51.85%)	9 (33.33%)	1 (3.70%)	3 (11.11%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
85 – 76	75 – 70	67 – 66	64 - 42

Many candidates coped very well with the paper. Some translations were not only grammatically and lexically accurate. They showed a very good sense of idiomatic and natural Russian and a good or developed sense of nuance. The corresponding performance on the essays was often of equally high quality. In some instance the style, language and content of the essay equalled native or near-native competence. The topic on migration proved to be the most popular choice. At the lower end of the marks scale, the translations and essays were characterised by a serious lack of grammatical awareness and limited knowledge of vocabulary. Some locutions also proved challenging for the better candidates, such as 'connective tissue', 'hitched us to the world', 'mothballs'.

Russian II (IIA and IIB)

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii
4 (14.81%)	16 (59.26%)	7 (25.93%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
72 – 67	67 – 64	64 – 59	58 - 54

Performance in this paper was generally good or respectable, but, overall, weaker than in Russian I. Only few candidates offered consistently convincing solutions to the various verbs expressing motion and position in space in the passage of Russian IIB. A number of other lexical items also caused recurrent problems, for example, in Russian IIA, 'в беспамятстве', 'леденит', 'ветхий', 'похлопотало', 'ватой'. Some complex constructions proved challenging, notably participles, gerunds and sequences of subordinate clauses. The syntax of colloquial style in direct speech in Russian IIA also produced some inappropriate paraphrase. Candidates should pay particular attention to expression in English. The English rendering of the Russian original should not only offer correct translations in terms of structures and vocabulary. It should also show stylistic awareness, and it should generally sound natural and idiomatic.

Russian III

Class profile: II.i: 1 (50%) II.ii: 1 (50%)

There were two candidates. Candidates taking this paper should bear in mind that a knowledge of modern Russian is not sufficient to deal adequately with the textual material. They need to familiarize themselves with the grammatical forms and syntax of pre-modern Russian and of Church Slavonic.

Russian IV

Class profile: II.ii: 1 (50%) III: 1 (50%)

There were two candidates. The same comment applies as for Russian III, particular in respect of the translation and commentary questions.

Russian V(i)

Class profile: II.i: 1 (50%) III: 1 (50%)

There were two candidates. Again, the same comment applies as for Russian III, particular in respect of the translation and commentary questions.

Russian V(ii)

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii
1 (11.11%)	7 (77.78%)	1 (11.11%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
71 – 67	66 – 66	65 – 61	60 – 57

All questions except 1 and 12 attracted answers, the most popular being questions 4 and 8. The overall standard was good, apart from occasional irrelevance or vagueness and a curious tendency among candidates who attempted question 6 to assume that word formation must entail semantic differentiation. The phonetic transcriptions all demonstrated awareness of possible variation in formal and informal speech; as usual, the main mistakes were in stress assignment and in failures to distinguish between the spelling and the pronunciation of consonants in clusters and at the end of words.

Russian VII

Class profile: I: 1 (33.3%) II.i: 1 (33.3%) II.ii: 1 (33.3%)

The better candidates showed a very good grasp of the themes and writings of the period. Answers were historically informed and thoughtful and a wide set of questions were done. One answer to question 9 on Russianness missed an opportunity to talk about the idea of nation as a problem rather than evident fact, and underestimated the difference between Russia and Rus'.

Russian VIII

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii	III
10 (38.46%)	12 (46.15%)	3 (11.54%)	1 (3.85%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
75 – 71	70 – 67	66 – 62	62 – 44

The candidates for this paper had generally prepared themselves thoroughly and had a good acquaintance with the historical background (e.g. the Emancipation of the Serfs) as well as a satisfactory command of the individual authors. For the most part, adaptation of material to particular questions was competent and persuasive. A small number of answers, however, attempted to adjust pre-prepared material without engaging sufficiently with the precise terms of the question, sometimes even at the cost of major errors in the chronological placing of an author's work (e.g. the use of C19 material for a question that explicitly required the candidate to address texts produced in the C20). Others mainly consisted of grandiose generalisation without sufficient substantiation. In these cases, marks were lower, sometimes significantly so.

Russian IX

Class profile: I: 2 (66.6%) III: 1 (33.3%)

Commentaries (on passage 1a) were done to a fine standard; essay questions were well-informed, combining a good grasp of the period and knowledge of the texts. The better candidates performed with relish.

Russian X

Class profile

I	II.i
3 (50%)	3 (50%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
73 – 72	70 – 70	67 – 66	63 – 63

The answers to this paper were all solid, and the best engaging and lively also. All the candidates were able to place the passages satisfactorily in terms of authors' overall oeuvre, and in some cases made thought-provoking comparisons, though a fault in some commentaries was a tendency simply to make inventories of formal features without engaging with these, or to throw in biographical information that was of at best peripheral relevance. Still, the general standard was satisfactory to very good both here and in the essays.

Russian XI

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii
1 (9.09%)	7 (63.64%)	3 (27.27%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
70 – 69	69 – 68	64 – 59	58 – 57

Most of the commentaries and essays submitted for this paper ranged from good to very good, with candidates showing solid knowledge of the texts and, in the cases of the best performances, historical background and critical literature. While a few answers were over-periphrastic, or, on the other hand, spent too much time simply cataloguing rhetorical features without an adequate account of their function, some were precise and to the point. The best commentaries, for instance, combined effective engagement with the assigned passage with a command of the overall context and of critical vocabulary. Close reading could sometimes have been pushed further – to note, for instance, the black humour in *sebe na ume* (Chekhov's *Ward no. 6*, describing a mental patient) or the repeated references to drunkenness in Dostoevsky. But candidates seem to have found the paper challenging in the right kind of way and in most cases to have enjoyed writing their answers. The weaker marks were explained by poor structuring and verbose, repetitive discussion; an indication that more time should have been spent in planning of the argument and selection of material before writing began.

SPANISH

Oral Examination and Listening Comprehension

The format was unchanged from previous years. Candidates prepared a brief presentation based on one topic chosen from a selection of three. The titles ranged from literature, philosophy, politics or current affairs, to more trivial matters (pets, social media). No preference was given for one choice or another from the candidates, provided that the register and intellectual level were appropriate for the exercise. Candidates were then asked questions, either specific to the presentation or on more general topics, for example in relation to their studies. Each pair of examiners consisted of a male and a female examiner and a native and a non-native speaker of Spanish. There was also linguistic diversity (Peninsular and Latin American Spanish).

The examiners (internal and external) were impressed with the level of spoken Spanish on display, with the very best speakers able to express complex ideas in fluent and very authentic Spanish. Future candidates are urged to consider the register of their speech, as slangy or highly informal speech is not to be encouraged, although the examiners endeavoured to conduct proceedings in a relaxed matter (e.g. not insisting on the formal *usted* form of address). The best candidates took advantage of the opportunity to jot down a few key points; candidates who made excessive use of notes or read things out were penalised accordingly. These candidates also often performed less well in the conversation part of the exercise, as they were unable to rely on their prepared material.

The listening comprehension was based on a text about an art exhibition. There were some excellent performances, with candidates achieving marks as high as 19/20. Weaker performances were marred by the inability to distinguish relatively common words (one, for example, heard 'humor' as 'amor'); misconstruing questions; or using information appropriate to one question to answer another. As irrelevant material is disregarded by the markers, many candidates took this as a cue to write down as much as they possibly could in answer to each question. Yet the most successful scripts, scoring the very highest marks, were generally succinct and answered the question as set, paying attention to the marks available for it.

