

Модельные решения и критерии оценивания первой и второй задач:

1. Ladies First

a. Solution

(Provided below is not the only but one of the possible ways to arrive to the correct answer. All other ways that lead in the right direction were also graded - see criteria of grading)

Let $P(k)$ be the probability that the person whose turn is wins, with k standing for the number of sticks on the table. Clearly, $P(1)=1$ and $P(2)=1$. Indeed, if there are two sticks, the player can use (2-3) coin and win. Let us calculate $P(3)$. If the player uses (1-2) coin, s/he certainly loses as the opponent get 1 or 2 coins on the table. If the player uses (2-3) coin, s/he either wins, if coin gives 3, or loses, if coin gives 2. So the best strategy at this stage is to use coin (2-3), and the probability to win is $1/2$, $P(3)=1/2$.

Now consider $P(4)$. Find the probability to win depending on the coin chosen.

For coin (1-2), the opponent will get either 3 or 2 coins on the table, with equal probabilities. So the opponent's probability to win is $P(3) \times 1/2 + P(2) \times 1/2 = 1/2 \times 1/2 + 1 \times 1/2 = 3/4$.

For coin (2-3), the opponent will get either 1 or 2 coins on the table, and wins with probability 1. Therefore, it is better to use (1-2) coin and the probability of current player to win is $1 - 3/4 = 1/4$. Finally, $P(4) = 1/4$.

We can continue in a similar way and find $P(5)$. Again, there are two options. For coin (1-2), the probability of opponent's win is $P(4) \times 1/2 + P(3) \times 1/2 = 1/8 + 1/4 = 3/8$. For coin (2-3), the probability of opponent's win is $P(3) \times 1/2 + P(2) \times 1/2 = 1/4 + 1/2 = 3/4$. Clearly, it is better to use coin (1-2), and $P(5) = 1 - 3/8 = 5/8$.

Finally, for $P(6)$ we have: if the player uses coin (2-3), the result is the same as $P(5)$, and if coin (1-2) is used, the probability of opponent's win is $P(5) \times 1/2 + P(4) \times 1/2 = 5/16 + 1/8 = 7/16 > 3/8$. Therefore, it is better to use coin (2-3) and $P(6)=5/8$.

Answer: first player wins more frequently. The probability of winning is $5/8$.

b. Criteria for grading

1. Answering Question 1 was graded five points.
2. Providing explicit argumentation for Question 1 was graded ten points.
3. Answering Question 2 was graded twenty points. Those who only made minor errors in calculations related to choosing the strategy got ten points. The answers where the authors identified possible outcomes but did not provide their probabilities were graded 5 points.
4. Small bonus grade could have been attributed for various keen remarks.

2. Come and Fall.

a. Preliminaries

In typology, speech reporting is generally classified into **direct** and **indirect** (speech) reporting. Under direct reporting, the quote represents the reported speech act as if **literally reproducing**

it. Among other things - and most importantly - this means the preservation of the **original deictic perspective** and is clearly seen in the use of **personal pronouns**. Cf. the following examples:

(a) Example of direct reporting: *She said: I'm going to be sick on you*

In (a), the use of personal pronouns is preserved as in the original speech act; 'I' refers to the reported (not the current) speaker and 'you' refers to the reported (not the current) addressee. Thus, it is direct reporting.

(b) Example of indirect reporting: *She said (that) she is going to be sick on you.*

In (b), the use of personal pronouns is re-calculated from the point of view of the actual speaker: the original speaker is referred to by "she", while "you" refers to the current rather than to the reported addressee. This is thus indirect reporting.

Note that, while direct and indirect reporting are often distinguished formally, in English the use of the subordinator "that" in indirect speech is optional. If it is absent, there is no visible formal difference between direct and indirect speech reporting in (a) and (b) (except probably the intonation). The difference is still there, as explained in terms of pronominal reference.

Therefore, students who assumed that the example provided for analysis was direct reporting based only on the fact that there is no subordination (or other special means indicating that this is indirect reporting) argued falsely. In fact, this is indeed direct reporting - because, presumably, imperative cannot be reported indirectly - see below - but the argument based merely on absence of subordination marker is invalid.

Finally, in naturalistic linguistic data speech reporting may be **semidirect**, combining elements of direct and indirect reporting.

Now we are ready to proceed to the task.

b. Solution

What kind of reporting do we have in the following example:

Z., *buwa-mu bo : un zaba.*

Z., mom-Erg say.Pfv [you.sg](#)(Nom) come.Imp

'Z(Nom), mom told that you should come'. (rough translation)

Based on the use of '[you.sg](#)' with reference to the actual speaker, one could suggest this is indirect reporting (formally unmarked, as when *that* in English is omitted in b), because the personal pronoun is selected from the perspective of the speaker.

The use of the **imperative** is however problematic - the speaker B reports the command from a third person (mom) and is not the issuer of the command, so the imperative does not seem to be appropriate.

Imperatives are not usually **reportable in indirect speech** at all (try this in Russian or English), so it seems to be a strong indication of direct reporting. But the pronoun is used as if in indirect speech. Is this contradiction problematic? Not so much: this may be a case of **semidirectness** (see preliminaries above).

However, simply positing semidirectness does not solve the problem.

Indeed, the use of the imperative does not represent original speech act, either. The original speaker could not have uttered the imperative, because the person whom she wants to act is not present. To issue a command to a third person she had to use another type of command (called **jussive** in typology; in fact, this is a separate form in the language in question). The note following the problem suggests not to postulate extended meanings of the imperative in addition to the basic one.

We conclude that another form was probably uttered in the original speech act, so there is something indirect about the use of imperative, too. However, the choice of the imperative does not reflect the perspective of the actual speaker (because B is not the issuer of the command); AND it does not reflect the perspective of the original speaker, either (because mom could not have uttered an imperative). Whose perspective does it reflect?

The imperative is used because this is a **command addressed to the current addressee, independently of who is the author of the command**. The person category of command (imperative, jussive, hortative) is selected **from the perspective of the addressee**. In the original speech act, jussive was used because the addressee of the command was not present. While reporting, jussive switches to imperative, because the addressee is present. In fact, this is not surprising, because commands are known to be second-person oriented.

To sum up, the quote is probably direct speech (because of the use of a command), but with two switches of the perspective (elements of indirect reporting). The personal pronoun has been recalculated from the perspective of the current speaker and the volitional form has been recalculated from the perspective of the current addressee.

Comments on the grades and criteria

Closest to the solution came those who correctly identified the problem of the use of the imperative as indication of directness and connected it to (contrasted with) the use of personal pronoun as indication of indirectness. Developing this idea into the explanation according to which "The current speaker utters what the original speaker would have uttered in her place" is probably too ad hoc; no such impersonification are attested as reporting strategy. However, this is a good guess and was graded high.

Noticing the problem with the pronoun was graded ten points.

Noticing the problem with the imperative was graded twenty points.

An explicit indication of how direct speech would look was graded ten points.

An explicit indication of how indirect speech would look was graded five points.

An (attempt at) explanation in terms of change of perspective was graded up to twenty points, depending on its explicitness, clearness and theoretical viability.

There is nothing wrong with the use of the cases - the nominative is used as address; the speaker is coded by an ergative because the verb of speech is transitive; its P slot is taken by the quote. Comments on the use of case marking were not graded.