Spanish I

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii
16 (26.67%)	42 (70%)	2 (3.33%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
81 – 71	70 – 65	65 – 64	64 – 58

The first part of the paper consisted of a prose translation into modern Spanish of an extract from Yann Martel's novel, *Life of Pi*. Whilst recent cohorts had had to demonstrate familiarity with different types of fish and fowl, this year the focus was on a detailed description of a human character. One set of challenges related to literary descriptions of different parts of the human body. The strongest candidates navigated them successfully. For instance, 'the most impressive jowls I have ever seen' elicited a range of acceptable translations that worked well in the passage, involving words like 'mejillas,' 'cachetes,' 'papada' or 'mandíbula,' as well as one of the best solutions, 'carrillos.' Other expressions in the text turned out to be more challenging, however, with 'sprigs of black hair' leading to difficult-to-imagine renditions such as 'ramos,' 'ramilletes' or 'ramitas,' rather than 'mata de pelo negro,' which was one of the better options. Many candidates did not know how to translate 'atheist,' creating non-existent words such as 'ateísta,' 'ateísto,' 'ateano' and 'ateador,' in place of 'ateo.' Future candidates should revise adjectives of affiliation, as well as the names of

professions, which tend to follow certain morphological patterns.

Some candidates struggled to understand the original English. The phrase '[he] was always hoping Tamil Nadu would stop electing movie stars and go the way of Kerala' proved particularly difficult. Many candidates failed to recognise that Tamil Nadu and Kerala were two Indian states, rather than individuals. It would have helped to pay closer attention to the use of the verb 'elect.' As in previous years, a common grammatical error was the omission of the definite article before titles, as in 'el señor Kumar' (Mr Kumar). Candidates should pay attention to this fundamental difference between Spanish and English, especially since it has featured in previous examinations. Despite these stumbling blocks, many candidates did a fine job at translating the passage while maintaining an adequate tone in the description of the character. One conclusion to be drawn from this exercise is that candidates should devote ten to fifteen minutes to rereading the passage and the translation to avoid grammar and agreement mistakes that can result in a substantial loss of marks.

There were some excellent essays in the second part of the paper. Many candidates' work was thoughtful and coherent, and displayed good control of language and idiom. Candidates need to bear in mind that convincing arguments and originality are highly valued in writing and should go hand-in-hand with an excellent grammatical and stylistic command of the language. The most popular topics were 'Por qué y para qué mantener el programa de intercambio Erasmus en el sistema universitario británico' (Q2d), 'Una democracia no es siempre el mejor sistema político para una sociedad' (Q2b), and 'Si el español se consolida como lengua de comunicación internacional, será gracias a los Estados Unidos' (Q2e). Some candidates ventured to answer less popular topics, such as 'Siempre imaginé que el Paraíso sería algún tipo de biblioteca' (Jorge Luis Borges) (Q2h) or 'Escribir es siempre protestar, aunque sea de uno mismo' (Ana María Matute) (Q2f), which led to original and persuasive ideas that were valued positively by the examiners. The use of textual markers and varied syntax was appropriate. Familiarity with key terms and metaphors used in politics and economics, such as 'la opinión pública' or 'el gigante asiático,' paid off when writing about those topics. In general, there were many very good texts in this part of the paper.

Spanish II (IIA and IIB)

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii	III
13 (21.67%)	43 (71.67%)	3 (5%)	1 (1.67%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
74 – 69	69 – 67	67 – 65	65 – 47

Spanish IIA

This passage, from the beginning of an essay on the poetry of Cristina Peri Rossi, by the Peruvian literary critic Eduardo Chirinos, reflects on the myth of the Tower of Babel, and its significance for human beings' understanding of language, and each other.

Some candidates were clearly unfamiliar with the myth, but even so should have been able to infer details with the text. Either way, they needed to avoid such infelicitous expressions as 'the Babel tower.' This was not the only point at which candidates demonstrated a worrying lack of general knowledge: surprisingly few rendered 'Yavéh' correctly into English ('Yahweh' would have done); the spelling of Babylon and Babylonian was incorrect in around 90% of cases.

Lexically the passage was not especially challenging, although almost no candidates recognised 'arcano' as a noun (a secret, or a mystery) and the terms 'incuria' (negligence, but 'incuria de los tiempos' is a good way of saying 'the ravages of time') and 'aciaga' (fateful, ill-starred) were almost universally mistranslated, with a greater or lesser degree of

plausibility. Some relatively common terms caused unsuspected problems: ‘confundió’ (confounded, confused) and ‘demuele’ (destroy, crush).

The passage presented a few grammatical hurdles. Yet the line, ‘Tal vez la Torre no haya sido edificado’ caused havoc for some candidates, who had no idea when this event was meant to have happened, or not; many struggled with the phrase ‘habrá de destruirla’; while the syntax of the long second sentence in the second paragraph elicited few successful re-workings – mostly candidates opted for a Babelic jumble.

There were occasional problems of register (‘mull over’ for ‘contemplar’), sometimes as a result of over-translation. Candidates should resist the temptation to improve the original. Conversely, opportunities for snappy, idiomatic renditions were not always seized: ‘lo que amamos sin respuesta’ was rendered neatly by a few candidates as ‘an unrequited love.’ Overall, however, candidates produced effective and coherent versions of the passage in English, and some very good marks were achieved.

Spanish IIB

The passage was taken from a historical novel by the Argentine writer Elsa Drucaroff, which tells the story of Martín Güemes’ battle against the Spanish Royalist forces, and the role of María Trinidad, a married woman from Jujuy’s pro-Spanish high society who becomes his lover and ally, much to the disgust of her erstwhile friends.

Overall, the passage allowed students to display their comprehension of the original and to produce some elegant and pleasing renderings into English. But at the bottom end of the scale, candidates misconstrued much of the text, including the action taking place and even, in more than one case, the gender of the participants.

The passage offered a number of tricky grammatical points that only the more successful candidates were able to negotiate. The phrase ‘a lo de sus amigas’ (i.e. to her friends’ houses and/or social gatherings) caused a variety of problems; likewise ‘lo suyo’ (i.e. what she had done; her case). Quite a few candidates did not know what to make of ‘hubiera renunciado’ (would have given up) in the penultimate line.

There were clear gaps in vocab in many scripts: relatively common or easily guessed terms that caused problems included ‘oprobioso,’ ‘tirano,’ ‘jurado,’ and ‘entereza.’ Even if candidates had never seen ‘disimulo’ before, it should have been clear from context that Güemes is brazen in his parting gestures to María Trinidad. Very many candidates translated ‘realista’ as ‘realist,’ turning the South American wars of independence into a battle between literary movements or maybe philosophical schools. Candidates are reminded that simply omitting more difficult words is not a solution.

Literary passages allow candidates some room for creativity; thus it was disappointing to see ‘levantó el brazo’ (waved) rendered as merely ‘raised/lifted his arm.’ ‘Las lenguas se habían movido’ was successfully rendered, variously as ‘tongues had been wagging,’ ‘there had been much talk’ and so forth. A number of candidates struggled with naming practices in Spanish: ‘La señora’ might be ‘The Lady’ or ‘Madam,’ but not ‘the woman.’ ‘Mrs Trinidad’ is also clearly wrong.

It is customary for examiners to comment on the more creative solutions offered by students, and this year shall be no exception. The phrase ‘chusma embravecida’ (‘enraged horde,’ ‘rowdy mob,’ or something along those lines) inspired suggestions from the bizarre (‘relentless smirk’) to the anachronistic (‘emboldened deplorables’) to the simply wrong (‘overinflated ego’) to the belligerent (‘overconfident bitch,’ ‘courageous floozey’ [sic]) to the frankly outrageous (‘spicy little plaything’). Both examiners wondered if the heat was playing tricks.

This year, once again, students are advised to read widely in Spanish and in English in preparation for this exercise. Close attention to both the gist and the specifics of the texts set is vital in order to avoid costly slips.

Spanish III

The three sole Spanish students sat this paper. The first part of the paper consisted of a prose translation into modern Spanish of an extract from Graham Greene's *England Made Me*. The passage contained detailed descriptions of a bar in a railway station, the railway station itself and passers-by. It presented a number of challenges regarding vocabulary, the use of tenses and pronominal verbs. Some phrases in the passage gave rise to a range of creative solutions. 'Behind her the ham sandwiches were piled under a glass dome' was translated as 'Detrás de ella estaban amontonados los bocadillos de jamón' and 'Detrás de ella los bocadillos de jamón estaban apilados.' 'Grit on the skin' was nicely rendered as 'como arena sobre la piel' and 'piedritas en la piel.' 'Sparks leapt' was translated in many creative ways ('chispas volaban,' 'saltaban ascuas,' 'unas chispas saltaron'). However, a number of specific words tripped students up: for example, 'swing door,' 'glass dome,' 'urns,' 'bookstalls.' Though they did present difficulties, these were often poorly rendered into Spanish. 'Bowler hat' was rendered as 'gorro inglés,' 'sombrero formal' and 'sombrero negro,' but options like 'bombín' or 'sombrero hongo' would have been more accurate. There was some confusion over how to translate the word 'rail' since it appears twice in the text but with different meanings. The English syntactic constructions 'She might have been waiting for her lover' and 'She was looking for someone who was not there' caused problems, and candidates who followed the English construction made a shift of meaning when rendering the text into Spanish. The examiners felt that students should pay more attention to the source language and the context in order to provide a more accurate translation.

The second part of the paper invited candidates to choose between a medieval translation (from the *Crónica carolingia*) and a Golden Age translation, a piece by Antonio de Guevara. Two candidates chose the former, one the latter. All three translations were plausible, one excellent, but there were some difficulties over specific items of vocabulary in all cases. It was particularly surprising to see candidates who tackled the medieval passage not recognize common terms from the *Poema de Mio Cid*, including 'pesar,' 'pleito' and 'tuerto'.

Spanish IV

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii	Fail
3 (21.43%)	8 (57.14%)	2 (14.29%)	1 (7.14%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
77 – 68	68 – 65	65 – 62	55 – 38

Fourteen candidates sat this paper this year. The range of marks was significantly wider than in previous years. Three candidates obtained First Class marks, two of them quite good Firsts; eight of them got II.1 marks, two of them in the high II.1 range (68), three in the low II.1 range (62, 63), and three in the mid II.1 range (65, 66). Two candidates obtained marks in the low to mid II.2 range (52, 55), and the performance of one of the candidates obtained a mark of 40. Therefore, some of the candidates did very well, producing essays and commentaries that displayed a good knowledge of the subject, were able to engage effectively with the essay topics and/or the texts for commentary, and laid out their ideas and analysis in a clear, organized and effective way. Other candidates, while producing competent performances displaying a satisfactory familiarity with the subject, did not reach the level of knowledge or precision that usually is found in the first class performances; they rather tended to recycle previous knowledge without engaging in depth in the analysis of

their essay topics or their texts for commentary. A useful bit of advice for future students sitting this paper is to try to engage closely with the essay topic or the text for commentary presented to their consideration. There is a tendency to regurgitate the information the candidate has acquired, without careful consideration of how pertinent these data are for the topic at hand. This is especially damaging in the case of linguistic commentaries, when information about the state of the Spanish language in the period to which the text for commentary belongs is provided without analysing in detail the text and seeing which of these features are present in the text or not, and without saying if the text documents a certain change as completely consolidated or as not happening at all, or if it rather presents a situation of variation.

Regarding the choices of questions made by the candidates this year, thirteen of the fourteen candidates chose questions from sections A and B, while only one chose questions from B and C. The more popular choices were questions 8 (on the expansion of lexical and syntactical resources of Spanish during Alfonso X's reign), with eleven takers, and 2 (on the evolution of the vocalic system of Old Spanish from that of Latin), with nine. The commentaries in sections A and B had four takers each (with one candidate choosing to do both), which is a significant increase from previous years. Questions 4 (development of palatal consonants) and 5 (evolution from the synthetic morphology of Latin to the analytic morphology of Old Spanish) had three takers each. Questions 3 (Old Spanish as a 'dialectal complex'), 9 (resolution of situations of linguistic variation in the period 1300-1450) and 10 (changes in Spanish lexis in the period 1300-1500) had two takers each. Finally, question 11 (morphology of Spanish future and conditional tenses and its evolution) was chosen by one candidate. The only Section C question chosen was 15 (*arte* and *uso* in Juan de Valdés and implications of this dichotomy in the history of Spanish in the early modern period), just once. Questions 6, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 18 were left untouched.

Spanish V

Class profile

I	II.i
4 (50%)	4 (50%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
80 – 75	72 – 71	69 – 62	62 – 61

The results on this paper were very pleasing, with half of the candidates gaining Firsts (including an exceptional performance of 80) and the remainder Upper Seconds. A relatively small subset of the questions on the paper was answered, with the phonetic transcription and commentary and essay questions on the syllable, on homonymy, synonymy, and antonymy, on the word, on aphasia, on Latin American Spanish, and on social gender proving the most popular. The phonetic transcription and commentary was particularly well handled, with most candidates who answered this question choosing to display their knowledge of variation in Spanish by transcribing the different elements of the passage in different varieties and commenting in an informed way on this and other aspects of their work. Once or twice, however, impressionistic language was used (especially when sandhi phenomena were being discussed), rather than appropriate technical terms (such as synalœpha and synæresis). Answers on the syllable, on the word, and on homonymy, synonymy, and antonymy were also generally good, although they were occasionally unfocused and sometimes failed to define terms clearly — in particular, few candidates discussed the notion of polysemy and whether it can be claimed to be different from homonymy at the level of synchronic psycholinguistic reality. In addition to problems of terminology, there were also some issues with the structure and coherence of answers. When discussing how a variety of Spanish differs from other varieties, it is important not just to list the features and structures involved, but also to analyse and, where possible, explain the differences; and, when a question on a general topic (such as aphasia) asks for the argument to be supported by examples from Spanish, it is important to provide such

examples, rather than simply writing a general essay, or an essay exemplified exclusively from some other language (such as English). Such failings were perhaps slightly too common; however, it should be stressed that they do not detract from the rather high standard of the answers overall.

Spanish VI

Class profile		Quartiles			
I	II.i	1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
2 (28.57%)	5 (71.43%)	73 – 70	68 – 66	65 – 62	62 – 62

Seven candidates sat the paper this year and there were two first-class scripts and five upper seconds. Candidates answered a good range of questions across all four sections of the paper. Section A attracted responses on orality and textuality, genre, and foreign culture influence. Section B was the least popular with only one candidate answering on the *mester de clerecía*. Section C saw several candidates answer on *Libro del Cavallero Zifar* and Don Juan Manuel, and one candidate on Sem Tob de Carrión and on Pero López de Ayala. From Section D the question (on war) in Manrique's *Coplas por la muerte de su padre* was the most popular of the entire paper but candidates also wrote about women writers, Juan de Mena's *Laberinto de Fortuna*, and *La Celestina*. In general the standard of the paper was very good. At the higher end of the scale, candidates displayed excellent critical engagement with the texts, sophisticated and incisive arguments, and appropriate awareness of historical and cultural contexts. Less strong performances tended to show signs of a scattergun approach to questions where candidates appeared to be throwing all the information they could think of, and sometimes a rather chaotic range of it, into the essay without due consideration or pause for careful analysis. Unsupported generalization and errors of facts, both textual and historical, also crept into some scripts. It was, however, a pleasing performance on the whole and heartening to see candidates opting for traditionally less popular texts and authors, and tackling theoretical and comparative questions on Section A.

Spanish VII

Class profile			Quartiles			
I	II.i	II.ii	1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
4 (25%)	10 (62.50%)	2 (12.50%)	77 – 70	67 – 65	65 – 61	61 – 55

Sixteen candidates sat the paper VII examination. Twenty-one of the twenty-seven questions were answered, with no candidate attempting the commentary question (Q10). The examiners were very pleased to see such a variety of authors and topics tackled this year.

In the first section the only question, other than the commentary, not attempted was the one on censorship (Q5). Question 1, featuring a quotation from Lope de Vega's *Arte nuevo* (recognised readily by most candidates) and focusing on the idea of dumbing down dramatic content/language in order to provide pleasure to an audience, provoked the largest number of responses. Candidates exploited a pleasing variety of prose and dramatic works to illustrate their answers to this question, including, ingeniously, the genre of the *entremés*. The questions on 'difficulty' in Golden Age poetry (Q2) and neo-Stoicism (Q3) also attracted more than the odd answer and demonstrated some good knowledge. In fact the examiners were pleased with the extent of candidates' general knowledge of the period: there were many solid, good or very good essays though some answers remained too much in the realms of the general. Although section A deals with ideas and 'isms' relevant to the period, it does not preclude candidates illustrating their arguments with close reading. Indeed an

ability to ‘zoom in’ on precise textual evidence to back up a bigger argument is often the sign of a well-informed and thoughtful candidate.

In section B, it was question 18 on San Juan de la Cruz that proved the most attractive. Candidates dealt very well with the ‘mixed’ imitation – explaining the myriad influences on the saint’s poetry – but only the best answers were able to explain what the ‘something new’ might be. Questions on Santa Teresa (Q13) and Fray Luis de León (Q14) were also answered by several candidates meaning that one of the trends this year was an increase in answers on religious writers, perhaps reflecting topics on which there had been lecture series. There were some first-rate discussions of Fray Luis as a religious (and moral) poet where exceptional close reading was combined with a very sound overarching understanding of the world of the poet. Unusually there were more answers on the pastoral (Q12) than on *Don Quijote* (Q11), a text which was all but ignored this year. No candidate wrote on the *romancero* (Q17) although the question was felt to be straightforward.

In section C questions 22, 23 and 24 remained unanswered. This was rather surprising since the two drama ones were on honour plays and Lope de Vega’s drama. However, candidates seemed to prefer the more general theatre questions with five answering on ‘doubt’ (Q25) and four on ‘the relationship between the sexes’ (Q26). There was some fine knowledge of the themes and characters and plots of a good variety of plays, though close textual knowledge, which would have helped to back up some of the bigger claims made, was in shorter supply. Previously popular prose works – the picaresque narratives (Q19) and Cervantes’s *Novelas ejemplares* (Q20) – attracted less attention than usual. There were some fine essays on the poetry of Sor Juana (27), whose verse was well known and appreciated.

The best essays, as ever, were by candidates who had thought hard about the texts studied and read widely and deeply in the period. This was evident, for example, in answers that referred to authors not on the main paper VII reading lists, such as the *entremés* specialist, Quiñones de Benavente and the early playwright, Juan del Encina. However, it was also pleasing to see essays based on sixteenth-century writers whose works, though taught, are less popular in paper VII, such as the poets Aldana and Herrera and the Humanist, Alfonso de Valdés. Future candidates for this paper should note that examiners are less impressed when candidates do not go beyond the content of lectures and Hilary Term seminars in their reading.

Spanish VIII

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii
12 (30.77%)	25 (64.10%)	2 (5.13%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
74 – 70	70 – 67	66 – 65	64 – 55

This paper produced a now familiar performance profile, both in terms of the range of questions attempted and the quality of the answers. 33% of the latter were on Section A (Spain) and 67% on Section B (Spanish America), reflecting the perennial and indeed increasing popularity of the latter. 61% of the questions on Section A were attempted by at least one candidate and a more encouraging 85% of those on Section B, though Q.16 (on theatre in the Franco period) Q.39 (on the Spanish American short story) and Q.41(b) (on form an expression in Spanish American women’s writing) were the clear favourites, receiving seven, thirteen and twelve answers respectively. The general quality of argument and expression was good, but (at least in comparison to 2016) there were very few outstanding scripts and only a handful of unequivocal first class performances. As ever, too many candidates had clearly prepared just three topics and a minimal amount of primary

material for each, and were stymied when the 'wrong' question came up. A case in point was provided by Q.41 (a): several candidates, evidently unprepared to tackle *any* of the other 40 questions, proceeded to write about short stories rather than novels, as specified, (with some actually admitting that they were doing so, perhaps hoping to be pardoned for their candour) and incurred the corresponding penalty for infringement of rubric. Others simply reproduced three prepared essays, regardless of the particular question set; the descriptors (which all candidates should be encouraged to read carefully) indicate that a 2:2 mark is the highest that can be awarded in such instances. Again, Q.41 (both (a) and (b) this time) exposed the shortcomings of that 'tactic.' Similarly, whilst it was pleasing to see so many candidates answering on women writers (this year a number of questions had been set specifically on women's writing, but there was scope to answer many more with reference to women writers across all genres), far too many of the essays took the form of a generic hotchpotch of largely misapplied critical clichés and commonplaces, a sort of gender studies by numbers (almost everyone answering Q.41 (b) trotted out the term *écriture féminine*, but almost none used it correctly; one candidate claimed that Countess Bathory's murdering of young girls in order to bathe in their blood was a 'feminist' gesture – one wonders what the girls themselves might have made of that claim. It is dismaying to see bowlderised theory displacing the close and attentive reading of texts even at undergraduate level, when basic critical reading skills are often lacking and need to be nurtured. Fortunately, these were on display elsewhere. It was also interesting (if not entirely surprising) to note how few candidates attempted the question on magical realism and tragicomedy (just six, whereas normally anything up to 75% of those who focus on Section B answer on this topic), presumably because it required a critical reconsideration of material covered in tutorials and lectures rather than merely a regurgitation of it. Those who were prepared to think and adapt were duly rewarded. This too is an a depressingly familiar story, but despite the repeated warnings of tutors and FHS reports to answer the question set, it is one whose moral is still not being heeded by a significant number of candidates. Hence this further reiteration.

This is not the place to dwell on particular errors of fact (though dates, nationalities and plots of novels proved challenging to a number of candidates) but one stands out: we are used to encountering applicants at Admissions who think that Lorca was writing under and against Franco during and after the Civil War, but this is the first time that this examiner has come across a candidate at FHS who continues to labour under that illusion. One wonders how that can happen.

Whilst, as indicated above, a good range of questions was attempted, particularly on Section B, it was dispiriting to note the absence of any answers whatsoever on major authors and topics such as Alas (there were also just two answers on Galdós), Machado, the Generation of 1927 and Neruda, often in favour of sometimes minor or niche writers whose work ticks some currently fashionable critical box or deals with 'issues' in a 'socially relevant' manner. Attacking the 'canon' or some imagined version of it has, ironically, become a new academic orthodoxy, but one wonders whether the resulting overhaul is always and necessarily cause for celebration.

On a more positive note, there were a number of excellent individual essays, often on topics (Bécquer's poetry, the novels of Pardo Bazán, Rubén Darío, Gaucho literature, the poetry of Rosario Castellanos and Susana Thénon etc.) which suggested a certain adventurousness and independence of mind on the part of candidates who had clearly enjoyed studying them and engaged critically with them rather than 'playing safe' which, ironically, so often proves to be a perilous strategy. It was also heartening to see that candidates were now studying a broader range of texts in relation to certain topics, such as the novel of the Mexican Revolution. A number of the best candidates also managed, when relevant, to contextualize their answers informatively and persuasively within broader literary, political and socio-historical contexts, providing the examiners with a welcome reminder that Paper VIII is still officially referred to as a 'Period Paper.'

Spanish IX

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii
2 (25%)	5 (62.50%)	1 (12.50%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
71 – 70	69 – 68	68 – 66	66 – 56

Eight candidates sat the paper this year and there were two firsts, five upper seconds, and one lower second. Six candidates chose to translate from the *Poema de Mio Cid*, two from the *Libro de buen amor*, none tackled *La Celestina*. As is not uncommon, the translation element was the weakest on a lot of scripts but there were some very good translations too which managed to combine both accuracy and sensitivity to register and tone. Common errors in the *Poema de Mio Cid* translation included 'de firme' (line 2) which was almost never translated as something like 'very thoroughly/resolutely/tenaciously' and often missed out altogether, and failing to realize that 'contado' (line 4) is part of the Cid's epithet here 'el Campeador contado.' The adjective 'fronzida' (line 7), meaning 'furrowed,' was often mistranslated as 'dirty.' The items or armour and weaponry worn by the Cid were not always rendered specifically enough and there were also some frequent errors over 'pagado' (lines 9, 15, 19) which refers to a state of happiness or satisfaction, not to being paid. The *Libro* translation was generally accomplished with greater accuracy but pitfalls included translating 'me castigó' (line 3) and 'sus castigos' (line 4) as a reference to punishment from Amor, rather than his advice. The spelling of 'bevir' (line 4) also confused one candidate, who mistook it for 'beber' and interpreted this as drinking, rather than living. Five candidates chose the *Libro* commentary, and three the commentary on *La Celestina*. On the whole commentaries were well done but weaker performances saw candidates summarize content and plot at the expense of engaging in extensive critical analysis. Candidates tackled a pleasing range of questions for the essay section of the paper, not always opting for what might seem safe choices and intellectual ambition was duly rewarded. The most popular was question 3(a) on the Infantes de Carrión, answered six times, followed by 5(c) on friendship in *La Celestina*, which attracted three responses. There was evidence of some sophisticated and original work in this section; the best essays closely answered the question and did so with range, detail, and critical acuity. Weaker essays tended to dodge the question in favour of related but not always pertinent material, and some essays were thoughtful but displayed a lack of focus and organization. The Examiners agreed that this was a more than satisfactory performance this year and that a few candidates were very impressive and displayed signs of real talent.

Spanish X

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii
5 (20.83%)	17 (70.83%)	2 (8.33%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
73 – 69	69 – 68	67 – 63	62 – 56

Twenty-four candidates took on Paper X this year. The most popular authors continue to be Cervantes (20 takers) and Calderón (19), followed by Quevedo (7) and Góngora (2), with no candidates for Garcilaso. Three of the four commentary passages were attempted, with thirteen candidates opting for the scene from *Gran teatro*, ten choosing the extract from *Don Quijote*, ii.68, and just one trying their hand at the lines from *Soledades*. Not for the first time in recent memory, there were no takers for a famous passage from the *Buscón*. Of the essay questions, there was a pleasing spread of answers on Cervantes, with 2(b), 3, and 7 all drawing five or more responses. On Calderón, though all questions were attempted by at least one candidate, the majority plumped, perhaps predictably (and with varying degrees of

success), for 18, on the 'interplay between free will and external forces.' All bar one of the *quevedistas* decided to answer on the *Buscón*.

The commentary was handled well by the majority of candidates. There were a number of very strong performances, spread evenly across Cervantes and Calderón, and, just as encouragingly, no disasters. On the passage from the *Quijote*, several candidates successfully blended general comment, on aspects of narrative technique and the dynamic between the central characters, with impressive close analysis of specific details, including the cross-reference to the scuffle in ii.60 and Quixote's use of Latin (though, here, there was more to be said about links to the Book of Job and/or Juan de la Cuesta). Candidates who answered on Calderón demonstrated good knowledge of *Gran teatro*, despite the *auto* not having been set for commentary since 2007. The best answers pinpointed the extract's immediate context (Rey as the first character to respond to Discreción's suggestion that 'cada uno diga | qué está en su imaginación'), noted and discussed the parallel drawn between Rey and King Solomon, and understood the meaning and implications of subjunctives (ll. 9–14 and the anaphoric *vuelva* in ll. 35–44). In light of recent reports on Paper X, it was heart-warming to see many candidates correctly identify, and explore the significance of, the switch from sonnet to *romance*. That said, a small number of answers had Rey's opening sonnet as anything from *redondillas* to *silvas*, one script going on to suggest that the *romance* section was in multiple different forms. The absence of answers on the extract from *Buscón*, l.5, suggests that candidates for Quevedo may need to spend longer working through the primary texts carefully in order to prepare themselves for close reading.

The standard of responses to essay questions was more varied. There were some exceptional individual answers, most notably on Cervantes and the *entremés*, characterisation and style in the *Buscón*, and the dramatic function of versification in Calderón, but also a number of weaker performances characterised by failings that are by now all-too-familiar. Ignoring part or all of a title quotation, twisting questions to fit pre-prepared material, and/or demonstrating limited command of essential terms will always have a detrimental effect on performance. For example, several answers to 2(b), on the claim that Sancho is 'una transposición de Don Quijote en una clave distinta,' turned it into a question about *quijotización/sanchificación*, with little or no attempt to engage with the explicit musical metaphor. On 18, there was widespread confusion and imprecision over the meaning of 'free will' and the identification of 'external forces'; very few of the fourteen answers to this question showed any understanding of the context of seventeenth-century religious and philosophical debate. Whilst the best essays across all four authors set out clear and confident answers to the specific questions set, supporting individual points with concise references to primary and secondary sources, performances at the lower end saw candidates fall back on plot summary and digression (sometimes, openly acknowledged as such). For Calderón, it was encouraging to see several answers branch out beyond the set texts, but future candidates for this author should note that detailed description of lesser-studied plays is not an adequate substitute for sustained analysis and argumentation. Errors of fact should also be avoided: if rounding the much-anticipated 3,300 *azotes* down to 3,000 is one thing, confusing Sancho's wife Teresa, elsewhere Juana Gutiérrez, with Juan Roca's *criado* Juanete is another entirely.

Once more, Paper X produced some very good scripts. Candidates for this paper in future years should be encouraged to read widely, and certainly well beyond the bare minimum of texts prescribed for commentary, but to ensure that breadth of reference is not seen as a replacement for detailed understanding of the words on the page and the key issues at stake in the case of each individual work.

Spanish XI

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii
7 (28%)	17 (68%)	1 (4%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
73 – 70	69 – 67	67 – 64	64 – 59

This year 25 candidates offered this paper. The most popular texts for commentary were Neruda (9) and García Lorca (7), followed by six for the author introduced this year, García Márquez. One candidate each opted for Galdós, Alas and Valle-Inclán. Perhaps it was the choice of a poem for the Borges commentary ('Un soldado de Urbina,' taken from *El otro el mismo* [1964]) that discouraged candidates from choosing what would have been a relatively straightforward exercise. Borges was however the most popular topic for essays (16), followed by Neruda (11) and Lorca (8), with low single figures for all the others.

The Galdós commentary was drawn from the final chapter of *Nazarín*, as the protagonist emerges from a vision, and this vacillation between the real and the mystical is present throughout the piece. The Alas section was taken from chapter three of *La Regenta*, and candidates needed to be aware of the interplay between different voices and points of view in the passage describing Ana's bedchamber and presence therein. The passage from Valle-Inclán's *Los cuernos de Don Friolera*, the tenth scene, towards the end of the play, included important stage directions (including the presence of anthropomorphic animals) and an example of one of Friolera's mock-tragic soliloquies, with reference to Calderón. The commentary drawn from the final scene of Lorca's *El público* set out the significance of the 'difícilísimo juego poético' that constitutes the 'teatro bajo la arena,' and highlighted such recurring themes and motifs as love and transformation. There were some very detailed commentaries on Neruda's 'Oda a la cebolla,' in some cases citing Pring-Mills' essay on the poem. Although the poem *looks* like free verse, candidates who could spot the presence of various traditional metres, broken by the poem's distinctive layout, were rewarded, as were those who linked the poem to both the history of the ode and Neruda's aims for the rest of the collection (as set out e.g. in 'El hombre invisible'). The section from chapter 15 of *Cien años...* drew a rather mixed set of commentaries, the best of which noted echoes from key moments elsewhere in the novel; highlighted the graphic imagery used to describe the crowd's panic; and connected the passage to the novel's wider themes, including memory and political violence.

There were good essays on Galdós and Clarín. Candidates attempting questions such as 10 ('the conflict between romantic subjectivity and social reality') needed to know what was meant by 'romantic' in the title. At least one of the efforts on Valle was hampered by a vague notion of the *esperpento*, and how this develops in the author's career, but there was one really excellent answer on *Divinas palabras*, including a subtle reading of the play's conclusion. The title referring to Lorca's 'amorous frustration and sterility' proved very popular, and the best answers, including some clearly first-class efforts, were judicious in their use of biographical material. On Neruda, *Veinte poemas* and the *Residencias* were popular; on the former, there were some insightful close readings of poems; on the latter, the very best candidates sketched variations between the different volumes of the work. There were many very competent essays on Borges's use of philosophy. One outstanding effort answered on nostalgia with reference to a wide selection of the Argentine's poetry. The essays on tolerance in Borges tended to be rather general, sometimes twisting prepared material on the canonical stories to fit more or less well; candidates might have focussed more successfully on the later poetry, for example. One candidate offered a competent essay on Cortázar's *Rayuela*, and what might be called its 'creative destruction.' There were some competent, but not really outstanding, essays on a variety of titles from section I

(García Márquez). It was pleasing, however, that a good number of candidates had chosen this new author.

The vast majority of essays were well put together, closely argued, and relevant; there was little inappropriate rehashing of material. Some essays did include irrelevancies, for example sections of tutorial essays lightly retouched with insufficient relation to the question as set. Other candidates failed to provide a complete essay, missing either a conclusion or an introduction that sets out an understanding of the key terms of the title. The best essays were wholly relevant, but often took an unexpected approach – looking at less canonical texts, identifying points of contact between different parts of an author's *oeuvre*, or engaging critically with appropriate secondary material. Such efforts were not necessarily very long, either, although very short or unfinished work was marked accordingly. Some of the weakest essays were long-winded and/or slipped into paraphrase. The best scripts contained work not limited to the prescription or the canonical works. Candidates are once again reminded that the prescription limits only what can be set for commentary: there are rewards for going off the beaten track.

SPECIAL SUBJECT / PAPER XII [Reports on Papers for 5 or more candidates]

Method A

Language change and Historical Linguistics (5 MLL & 2 PPL)

ML Class Profile: I: 1 (20%) II.i: 3 (60%) II.ii: 1 (20%)

Nine of the thirteen questions were attempted, with questions 5 (the grammaticalisation cline) and 11 (first language learners as agents of language change) proving most popular, attracting four answers each.

The vast majority of answers to individual questions and of whole papers showed evidence of effective study. There were some excellent performances on individual questions where candidates showed clearly that they had thought carefully about what the question set was asking for (e.g. a description of a process, an assessment of a theory); some weaker answers gave the impression of the candidate alighting on some key word or concept in the question and delivering what the candidate had prepared on that topic without sufficient attention to the question actually being asked.

The selection and presentation of evidence was also a significant discriminator between more and less convincing answers: at the upper end candidates knitted theory and data to present a cogent case; at the lower end the quality and/or quantity of discussion of actual examples was lacking. Candidates should not be shy to exploit any detailed knowledge they may have of the history of particular languages in their discussion of general patterns of language change; conversely when dealing with languages with which they are less familiar – including English – candidates would be more secure in what they say if they also had a broader appreciation of those languages' histories

Romance Philology & Linguistics (2 MLL & 1 PPL)

Class Profile: I: 1 (50%) II.i: 1 (50%)

The three candidates produced a good spread of answers, over questions 3, 7, 10, 16, 17 and 19. The best answers showed broad, accurate and in-depth knowledge of the facts, and awareness of possible existing debates around the issues discussed, and rather than presenting some repetition of the lecture handouts offered mature reflections and took an original angle. Weaker answers were factually inaccurate, thin on details and/or discussion and lacked clarity and focus. Overall, however, the candidates displayed a good and thorough understanding of the material.

Semantics (4 MLL & 4 PPL)

Class Profile: I: 1 (25%) II.i: 2 (50%) II.ii: 1 (25%)

Six questions attracted answers, of which four were preferred by candidates:

Question 2 was attempted by seven candidates and was in general answered well. The best answers engaged closely with the question, were thoughtful and demonstrated strong command of the material. Answers at the lower end did not engage directly enough with the question and/or featured errors that pulled the mark down.

Question 4 was attempted by four candidates. The best answer featured some material that went beyond the core taught content.

Question 7 was attempted by eight candidates and was the most popular question on the exam. The best answers clearly explained the inadequacy of logical quantifiers for natural language quantification on the basis of both their composition and the possible meanings they can represent. The worst answers lacked focus, failed to demonstrate real understanding of the question and/or made errors that pulled the mark down.

Question 10 was attempted by five candidates. The best answers were wide-ranging without lacking focus and demonstrated clear knowledge of the concept of *intensiMonality* (as well

as *extensionality*). The worst answers demonstrated understanding of only the basics and/or featured errors that pulled the mark down.

Sociolinguistics (4 MLL & 3 PPL)

Class Profile: II.i: 3 (75%) Pass: 1 (25%)

Most questions were attempted, with the most popular topics being gender, stylistic variation, and creoles. The majority of answers were competent, and some were very good, but there were also some which fell short of expectations because they were too short, contained irrelevant material, or were marred by inaccuracies and gaps in the candidate's knowledge.

The strongest answers made a clear argument in relation to the question which was also illustrated with concrete, well-chosen examples of the linguistic phenomenon under discussion. In weaker answers, especially to the questions on gender and social class, there was a tendency to spend too much time on general theoretical/sociological issues (e.g., how to define gender/class) and too little on specifically linguistic points. Another weakness was using examples (e.g. specific cases of creolization or language shift) which did not speak directly to the key issues raised by the question: this suggested that some candidates had not read widely on the topics they planned to write about. It is important to be prepared to answer a range of potential questions on any given topic, since the focus of the question set will vary from year to year.

Psycholinguistics (3 MLL & 6 PPL)

Class Profile: I: 1 (33.33%) II.i: 1 (50%)

Most of the 13 questions attracted at least one answer, but three were preferred by candidates:

Question 1 was one of the two most popular questions. Good answers to this question discussed the theoretical ideas behind incremental vs. one-trial learning of words and brought together relevant studies that directly addressed the different predictions these theories make.

Question 7 attracted three responses. The candidates were required to differentiate incremental language production from interactivity in language production and discuss the evidence for the unit of speech planning at different levels of representation.

Question 9 was the other popular question, drawing six responses. Strong answers discussed the core relevant aspects of Fodorian modularity and distinguished it from a more general use of autonomy found in much of the experimental work. Weak answers may have made relevant points, but failed to go into detail about how such points were supported by theoretical argument and empirical evidence.

Syntax (4 MLL & 1 PPL)

Class Profile: I: 2 (50%) II.i: (25%) II.ii: 1 (25%)

There was a reasonable spread of answers: 8 of the 12 questions received answers, but there was no question that was answered by more than 2 candidates. High marks went to answers that brought in appropriate linguistic data in support of the point being made, displayed skilful and appropriate use of grammatical tests to support the arguments being made, and showed good awareness of the relevant literature. Particularly high marks went to answers that showed originality, either in coming up with novel linguistic arguments or novel data in support of a position, or in broad and deep familiarity with a range of theoretical and typological literature. Less successful answers were poorly structured, did not support their claims with appropriate argumentation or grammatical tests, and/or lacked focus.

Phonetics & Phonology (6 MLL & 4 PPL)

Class Profile: I: 3 (50%) II.i: 3 (50%)

The most popular questions were 5a (typical pattern of development of speech production or perception, 7 answers) and 2 (models of speech production or perception, 6 answers). The better answers to question 5a gave a very detailed and well-informed chronology of developmental phonetics in the first few years of life, including prenatal learning of native-language intonation patterns, attracting high marks for showing an excellent range of relevant knowledge. Some answers discussed theoretical frameworks (generative linguistics and others) that attempt to explain why the typical and uniform developmental patterns are seen.

Other questions were answered by 5 or fewer candidates. Questions 5b, 7, 8b, 9 and 12 were not chosen by any candidates.

For the remainder of the examination, 6 candidates offered lab reports and 4 elected to sit the aural test. The lab reports were on varied but related studies of domain-initial strengthening in data from the IViE corpus. There was no significant difference in the profile of marks in the lab report vs. the aural test.

Russian Drama of the 19th and 20th Centuries

Class profile: I: 1 (33.3%) II.i: 2 (66.67%)

Three candidates took this paper. Between them they covered a pleasing range of texts in their comparative commentaries and essays, touching upon 13 out of 18 possible set texts, plus a few additional plays they had read. The stronger answers were able to use points of detail (relating to content, style or dramatic technique) in such a way as to make broader points about the plays in question, or indeed about Russian drama in a wider perspective.

Russian Literature of the 20th Century

Class profile: II.i: 2 (100%)

The two candidates performed to a solid standard.

Paper XII: The Structure and History of a Language: Polish

Class profile: I: 2 (100%)

Candidates chose a good range of questions and performed to a very good standard.

Method B

Latin American Cinema

Class Profile: I: 4 (36.36%) II.i: 7

Class profile

I	II.i
4 (36.36%)	7 (63.64%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
75 - 72	71 - 69	69 - 68	67 - 65

Students submitted a portfolio of three essays, covering at least two countries and at least one of which had to be comparative; these essays were based in part on work produced for seminars and tutorials over the course of Hilary term and the lectures given at the start of that term.

The examiners were impressed by both the range and depth of the essays included in students' portfolios. For instance, the origins of the films analysed spanned the region (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru, and a number of transnational collaborations); ranged from the 1960s to the 2010s; and covered a variety of genres (blockbuster, melodrama, documentary). Students dealt with a variety of technical aspects (editing, lighting, sound, music) as well as thematic ones.

Films touching on LGBTQ+ and racial themes were common subjects and there was an increasing and noticeable presence of women film directors (Bemberg, Martel, Muylaert, Llosa). Five of the eleven portfolios included analyses of Brazilian films, showing that candidates were willing to work on Portuguese-language film even if they were not students of Portuguese.

As in previous years, the very best essays combined detailed and precise cinematic analysis with accurate and relevant contextualization (in terms of e.g. politics, culture, or film history or theory) and a clear argument about specific aspects of the film or films in questions.

Weaker essays tended to resort to recounting the plot or describing the characters of the films, or deal in generalizations, and were not as well organized (e.g. lacking a clear conclusion). Other failings included an uncritical or derivative attitude to secondary material, as well as problems with presentation and expression.

It was perhaps most pleasing to get a strong sense of students having discovered Latin American cinema through this course and engaged intellectually with something new and exciting for them, in many cases beyond the scope of the assessed components.

Nietzsche and his Impact

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii
3 (42.86%)	3 (42.86%)	1 (14.29%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
83 - 75	72 - 69	68 - 65	57 - 57

In this special subject, examined by a portfolio of essays, candidates produced essays on a wide variety of subject, from Nietzsche's critique of religion to his impact on other writers such as W.B. Yates, D. H. Lawrence and Stefan Zweig. Marks ranged from the II.2 to the high 1st range. The intellectual quality of the portfolios was generally high; essays exploring Nietzsche's critique of religion (a popular topic) were sometimes brought down by a limited and somewhat formulaic understanding of theological concepts and religious traditions. As there a number of different Nietzsche editions, candidates should quite referring to paragraph numbers rather page numbers, as is common practice in Nietzsche scholarship.

Method C

European Cinema

Class profile

I	II.i
11 (45.83%)	13 (54.17%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
77 - 72	72 - 69	69 - 67	67 - 60

This was a good set of essays as all the candidates had taken on board the advice to think very carefully about their choice of films, not only in relation to the essay question but also in terms of their comparability or compatibility in aesthetic terms. There was a wide range of film choices, ranging from German expressionism, over Italian neo-realism and Spanish seventies cinema to contemporary directors such as Sorrentino and Haneke, with most students preferring either contemporary cinema or canonical classics. In terms of methodology, most candidates showed that they were at ease with mise en scene analysis - although this could at times have been more detailed. One of the examiners noted that in several cases the candidates had difficulty structuring an argument over the long form of the essay.

French Literature and Modern War

Class profile

I	II.i
5 (38.46%)	8 (61.54%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
74 - 71	70 - 66	66 - 64	63 - 62

There were more takers for this paper than ever before (13). 12 of the 14 questions attracted at least one answer, and 8 of them at least two. The most popular questions were on gender roles, subversion of inauthentic discourse, soil/soul, national pride, and time. Only two candidates attempted a commentary (both on the verse passage, one of them very successful). Candidates had read widely, across a range of genres, and used their knowledge to good effect; a few were brave enough to tackle texts dealing with wars later than the First World War (Camus, Sartre, Edith Thomas, Perec, Dib). While some answers were on the predictable side, others showed a pleasing willingness to construct and defend a personal viewpoint. Five first-class marks were awarded, and eight 2.1s.

Marcel Proust

Class profile

I	II.i
3 (60%)	2 (40%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
80 - 80	76 - 76	66 - 66	64 - 64

Five students sat this paper in 2017, and the standard was extremely high, with three first-class marks overall. Most students chose to answer questions on either the dichotomy whereby people who engage our feelings thereby become unknowable (4 candidates) or the difficulty of reconciling Proust's rich detail with his 'big-time temporality' (3 candidates). The best work was not only sophisticated but original, displaying a keen sense of argumentation, and in two cases this was rewarded by very high first-class marks. Weaker approaches relied too heavily on one critic, or were a little hesitant or imprecise in their discussion of the commentary passage (passage no. 1, on mourning and sleep, for 4 candidates). The strongest essays were able to respond not only to Proust's high seriousness of purpose, but

also to his sense of humour. Some of the weaker answers skimmed over the problem of the non-identity of the author, narrator and protagonist without giving justification, whereas stronger essays were able to deal with this efficiently and with clarity.

Advanced French Translation: Theory and Practice

Class profile		Quartiles			
I	II.i	1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
7 (36.92%)	19 (73.08%)	78 - 70	67 - 66	66 - 65	64 - 60

Twenty-five candidates took the paper this year. The compulsory Section A was an extract from Gaël Faye's 2016 novel, *Petit Pays*, set in Burundi in the early 1990s during the lead-up to the civil war. Stronger answers in this section sought to identify the various sources of the 'foreign' within the text, and calibrated their approach accordingly, drawing on comparative stylistics (for contrastive norms of grammar and syntax), post-colonial theory (for markers of cultural difference, such as '*tchipé*'), as well as the techniques of close reading (for syntax, tense and narrative perspective, as well as the text's distinctive sound patterns, grammatical arrangements and word play). Weaker answers were less finely tuned and tended towards a blanket foreignization of the source text, erasing a number of its own internal tensions. The paper then offers a choice in Section B. Sixteen candidates chose the first option, which comprised three short extracts taken from the online blog of contemporary French writer François Bon, thematically grouped around his travels through the landscapes and soundscapes of contemporary Paris. The most effective answers were able to establish a theoretical framework through which to accommodate the linguistic hybridity of Bon's writing (including his own individual mode of discourse analysis), often helpfully supported by wider research into web-related translation in general and Bon's digital writing project in particular. Less successful answers made errors in comprehension, and in the commentary tended simply to index isolated translation decisions, citing naturalness. Nine candidates picked the second option, Louisa Siefert's 'Pantoum', published in her *Rayons perdus* of 1868. English versions were largely comfortable working with rhyme and/or rhythm, although in the commentaries surprisingly little was said about the different conventions of French and English versification, even where marked in the translations themselves. There was otherwise some sharp analysis of imagery and form, and a good awareness of the history of the pantoum, at times in relation to the possibilities offered by feminist theories of translation either at a more experimental level or as a means of reinscribing Siefert within the poetic canon. In the essay section, (d) proved to be by far the most popular, while a handful of candidates attempted each of the other three questions. Here, reasoned argument was given preference over summary. Answers ranged across the philosophical, ideological and socio-economic aspects of translation, and included some very focused historical re-evaluation. Overall, the examiners were impressed with the resourcefulness demonstrated by these portfolios and the spirit of intellectual inquiry in which they were put together.

French Satire from Rabelais to Beaumarchais

Class profile		Quartiles			
I	II.i	1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
2 (40%)	3 (60%)	75 - 71	68 - 68	66 - 66	65 - 65

The standard of scripts was very good this year. All three commentary passages were attempted, and candidates showed a willingness to engage with stylistic and thematic particularities, as well as exploring how each functioned as satire. Essays showed critical ambition and were prepared to question and problematize the titles chosen. The best

candidates drew on examples across a broad temporal and generic span, and brought out the diversity of the material, rather than seeking simply to arrive at more generalised, or reductive, conclusions.

Francophone Literature: Colonial and Post-Colonial Perspectives

Class profile

I	II.i	II.ii
3 (30%)	6 (60%)	1 (10%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
73 - 70	67 - 67	65 - 64	60 - 59

Scripts for this paper were generally solid with a few examples which stood out for their astute and nuanced analyses. 10 students took the paper, and there were 7 2.1s, and three Firsts. Some inventive candidates made productive comparisons across regions, and showed evidence of further reading beyond the syllabus and set texts. A good range of questions were answered, though the notion of the 'posture de refus' misled one candidate, and one drew heavily on the Prelims text, Césaire's *Cahier du retour au pays natal*. Generally candidates engaged well with a range of theoretical contexts, which was refreshing.

Literature and the Visual Arts in France

Class profile

I	II.i
0 (0%)	6 (100%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
69 - 68	66 - 66	65 - 64	63 - 63

This paper was, on the whole, very well done. The best answers provided a clear rationale for the primary material selected and engaged with it at close quarters, while keeping the broader terms of the question ('genre', 'time') in view. The weaker answers tended to involve familiar examples from canonical works (Diderot, Zola), often simply recycled from the lectures, though they were often perfectly competently handled nonetheless. In a number of cases, the examiners were frustrated that candidates didn't get to the heart of the question quickly enough, which meant there wasn't space for them to offer a full development of the argument and its implications.

Advanced German Translation

Class profile

I	II.i
4 (57.14%)	3 (42.86%)

Quartiles

1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q
75 - 73	73 - 71	66 - 66	65 - 65

Seven candidates took this paper this year. The examiners assessed three components for each candidate:

- 1) Translation: looking for accuracy, fluency, appropriateness to the genre;
- 2) Introduction: looking for a good match with the translation, broader context and creative problem solving;
- 3) Comparison of the two translations: looking for awareness of theory and a keen observation of differences.

As the overall results indicate, the paper was generally well done, and there were some outstanding performances at the top end, including a demonstration of rare talent in translating comical rhyming verse. The setters are to be commended for an excellent choice of comparison texts, Eric Sutton's 1933 and Susan Bennett's 1996 translations of the opening of Hans Fallada's *Kleiner Mann, was nun?*, which posed a range of different issues for candidates to consider. Some of the candidates' selections for their self-chosen passage for translation were less than felicitous, however, both at the more difficult end (contemporary poetry) and at the easy end (blog posts). Early consultation with the course tutor is to be encouraged, even before candidates start looking for suitable texts to translate, to ensure the selection of a passage that is of sufficient difficulty to enable the candidate to show convincing skill in managing translation problems (and applying translation theory to develop strategies for doing so), but not so challenging as to defeat the object of the exercise. As usual, the term 'dynamic equivalence' cannot be applied to plain mistranslation. There should be the possibility at the tutor's discretion to apply a different word limit for poetic texts or otherwise particularly challenging material; 3000 words of poetry can be hard not only for the candidate but also for the markers. Consideration might be given to re-naming the paper 'Translation: theory and practice'.

F. NAMES OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS

CHAIR: Professor Almut Suerbaum (German Examiner)

VICE-CHAIR: Professor Geraldine Hazbun (Spanish Examiner)

French Examiners

Professor Caroline Warman (Senior Examiner)

Professor Jane Hiddleston

Professor Katherine Lunn-Rockliffe

Professor Daron Burrows

Dr K. Ibbett (External Examiner)

Professor N. Harrison (External Examiner)

German Examiners

Professor Tom Kuhn (Senior Examiner)

Professor Carolin Duttlinger

Dr Lyn Marven (External Examiner)

Dr Sarah Bowden (External Examiner)

Italian Examiners

Professor E. Lombardi

Professor G. Pieri (External Examiner)

Spanish Examiners

Professor Ben Bollig (Senior Examiner)

Professor Oliver Noble Wood

Dr Stephen Roberts (External Examiner)

Portuguese Examiners

Professor Cláudia Pazos-Alonso (Senior Examiner)

Dr C. Ramos Villar (External Examiner)

Russian Examiners

Professor Jan Fellerer (Senior Examiner)

Professor Catriona Kelly

Dr Andy Byford (External Examiner)

Linguistics Examiners

Professor Catherine MacRobert (Senior Examiner)

Professor Kerstin Hoge

Dr R. Sen (External Examiner)